UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERACTION IN THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM THROUGH DRAMA

A Licentiate thesis

by

Marja Putus

Department of Languages
2008

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Marja Putus
CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERACTION IN THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM THROUGH DRAMA

Lisensiaatin tutkielma

Englannin kieli
Syyskuu 2008 213 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tutkimus tarkastelee draaman käyttöä vieraan kielen opetuksessa ja sen tavoitteena on selvittää draaman tarjoamia vuorovaikutusmahdollisuuksia keskustelunanalyysin ja muiden analyyttisten työvälineiden avulla. Draamakasvatus tähtää oppilaan kokonaisvaltaiseen kehittämiseen ja kielen monipuoliseen käyttöön erilaisissa vuorovaikutustilanteissa. Pedagogisen draaman perustana on vygotskilainen sosiokulttuurinen oppimiskäsitys, joka on myös teoreettisena viitekehyksenä tässä tutkimuksessa tarkasteltaessa vieraan kielen oppimista. Lisänä keskustelussa on van Lierin ekologinen lähestymistapa kielen oppimiseen.

Tapaustutkimuksen aineistona on kaksi draamaharjoitusta videoiduilta draamatunneilta, jotka on taltioitu lukion ensimmäisen luokan englannin kurssilta. Harjoitukset ovat osa suurempaa draamakontekstia, jossa erilaisin draamallisin keinoin luodaan kuvitteellista todellisuutta. Draaman liittyvä konflikti ja asioiden pohtiminen ovat olennaisena osana kummassakin harjoituksessa. Ensimmäisessä opettaja ja oppilaat pelaavat ehdotusleikkiä vastakkaisina joukkueina. Opettaja ohjaa ja johtaa aktiviteettia, mutta esiintyy draamaroolissa. Toisessa harjoituksessa myös oppilaat ovat draamaroolissa, joista kaksi on keskeistä. Oppilailla on enemmän vastuuta vuorovaikutuksesta ja draaman kulusta.

Tutkimus osoitti, että kummankin harjoituksen vuorovaikutuksessa esiintyi sekä institutionaalisen luokkahuonediskurssin että arkikielen piirteitä. Ensimmäisen aktiviteetin neuvottelujaksot koostuivat pääasiassa erilaisista kysymyssekvennseistä opettajan ja oppilaiden välillä, joissa oppilailla oli tilaisuus myös aloitteellisiin puheenvuoroihin ja kollektiiviseen toimintaan. Toisen harjoituksen analyysi osoitti, että oppilailla oli mahdollisuus vaikuttaa toimintajaksojen muotoon, kysymyssekvenssien kulkuun ja toimia kollektiivisesti. Kummassakin harjoituksessa osallistujilla oli tilaisuus yhteiseen leikilliseen vuorovaikutukseen.

Tulokset näyttivät seuraavat draamakontekstille tyypilliset piirteet: Draamakontekstit ovat kuvitteellisia, mutta konkreettisia vuorovaikutustilanteita, joissa toimitaan kuten muissa sosiaalisissa konteksteissa. Draamakontekstit eivät ole irrallisia, vaan osa suurempaa draamakokonaisuutta, joka luodaan kertomuksen ja osallistujien toiminnan avulla. Osallistujat voivat myös puhua draamaroolien suojassa ja draamassa toimimiselle on olennaista ongelmanratkaisu, leikki ja huumori. Kielenoppimisen kannalta tarkasteltuna tutkimus osoitti, että osallistujilla on draaman antamat oikeudet ja tehtävät, joissa myös näkyy pyrkimys symmetriseen keskustelunomaiseen vuorovaikutukseen opettajan ja oppilaiden välillä. Draamakontekstin ja leikin voidaan katsoa toimivan välittäjänä vuorovaikutuksessa ja opettajan ja oppilaiden toiminta muodostaa oppimiselle lähikehityksen vyöhykkeen. Tutkimuksessa käy ilmi, että draaman asettamia tavoitteita voi saavuttaa myös vieraan kielen oppitunnilla. Tärkeintä on kuitenkin suostuminen draaman edellyttämään ’vakavaan leikkiin’.

Asiasanat: vuorovaikutus. keskustelunanalyysi. englanninkielen opetus. pedagoginen draama/ prosessidraama. Vygotskyn sosiokulttuurinen teoria. ekologinen lähestymistapa.

C O N T E N T S

1 INTRODUCTION

This research looks into interaction in a drama context which is used as a language learning environment in an English class, and where the interaction involves participants' fictional drama roles. The present study ties in with the growing amount of classroom research seeking to gain insight into language learning and teaching by examining interaction between teacher and pupils or between peers. More precisely, this study is based on the notion which sees second language learning as participation in a social activity, and understands interaction between participants as "the primordial site of sociality", in which the organisation of talk and participants' experience can be studied and explicated by means of conversation analysis (Young 2004: xi).

The present case study looks at the way in which the teacher and pupils participate in two drama activities for the common goals, and the opportunities which the drama frame seems to offer the participants to act and interact. The investigation of the two drama activities through conversation analysis (CA) is based on the taped and transcribed drama data alone, i.e. on the participants' verbal interaction and their understanding of it. In addition, the theoretical approaches and concepts of interaction and participation by Linell (1998), Levinson (1992), Goffman (1974) and Goodwin M.H. (1990) are part of the used analytic framework. Further, this study draws on previous research on classroom interaction and other CA informed studies which take a dialogic view of language and interaction. These classroom studies largely approach learning from the Vygotskian sociocultural perspective, which I will also do when discussing the findings of the present study. Since the theoretical underpinnings of drama in education are guided by Vygotsky's central ideas, the same theoretical notions and principles can thus be used when learning through drama and learning a second language are considered and discussed. As a classroom study, this research also draws on the theoretical concepts which van Lier (1988, 2000, 2001), Seedhouse (2004) and Edwards and Westgate (1994) have of second language learning.

Drama lessons which are carried out in an English classroom offer two areas of learning: they provide language learners with a forum to explore topics, broaden their understanding, play and use their imagination, and naturally they also make a context for foreign language practice. Whatever the context or circumstances for learning may be, the core goal of the L2 classroom is to teach a foreign language (Seedhouse 2004), and classroom drama is thus used

as a means of reaching the goal, i.e. fictional, make-believe situations create social contexts in which pupils can act, try out their ideas or appear in role. If the topics and themes in the drama lesson engage or move the participants, it may encourage participation, which may further motivate language learning. These are important considerations involved in practical classroom work, but not the focus of this study. Neither is there a purpose to find out how much English the participants in drama learn, how effective a method classroom drama appears to be or what drama skills the pupils acquire. Instead, I hope to describe and analyse the participants' action and interaction and pinpoint the opportunities which participation in a fictional context may offer the language learners to act and interact with each other. An 'opportunity' implies the idea of participants' voluntary activity and interest, and a chance to join in and participate is made available, not demanded. Van Lier (2000: 252) uses a more precise and evocative notion of 'affordance' (using a concept from Gibbons) by which he means a particular property of the environment which is relevant to "an active, perceiving organism in that environment". What the organism needs determines the property which becomes an affordance, i.e. in terms of language learning, an active learner will perceive linguistic affordances and make use of them in interaction. This notion of affordance (or opportunity) is at the centre of this study, since participation in drama means one type of interaction in a social context, and while creating a fictional context, the participants may largely decide about their own involvement in the talk.

Though the learning environment in this study involves a make-believe context, it is inevitably an L2 classroom context with its characteristic institutional nature. The classroom thus has its resources and constraints which have similarities and differences with other social settings. In the classroom, the teacher traditionally holds power and control, though they may be exercised in more subtle ways in more democratic classrooms. However, there is a growing need for an orientation towards interactional symmetry of participation in classroom talk, which does not mean the loss of the teacher's authority in class or assume equality between teacher and pupils. Interactional symmetry expresses itself in 'contingent talk' which resembles ordinary conversation with recognisable features. (van Lier 2001: 98-100) The way in which the interactional symmetry and participants' joint action is achieved in the two drama activities under scrutiny is also an important area of observation.

This chapter gives an introduction to the present study starting with some background information on classroom drama as a school subject, and continuing with the aims and scope

of the research. Conversation analysis and other methodological tools used in this study are next given a brief overview, and an account of the organisation of the chapters will finish the introduction.

1.1 Classroom drama

The roots of classroom drama are in England, in Peter Slade's workshops in the 1930s and from that on in the drama practices of Brian Way, Dorothy Heathcote, Gavin Bolton and Jonothan Neelands. They, among other drama practitioners in Britain, America and Australia, have their own philosophical and educational ideas which are expressed in practical applications and materials for teaching. Drama educators believe that while being engaged in a playful, imaginative activity, participants in drama learn something about themselves, others and the world around them. Thus, drama aims to provide a powerful learning experience in which fun and play can be an asset rather than a distraction for pupils of any age. In Britain, drama has established its place as a provider of versatile contexts for language use in the English class, as a separate art subject and as a medium to enhance learning in other subjects such as history, geography, religious instruction and science. In Finnish education too, drama has by no means been left on the sidelines in terms of theoretical and practical considerations and developments (see e.g. Heikkinen 2005).

Classroom drama, also called drama in education, educational drama, and more recently process drama, as an established genre within the genre system of drama education, involves working within a structured drama lesson, usually built round one theme, which can also be extended and branched into a larger project. Working in drama is a process which uses different drama conventions to highlight the content as well as narrative, poetic or artistic qualities and reflection in the drama. It sets intellectual, emotional, physical and social goals and allows the participants, teacher and pupils, to work side by side. The teacher knows the plan of the lesson and is in charge, often appearing in role, and in this respect, the lesson is not a free 'democratic' forum for speech. Still the teacher's instructive role has changed: she is an organizer, helper, co-worker and a member of the group. She leads the drama on through different conventions, which give the frame for interaction, while the participants create the content. It is here that the pupils are free to take the opportunity to participate and interact when they plan, propose, negotiate or question in role or out of role.

But what is actually needed to create a successful drama session whether it involves one's mother tongue or a foreign language? Most essentially, participants must be ready to accept the pretend context, i.e. to 'submit' to the dramatic situation (Bolton 1992), feel like playing the game and 'step in someone else's shoes'. On the other hand, participants in drama have some power over their own involvement and the amount of initiative they take in the development of the events. However, ideally the more active and focused the participants' action is, the more enjoyable and beneficial the drama is likely to become. Thus, it seems that a drama lesson demands somewhat different skills from those needed in ordinary lessons. Besides the willingness to join in, participants should have the courage and confidence to face the changing situations. Here the social climate of the group is an important factor. Moreover, though the active use of language is not compulsory, the unpredictable nature of drama may also cause language problems. On the other hand, we learn in different ways, and the quality of play and the use of roles in drama may create the type of context that some pupils find relaxing and ideal for them.

Thus on the whole, adopting the drama context into a second language classroom does not seem to involve any significant changes in participation, viz. the lesson has an agenda which is followed through varying activities with the teacher in charge of the process. However, participation in drama essentially requires submitting to the make-believe reality, i.e. a willingness to play the game, taking a role of some status, carrying out the talk or reaching for the goal set in the drama. Moreover, when participants are engaged in negotiating or acting out in a make-believe situation, the drama context works like a social context in 'the real world'. Thus, different drama activities can be seen to provide language learners with a variety of social contexts in which to act and interact.

1.2 Aims and scope of the present study

To discover the opportunities for interaction which a drama context may offer to language learners, this research aims to find out the defining characteristics of a fictional learning environment as they appear in the single case of one particular group participating in two drama activities. Being engaged in dramatic playing in the drama contexts, the participants have a chance to interact in a fictional setting which resembles a real social context. On the other hand, the interaction in the drama context is also shaped by the institutional L2 context,

in which it is embedded. The four research questions in this study focus on the way in which the participants interact and organise their talk in the two drama activities:

1. How do the participants organise their talk in the drama activities, and what institutional and non-institutional features can be found in them?
2. What access do the pupils have to talk individually or collectively?
3. What kind of action sequences are built in the two drama activities?
4. What is the role of the fictional context in the interaction between the participants in drama?

The two drama activities under study, i.e. the problem solving activity and the whole group role play, comprise the primary data, for which a first-year sixth form class and their English teacher have acted as participants during their English course. These activities are part of three recorded and transcribed drama lessons which form the background data for the investigation. The participants also use the third lesson, from which the primary data are taken, as a contextual resource for interaction. Participation in both the activities involves a fictional drama context so that in the first activity, the teacher appears in a central drama role, and in the second, the whole group takes roles with varying statuses. The use of questions as tools for negotiation between participants appears another common factor in the activities and is made into a central object of investigation. As the problem solving game has a more teacher-centred interactional pattern than the whole group role play with more equal participation rights, pupils' access to talk and symmetry between speakers can also be focused on in the study of talk-in-interaction.

Thus on the one hand, the description and analysis of the two drama activities hope to display the interactional pattern of each activity and the way in which the participants orient to the activities, i.e. what features of classroom talk and everyday communication are made visible in talk-in-interaction. On the other hand, the impact of the make-believe on the interaction is also focused on in the chapters of analysis. When participants 'talk the drama into being' in various ways, playfulness becomes an important and interesting focal point of study.

1.3 Methodology

The core methodological tool used for the analysis of talk-in-interaction in this research is conversation analysis, which studies social interaction in a natural setting and the way in which the interactants themselves orient to the situation as a social activity. Since

conversation analysis gives an emic, participants' perspective to the action and interaction in question, it seems an apt method to use in this kind of study, i.e. in describing and analysing participants' talk systematically. 'Talk-in-interaction' will also be used to refer to the interaction in this study, since it gives a wider scope for the concept of conversation, which refers to talk in everyday situations (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1999: 13). Everyday talk, however, makes an essential point of comparison, a 'benchmark', for interaction which is studied in an institutional setting. The analytic framework in this study also includes the study of participation frameworks and the participants' use of contextual resources and topics for interaction in drama, for which the approaches of Goffman (1974), Goodwin M.H.(1990) and Linell (1998) are used as tools for the investigation of these phenomena.

1.4 Organisation of chapters

The first chapters in this research offer some background information on the topics of the study of talk-in-interaction, interaction in the classroom and classroom drama: Chapter 2 gives a brief introduction to the tools and approaches which are used in the description and analysis of participation in the drama activities. Chapter 3 focuses on central institutional features of classroom interaction with reference to recent research carried out about it. In Chapter 4, the main characteristics, principles and practices of classroom drama are introduced and discussed. Chapter 5 outlines the organisation of the present study.

The two core chapters of analysis and description are organised in different ways, so that Chapter 6, which deals with the problem solving activity, describes the participation and interaction of the teacher and the pupils separately as acts and moves of the two opposite sides which play against each other. This also means that the same extracts will be shown more than once, as different aspects in interaction are focused on separately. Chapter 7 displays how questioning is done in the whole group role play and takes the participation frameworks used in the activity into account. Discussion in Chapter 8 sums up the findings displayed in the previous chapters of the analysis of the two drama activities, and explicates the defining characteristics of a fictional learning environment. The way in which the two drama activities are carried out is next discussed from the point of view of classroom drama, i.e. which goals set for the drama seem to have been attained. The findings of the study are also viewed in the light of second language learning to explicate what kind of opportunities and affordances interaction in a drama context seems to offer to language learners, and how learning may be

seen to be mediated in this type of learning environment as observed from the Vygotskian perspective. Finally, the use of classroom drama, its potentials and applications in the English classroom, areas for further research and the limitations of the present study are discussed.

2. THE STUDY OF TALK-IN-INTERACTION

This chapter discusses the organisation of talk, conversation analysis with which this organisation can be studied, the concept of participation framework, the notion of activity types and the nature of contextual resources which speakers use in their talk. In conversation analytical research, the term 'talk-in-interaction' is generally preferred to 'conversation' to refer to different types of data which are analysed (Drew and Heritage 1992: 4). In the present study, it is used about the talk in a fictional drama context which has features of everyday conversation and institutional classroom talk, and which can also be recognised as interaction in a second language classroom. The main focus in the first two sections is on everyday talk, the way it is studied through conversation analysis and participation frameworks, but the interaction in the drama activities is discussed and commented on with examples from the present data. In the third section, drama activities are defined as special activity types in the genre of educational drama, and the last section discusses the contextual resources which participants in talk or a drama lesson can make use of.

2.1 Conversation analysis

Conversation analysis studies the social action and the whole process of interaction between interactants in mundane naturally occurring talk and focuses on the three ways in which speakers construct their speech, i.e. by organizing their speech turns and sequences of action as well as through repair. All these are the preconditions of interaction and a background for the conversation helping participants to interpret each other. (Hakulinen 1997: 13-16.) Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 38-39) point out that the 'sequential order of talk' is the essential notion of conversation analysis, and it is one of its aims to reveal this order: firstly, by considering the 'next turn' in which the speakers' understanding of the possible completion of the 'prior turn' is displayed, and secondly, by observing the way in which the ongoing production of talk is analysed by participants themselves so as to be able to participate and act appropriately on the basis of their analysis. Another equally central concern of conversation analysis is the 'inferential order of talk', which means the cultural and interpretative resources used by participants to understand each other correctly. However, the main focus of conversation analysis is to study the organisation of meaningful conduct or action, rather than how the turns are organised. Thus, the analysis does not only explicate the talk, but is also

able to capture the way in which interactants accomplish their conduct, i.e. talk is viewed as social action. (Pomerantz and Fehr 1997: 65.)

This method of studying talk was originated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson whose article (1974) proposed a model for the turn-taking organization for conversation. They suggested that the model should be "characterized as locally managed, party-administered, interactionally controlled, and sensitive to recipient design" (Sacks at al 1974: 696). The researchers saw turn taking as a basic form in which conversation could be organised. It would be 'context-free', since its major aspects were not affected by the context. Being independent of the context could make the turn taking system take the different situations and local contexts into account, i.e. be 'context-sensitive'. The turn-taking system could thus be used in any type of conversation as a 'formal apparatus' (Sacks et al 1974: 699-700).

In Seedhouse (2004: 13-16), the principles of conversation analysis are characterised as follows: firstly, talk in interaction is systematically organised, orderly and methodic; secondly, the produced interaction is shaped by the context and is also context-renewing; thirdly, research cannot dismiss any detail in interaction as disorderly or irrelevant (quoted from Heritage 1984b: 241); and fourthly, the data should not be approached with any theoretical background assumptions. Conversation analysis draws largely on Garfinkel's ideas in ethnomethodology, and the third principle of conversation analysis is based on the ethnomethodological principles of indexicality and reflexivity. i.e. of the context-boundedness of talk and the fact that the same methods are used in producing the action and interpreting it (Seedhouse 2004: 7-11). Because of the influence which the co-operation with Garfinkel and the adoption of his principles had on Sacks's ideas, both men have been seen as the founders of conversation analysis (Koskela and Piirainen-Marsh 2002: 261-262). This section discusses the way in which interaction is organised by turn taking, action sequences and repair.

2.1.1 Turn-taking rules for conversation

The turn-taking system focuses on both the message units which comprise the turns and the practices which are used to allocate the turns between participants. In everyday talk, conversational turns may be constructed out of four kinds of units, those consisting of a single lexical item, a phrase, a clause which is part of a sentence or a full sentence. Participants in conversation will project to the place where these 'turn construction units' will end and where

a speaker change is possible and made relevant. They look for cues, such as a change in the pitch of the voice or the end of the syntactic unit, which mark the end of the turn at the 'transition relevance place' (TRP), which will allow them to have the floor. (Nofsinger 1991: 80-82.) This feature is called ‘projectability’, which allows participants in conversation to project what type and length the ongoing turn-construction unit is, and what possibility there is to have a speaker change at the transition relevance place, which are the two key features in turn-construction (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 48).

Further, participants’ turns can be allocated in any of the following ways, according to the model by Sacks et al (1974): the current speaker can either select the next speaker, any other speaker may self-select or the current speaker can go on. At the next transition relevance place, the same set of rules is followed again. These ‘rules’ are normative practices which are oriented to and used to achieve orderly turn taking by participants in talk. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 48-50.) Sacks at al. thus see turn-taking as ‘locally and interactionally managed’ between the participants, who turn by turn decide about the next speaker at the transition relevance place of each turn, and participants’ action has an effect on their co-speakers’ behaviour in talk (Nofsinger 1991: 80-86) .

These turn taking rules are typical of ordinary conversation, but as will be discussed later in Chapter 3, different turn-taking rules often apply to institutional settings, such as classrooms. Still, talk-in-interaction in a language class may resemble ordinary talk at times, the rules of which the participants orient to while interacting. In the first drama lesson of my research data, two participants get into a longer exchange of words in the middle of a ‘hot seating’ activity, in which a pupil in the role of a table is being interviewed by the group:

(1)

1	Anu		you are a table (1.0)
2	Ella		yes kitchen table
3	Anu		kitchen table why you be a ↑<u>kitchen</u> table (1.0)
4	Ella		why=
5	Anu		=why why (.) you don't be (.) for example in the living room or=
6	Ella	→	=because I'm so <u>big</u>
7	Ps		((laughter))
8	Anu		big
9	Ella		and if you wanna be a living room table=
10	Anu	→	=yes=
11	Ella		=you have to be like a ↑small↑ table I'm so big and I can live
12			with those messy people
13	Ps	→	((laughter))
14	Anu		ok

In the passage, there is no competition for the floor, and the interview structure is followed in an orderly manner. The length of the speakers' turns varies from a clause to single lexical units. The talk runs smoothly between the speakers, and there are no noticeable gaps between turns except for brief pauses at the beginning. Both the pupils orient to the normative rules of turn-taking and the speaker change occurs at the transition relevance places. This is also the case in line 6, when Ella's turn seems to interrupt Anu's explanation. The onset of her turn occurs at the transition relevance place of Anu's turn (line 5), i.e. she projects to the TRP of Anu's turn, where she has the right to self-select a turn. Further, the interruption does not appear disruptive, since it also informs that Anu does not have to continue with her explanation. In line 10, Anu places her response ('yes') at the transition relevance place. It occurs in the middle of Ella's turn latching, but seems like an overlapping turn. It can also be considered orderly in displaying how Anu orients to the transition relevance place. The brief exchange of talk is clearly between two speakers addressing each other and the rest of the group (i.e. Ps) here is in the role of an audience, which is also seen to occupy turns (lines 7, 13) by providing a response to the talk through laughter.

Many of the features in the drama excerpt above are among the phenomena which Sacks et al included in their list of 'grossly apparent facts' which characterize ordinary conversation and result from the conversational turn-taking system. These facts state that only one participant speaks at a time, that the order of speaker turns is not determined in advance, that the length of speakers' turns varies, that the contents of the turns are not restricted but free, and that speaker change occurs. These 'facts', except for the first one, can be considered the defining characteristics of ordinary conversation due to the locally managed turn taking between speakers. (Nofsinger 1991: 86-89.) Besides dealing with speakers' ways of taking or keeping the floor, conversation analysis is detailed enough to include different types of silences, i.e. pauses (occurring within a speaker's turn), laps (taking place during and after a TRP) and gaps (a brief silence at the TRP, or overlapping of turns and interrupting a co-speaker's talk (Nofsinger 1991: 94-104). Further, overlaps, rather than being proved as speakers' failures to produce orderly talk, are seen to be evidence of participants' close orientation to the turn-taking rules: as research e.g. by Jefferson shows, overlapping tends to occur at possible transition-relevance places (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 54).

One of the consequences of the turn taking system is that participants in conversation have to listen to the continuing talk to find a place to join in, viz. the system holds an inbuilt

motivation to listen regardless of other motivations, such as interest (Sacks et al 1974: 727). This is because, as Nofsinger (1991: 90) puts it, “things that happen in the current turn are potentially vital to how we should conduct ourselves in the next turn, whether we should speak (and if so , what we may appropriately say) or whether we should remain silent”. In the classroom activity above, this seems to affect only the two pupils carrying out the interview. Still, any other pupil is allowed to join in the interview, since the whole group is asked to ‘hot seat’ the pupil as the kitchen table, and doing so, would require listening in order to find the right gap in the talk.

In the drama excerpt above, the interviewer’s questions and the interviewee’s answers form question-answer adjacency pairs, which are one of the most typical action sequences with which interactants structure and organize their talk in a conversation.

2.1.2 Sequential organisation of talk

The turns which are exchanged by participants are not just ‘serially ordered’, but ‘sequentially ordered’, which means that there is a link between the turns, and some utterances regularly appear in pairs. Accordingly, greetings, questions and invitations are followed by return greetings, answers and acceptances or declinations, as a rule. In their latter turns, co-speakers display their understanding of the contents of the prior turns and the action which they are meant to do, for which speakers also use inference. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 38-39.)

The concept of these kinds of paired utterances, i.e. 'adjacency pairs', was characterised by Schegloff and Sacks as sequences of two communicative actions adjacent to each other produced by different speakers. Thus in an adjacency pair, the ‘first pair part’ and the ‘second pair part’ of the action must be sequentially ordered and matched with each other. (Raevaara 1998: 76.) With some adjacency pairs, alternative actions are made relevant, such as an acceptance or a refusal of an offer. Participants in talk produce these alternatives in different ways, for which they use the following preference organisation, in which an acceptance is considered ‘preferred’ and a refusal is seen as a ‘dispreferred’ action (Pomerantz 1984, as quoted by Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 43). In the case of offers, speakers accept them promptly without delay, which is the expected action, but tend to produce a refusal as a delayed action with an explanation (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 43-45).

Moreover, adjacency pairs often occur in different combinations. An 'insertion sequence' may be used after the first pair part (for instance, a question) to get a clarification to it before the second pair part (i.e. an answer) is uttered. So an insertion sequence intervenes another adjacency pair as a necessary exchange, before the second pair part to the original first pair part can be produced, i.e. before it becomes relevant. (Nofsinger 1991: 61-65.)

A sequence may also start with a 'presequence' which leads to the actual conversational action, for instance, to an invitation, and helps the co-speaker to predict the coming action (Nofsinger 1991: 55-61). In the previous example (1), a presequence is seen to begin the ‘hot seating’ activity:

(2)
1 Anu you are a table (1.0)
2 Ella yes kitchen table

These two turns form an adjacency pair spoken by two different speakers: Anu is about to interview Ella in the role of a table, and her statement works as an introduction to her next action, which is to interview ‘the table’. Ella’s agrees and adds a clarification.

The sequential organization of talk helps the speaker to coordinate her own speech and understand that of another person. The speaker is drawn to interpret the prior utterance, whether it appears in an adjacency pair or not, and her current utterance proves its correct interpretation. In this way each utterance builds an expectation of the next utterance, and this creates a frame for interpretation. (Raevaara 1998: 91.) In everyday situations, subjective meanings are created by each person for talk, but since these meanings are similar to the ones created by her conversational partners, the participants in talk can achieve an ‘intersubjective understanding’ about things in life (Nofsinger 1991: 66).

2.1.3 Repair organisation

Conversation analysis is not interested in errors in speech, but in those instances in conversation which the speakers themselves find problematic and in need of repair. In fact, repair is necessary for participants to be able to understand each other, and any part of speakers' utterances can be repaired. (Sorjonen 1997: 112-113.) In everyday situations, conversational problems caused by someone forgetting a word, using an unclear expression or making an error occur quite frequently, and these are usually fixed in the same turn or in the

next one after the trouble source. The purpose of repair in conversation is to make the conversation work, and when successful, repair increases alignment between speakers, and it is often accomplished jointly by the participants. (Nofsinger 1991: 124-126.) The repair system in conversation analysis makes a distinction between the initiation of repair and the repair itself, and both of these actions can be initiated or carried out by self or by other. Four varieties of repair in interaction typically occur at different places in talk-in-interaction, i.e. self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair. In everyday talk, speakers show a tendency to use and favour self-repair rather than other-repair in various ways to maintain harmony between the speakers. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 61-69.)

Thus, repair interrupts the ongoing conversation until the problem has been solved, i.e. the speaker may stop his current utterance and repair it, or the recipient may want to get a clarification (Nofsinger 1991: 129). In the following data segment, the question-answer sequence is inserted with Ella's repair initiation ('why') which seeks for clarification (line 4). The insertion sequence (lines 4 and 5) is needed before the answer, i.e. the second pair-part of the sequence, can be given (line 6):

(3)

3	Anu		kitchen table why you be a <u>kitchen</u> table (1.0)
4	Ella	→	why=
5	Anu		why why (.) you don't be (.) for example in the living room or=
6	Ella		=because I'm so <u>big</u>

This is other-initiated self-repair, in which the interviewer (line 5) repairs the problem source. Repair is a common conversational phenomenon and crucial for successful, smoothly-running interaction, but there are also other methods of alignment constantly being practiced in any conversation.

2.1.4 Alignment between speakers

The secret of a smoothly running conversation is in the aligning work which conversational partners resort to whenever there is a danger that they have violated cultural expectations. In an ordinary conversation, a simple response to an offer shows how its speaker understands the prior turn, and by doing so, he shows what the alignment between the speakers is. Assessments to given information and expressions of surprise at a new piece of information (with 'newsmarks', such as 'really?', partial repeats or 'oh'-receipts) are common aligning

practices in talk. Heritage (1984, as quoted by Nofsinger 1991: 116) calls the ‘oh’- receipt a ‘change-of-state token’, which means that a speaker’s state has changed from ‘uninformed’ to an ‘informed’ one. Some other aligning methods have different functions, such as giving feedback to the co-speaker with ‘continuers’ (”uh huh”, “yeah”), which show that their user is listening, but which do not aim at taking a turn and thus allow the current speaker to continue. Formulations summarise the gist of the prior turn and also clarify or conform what has been said. They also occasion a confirmation about the correctness of the formulation from the other party, and are a proof of the reached alignment. Formulating or completing another speaker's utterances and opening and closing conversations are some of the most common aligning practices. (Nofsinger 1991: 111-123.) All in all, speakers are guided by alignment practices in order to achieve intersubjectivity between each other, as well as by the context in which each utterance can be interpreted, i.e. participants’ conversational actions “create an interpretative resource that is used to align conversational understanding” (Nofsinger 1991: 142-143).

The segment of the ‘hot seating’ excerpt also includes an aligning utterance in line 10:

(4)

9	Ella	and if you wanna be a living room table=
10	Anu→	=yes=
11	Ella	=you have to be like a ↑small↑ table I'm so big and I can live
12		with those messy people
13	Ps	((laughter))
14	Anu →	ok

Anu’s feedback cuts Ella’s turn midway unobtrusively, and the utterance latches with the prior part of Ella’s contribution. In line 14, the ok-pass works as an assessment to the speaker's account.

The drama excerpt which has been recycled in the sections of this chapter is short, but it includes plenty of those features which make a conversation an organized activity which the speakers construct together. The two speakers participate in turn as a current speaker and a recipient, and the third party, i.e. the rest of the group, has the role as ‘ratified listeners’ with a right to participate if they wish to. These participation roles will be discussed in the following section.

2.2 Participation frameworks

Conversation analysis studies interaction in which all participants are seen as equally important to the organization of talk, and both the 'current speaker' and the 'recipients' actively influence the outcome of a conversation. ‘Participation framework’ describes the way in which participants in conversation have different roles in participation as well as different discourse identities. Originally Erving Goffman developed the concept of participation framework to give the analysis of a multi-party conversation a much wider scope and depth, and he used the term only to refer to the recipients. Instead of using a linguistic concept of a listener, Goffman saw a group of participants as recipients who each had a different access to speech. They could join in the talk as 'ratified participants' or remain as listeners, i.e. as 'overhearers and bystanders'. 'Production format' was Goffman's term for speaker roles, in which the current speaker was referred to as the 'animator' when he simply produced the utterance in a speech situation. If the thoughts he expressed were his own, he also acted as the 'author' of the expression. However, if the speaker borrowed someone else's thoughts, values or expressions, he only acted for the 'principal', the source whose values and thoughts he was expressing and whose position he was supporting. In reality, most often all three roles are expressed in the speaker's words: he expresses his own thoughts in his own words and according to his own conviction. The newsreader represents exactly the opposite: he is only the reader of the editor's story which, in its turn, is based on the politician's opinions. (Seppänen 1997: 156-159.)

Charles Goodwin and Marjorie Harness Goodwin introduced the concept of participation framework into conversation analysis in a somewhat modified form. They applied participation framework to cover all the participants, the current speaker included, in the speech situation. The conversation analytical concept of participation framework is based on the thought that the context of a conversation is created by all participants together, and that each participant has a role which affects the talk which is being created. The participation framework during talk is in constant motion, as speaker changes occur, i.e. speakers ‘change their footing’. The term ‘recipient design’ is used to describe the way in which the speaker takes the recipients into account in his talk. Besides speaker roles, according to Charles Goodwin, participants have certain changing discourse identities, which depend on the kind of access that they have to the conversation, i.e. whether they share the same experience as the other speakers or not. (Seppänen 1997: 159-162.)

2.2.1 Participation roles in play and drama

In studies on participation roles used in storytelling or children's play, Margaret Harness-Goodwin shows, using the analytical view of Goffman (1974), how the speaker in storytelling may be seen to have several entities which "coexist as different levels of intricately laminated participation structure" (Goodwin M.H. 1990: 233). These speaker entities are demonstrated through an exchange of talk between the ethnographer (MHG) and a child called Bea:

(5) Boy skates down the street.

Bea: That boy have ugly sneaks don't he.
MHG: Mm yeah.
Bea: HEY BOY
→ THAT GIRL SAY **YOU** HAVE UGLY SNEAKS! (Goodwin M.H. 1990: 234.)

In this situation, the ethnographer herself is the 'principal' or the 'originator' of the statement. The content of the statement is 'authored' by Bea, for whom it may be part of a larger 'strategy' to initiate a confrontation. Bea also 'emits' the statement. When speaking to the boy, Bea 'animates' the talk as the talk of the ethnographer and also animates her as a 'figure'. In other words, when the speaker acts as a 'sounding box' that transmits the actual sounds, she is said to 'emit' the talk, whereas when the speaker enacts the character whose words she emits, she is seen to 'animate' the talk. (Goodwin M.H. 1990: 233-234.)

Similarly, when participants in drama speak in role and take turns, they do not necessarily express their own thoughts, feelings or attitudes. In conversation analytical terms, they are not the 'principals' of the thoughts or values which they express, but act as 'authors' speaking as the representative of the principal, which is their imaginary role figure. In this case, individual speakers are not responsible for their opinions alone, and they "use words and meanings for purposes that are only in part their own" (Linell 1998: 108). For example, the pupil in the role of the rude porcupine, which is a drama character in the data of the present study, is not likely to share all or any of the sentiments of the porcupine, but she may still portray the character in a convincing way. Moreover, participants' drama roles and learner roles may exist side by side and a change between these roles may take place within the speaker's turn.

The next extract is a brief questioning sequence between two pupils who author the exchange in the roles of an animal questioner and the squirrel from the parliament of animals, which is

the second analysed activity in the research. There is a temporary shift from Ella's drama role into her learner role:

(6)

1	Simo	do you have [any friends
2	Ella	[ºn(h)ice to m(h)eet youº
3	Ella →	↑friends (.) oh yes I have (.) one (4.0) he's a (2.0) he's <u>she</u>'s a where is it
4		((looks at her wordlist)) now ladybird
5	Ps	((some laughter))

Simo asks whether the squirrel has any friends (line 1). In line 2, Ella produces a laughing greeting, and animates the squirrel's affirmation ('↑friends (.) oh yes I have (.) one') in line 3. She continues to elaborate her turn in her role as the squirrel. Since she fails to remember the word which is needed, she switches her role into that of a language learner by uttering 'where is it', i.e. she now acts as the principal of her talk (line 3). When she finds the word in the wordlist and utters the word 'ladybird' she is again authoring the squirrel's words (line 4).

In other words, there are two frames, i.e. abstract situation definitions (Goffman 1974), for participants in drama: As usual, they act and interact in an 'everyday' frame while participating in a drama activity as teacher and pupils. At the same time, they interact within a fictional drama frame, which involves speaking in role and treating the circumstances in the drama as if they were real, in the same way as you play a game in earnest still knowing that it is only a game.

In this drama activity, some participation roles have set positions, i.e. the two pupils in their animal roles act either as current speakers or as addressees, and cannot take other listener roles while they are questioned. The positions of the other participants, the teacher included, are more varied, and they can act as current speakers, but are also free to adopt listener roles whenever they like. In interaction, as a rule, the talk by the current speaker is always directed to someone else and in a multi-party event there may be several listener roles. There is the '(primary) addressee', who is often the prior speaker, and to whom the talk is designed. There are also 'third persons', which means other recipients present at a multi-party event as 'ratified listeners', often when the current speaker has singled out one primary addressee. Whatever the listener role, i.e. that of addressee, third person, overhearer or split audience, the current speaker's talk is other-oriented to all those audiences. (Linell 1998: 101-107.)

2.2.2 Playfulness

In the fictional contexts of the drama activities in my data, participants' action can often be described as 'playful', denoting a witty and humorous choice of words, a non-serious way of uttering them or bursts of laughter which mark the incident playful. Playfulness in those contexts is connected to the 'make-believe' or acting in role. In Goffman's Frame Analysis (1974: 43-45), the way in which participants transcribe a situation as playful, i.e. a given, meaningful activity is transformed into something else by the participants, is called 'keying'. Thus, participants in the activity must openly acknowledge the systematic alteration of meaningful materials, and in doing so, show that they know what event is going on. Cues are used to mark the beginning and end of the transformation of a playful activity, and the scope of the materials that can be altered is wide. Finally, the playful activity may not be much different from the activity which is transformed, but participants experience it quite differently and know what is going on.

Playfulness is a central kind of 'make-believe', which is one of the basic keys which are used in a social context. In make-believe, participants imitate or run through an activity for fun, also knowing that they are doing it for fun. Playfulness means "the relatively brief intrusion of unserious mimicry" between interlocutors, and this occurs in society everywhere, though limits, concerning matters of good taste, may be established as to the use of playfulness. (Goffman 1974: 48-51.)

When participants are involved in dramatic playing, they act in a make-believe context, and though they do it as a classroom activity, it is keyed as a make-believe activity. But this is not an automatic occurrence, and it is up to the group how they decide to participate. In an ordinary social context, moments involving make-believe or playfulness require participants' mutual understanding and acknowledgement about the nature of the situation. Similarly, successful drama requires that participants want to play the game and submit themselves to the make believe. Playfulness does not seem to be a necessary ingredient in a drama lesson, especially if the theme which is dealt with is serious or sensitive. On the other hand, in a game-like drama playfulness is likely to be actively pursued in interaction.

Language play created for fun by children and adults is seen as a natural part of life, which should be taken into account in language teaching too, according to Cook (1997: 227-231),

who has studied pupils' play with language forms and play with semantic meanings in a language classroom. More recently, the use of language play as a resource has started to gain further interest as a way of enhancing second language learning. In her research, Bell (2005: 192-214) studied how three non-native female students used verbal humour in interaction with native speakers outside the classroom. She found that language play could suggest proficiency and be useful in learning vocabulary. Sullivan's (2000: 115-131) research on the use of playful interaction between teacher and adult language learners in Vietnam took the sociocultural perspective. Playfulness as a cultural feature was found to be a mediating factor in language learning. The study by Broner and Tarone (2001: 363-379) distinguished two notions of play in classroom interactions in a Spanish immersion classroom: ludic language play (i.e. play for fun, as defined by Cook (2000)) and language play which Lantolf considers rehearsal in private speech. Both types of play were seen to have different but potentially important roles in second language acquisition. Cekaite and Aronsson (2005: 169-191) researched form-focused language play in a Swedish immersion classroom, and showed how language play was initiated by children and carried out collaboratively. The play was seen to involve a number of spontaneously produced actions, such as verbal puns, mislabelling leading to informal repair sequences, shared laughter, joking and play with language and human voice. Drama creates a context which inherently involves play and the use of humour, stemming from the same human need to have moments of shared fun as has been found in the studies on play in language classrooms.

2.3 Activity types

Drama activities in a drama lesson have their own interactional patterns which participants have to learn and use, and which make sense within the drama context. These activities with their characteristics can be seen as different 'activity types', the notion of which was introduced by Stephen Levinson (1979). This notion is close to Wittgenstein's concept of 'language games', and it argues that single utterances, i.e. communicative acts, can only be interpreted correctly in the context of some particular activity that the speaker is engaged in. On the other hand, communicative acts reflect the context of those activities, which participants use for interpretation, i.e. there is interdependence between acts and the activity itself, and they can be seen to co-constitute each other. (Linell 1998: 235-237.)

Levinson (1992: 69) himself defines activity types as “a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions”. Activity types may range from pre-planned occasions, such as a mass in church, to informal talks, or may even be constructed without any talk like football games. Activities, such as seminars or court cases, are also subdivided into ‘subparts’ or ‘episodes. (Levinson 1992: 69-79.) Drew and Heritage (1992: 21-25) use Levinson’s concept of activity types as a point of departure when addressing aspects of institutional talk (discussed in the next section in more detail), which is seen as goal-oriented interaction, involving constraints on contributions as well as requiring reasoning and inference. These features also direct the interaction in the drama activities.

In a drama lesson which comprises different types of activities, participants have to learn the rules of each ‘language game’ in question and to interpret the interaction within the drama frame: first, they will have to acknowledge the imaginary nature of drama, and second, they will have to learn the 'rules' of that particular activity. Each drama activity, or drama convention, can thus be seen as a separate activity type, which has its own procedures for interaction to be accepted and interpreted within that activity. Some, such as the parliament of animals in the research data, involves ‘subparts’ which are followed. The next excerpt from an activity called 'hot seating' uses an interview structure all the way through. Here the group ‘hot seats’ one of the pupils who is in the role of a kitchen appliance:

(7)

1	Tomi →	£do you like to be a mixer
2	Anu	yes [that's that's my favourite hobby ((laughs)) and I (2.0) like to be a mixer
3	Ps	[((laughter))
4	Asta →	why do you like to be a mixer even if you get err a headache
5		[all the time
6	Anu	[I have a err strong head
7	Ps	((laughter))

The group interviews one pupil at a time in the drama activity in which the goal is to make questions and answers which are suitable to inanimate objects. The humorous drama context helps pupils to come up with playful exchanges of talk, and the activity can only make sense within the fictive frame. Interviewing a mixer may also be thought sensible within a bigger framework, i.e. as a classroom exercise which teaches drama skills, or in an English class, provides language practice, which can be seen as the ultimate goals of the activity. Reversely, the talk through which the pupils pursue fun and humour reflects the whole activity: in the

extract above, the pupil in role produces playful answers, and the audience, interpreting the activity as a task which involves fun and play, responds with laughter.

Linell (1998: 239) discusses the concept of communicative genres in connection with activity types. Introduced by Luckmann (1985), communicative genres are socially constructed solutions to occurring communicative problems which thus can be solved in a routinised ways, in other words, they are "originally interactionally developed, then historically sedimented, often institutionally congealed, and finally interactionally reconstructed in situ". Activity types, frames or genres define speech situations for speakers and they can be considered the most important contextual resources for carrying out a conversation. Further, for some institutional activities, such as court trials, police interrogations, job interviews or school lessons, such routine genres have developed. In these genres, talk is the means of dealing with the tasks in question, participants have particular social roles and participation frameworks, and topics and turn-taking systems are defined. Besides, ordinary conversations can also form communicative genres or genre-like activity types, such as dinner-table conversations, telephone conversations or talk at work between colleagues. (Linell 1998: 236-241.)

However, activity types and communicative genres cannot be seen as 'interchangeable', since not all activity types have fixed cultural patterns (Linell 1998: 239). Rather than represent a communicative genre themselves, some activity types could perhaps be thought to belong to a communicative genre or two genres at the same time. School lessons vary from teacher-centred lessons to group discussions, both of which could be seen to represent different activity types, for which different language games must be learned. Similarly classroom drama seems a communicative genre of its own, which employs a number of drama conventions with their own patterns of interaction. As a school subject, classroom drama is institutional in character with special goals, constraints and procedures, but its tools for work are derived from the fields of art and theatre. Sometimes communicative genres "get blended" (Linell 1998: 240), and classroom drama could be thought as such a blend, since in drama lessons, the fields of instruction and theatre are brought together. Within the communicative genre of classroom drama, an individual drama activity, i.e. drama convention, would thus appear as an activity type with its well-defined pattern for interaction. When drama is used to enhance second language learning at school, drama activities similarly work as special activity types which work within a drama frame and are understood as such. Within the genre

system of drama education, classroom drama, now generally called ‘process drama’, is also regarded as a genre in its own right with that name (Heikkinen 2005: 62).

Thus, classroom drama appears as a special didactic genre, which has other patterns for interaction than traditional teacher-centred lessons. Some of the activities in both kinds of lessons may be the same, but the defining feature in a dramatic speech exercise, compared with other language exercises, is its use of the medium of the theatre. The different activity types which are employed during a drama lesson have this feature of an imagined reality in common, one way or another. The goals of drama lessons and traditional lessons may be similar, but the approach and learning theories greatly affect the way in which both the lessons are carried out concerning teacher-pupil roles, topics and participation. Drama lessons and traditional lessons, thus, can be seen as forming separate genres of their own. The discourse used in the course of the two types of lessons is the main evidence of their separate systems for interaction.

2.4 Contextual resources for participation

In the study of talk-in-interaction, discourse is seen inseparable from and dependent on the context of the speech event, which already exists and is shaped and created at the same time (Linell 1998: 7). From the conversation analytical perspective, the talk is thus seen as ‘doubly contextual’, i.e. it can only be understood correctly in its context, including the preceding talk. The context is also used by speakers when designing the next utterances, which in turn shape the future talk. (Heritage 1884: 242, as quoted by Goodwin and Duranti 1992: 28-29.) Instead of a context, Linell prefers to talk about 'available contextual resources' which are used for carrying out a conversation, and defines them as “potential contexts that can be made into actual, relevant contexts through the activities of the interlocutors in dialogue” (Linell 1998: 128). Thus, the prior discourse called 'co-text' and the surrounding concrete situation serve as immediate contextual resources for speakers. In addition, there are some abstract contextual resources available, such as actors' assumptions and understanding about the discourse in question, i.e. a ‘model’, which is linked with the speakers’ model of the communicative projects being carried out. Both models are updated during the conversation. Further, actors' background knowledge about their co-speakers, the 'framing' of the situation as a particular activity type, i.e. how the abstract situation is defined, and actors' knowledge of some organizational context can also act as contextual resources. Finally, speakers' knowledge

about the language or the world at large can be seen as highly abstract contextual resources in a speech situation. (Linell 1998: 128-130.)

When participants take a role in drama, they will have to frame the situation which they enter in role. That situation does not differ from any real one as such: drama deals with the present rather than some future or past events. Though drama is always clearly fictional, it must feel 'real' and partly share the same rules as real life. Drama is creative though seldom fantastic, and requires that those who enter this 'as if'-existence will have to behave according to the role. (Neelands 1984: 83-84) Thus, the contextual resources mentioned above also seem to be available for participants in the imagined reality: once the 'as if'- situation is created, it is a concrete situation with specific real-life rules. This serves as a concrete context, which can be used and developed. Drama does not play tricks on participants or make them act in a strange or unnatural way. They can step into the drama world and make use of their own assumptions about the supposed discourse in that reality or about the course of the coming events.

Pupils in role, as well as the teacher at times, demonstrate a particular attitude rather than portray a character (see Neelands 1984: 85), and this attitude or view is expressed in interaction in a concrete situation. The created discourse is then likely to include similar phenomena that appear in the discourse of any conversation: the use of prior discourse (i.e. co-texts) and other situational and contextual resources. Or as Linell poetically explains the creation of a coherent text: speakers construct “an island of temporarily shared understanding” with fragments of contexts as resources and consequently build bridges from one island to another (Linell 1998: 141-142).

When speakers construct a coherent text and its context by picking fragments of other contexts and using them as resources in order to build new episodes of discourse, they recontextualize, in other words, transfer something from one discourse-in-context to another. Recontextualization is a broad notion which can operate locally within one encounter, or more broadly and globally across discourses and contexts. Anything in an ongoing conversation can be extracted, i.e. ‘decontextualised’, and used for building new utterances through recontextualization. This pool of resources is available for the interlocutors, but only some are made relevant and are actively selected for topics. (Linell 1998: 140-144.) The aspects of discourse or the 'material' which can travel from one place to another are versatile and may include linguistic expressions, stories, assessments, concepts, values, knowledge or ways of

thinking among others. While they travel, they also inevitably undergo certain changes, such as simplification, elaboration or refocusing. They may get new meanings, accentuations and even emissions of some items, and reported or quoted utterances also reveal the speaker's evaluative or affective attitude towards the original context. (Linell 1998: 154-157.)

For participants in drama, the fictional context is a natural pool of contextual resources, but the participants' real life experiences, past histories, hobbies, interests and mutual relationships comprise another source of materials which can be recontextualized in dramatic interaction. Other art forms, entertainment and the media provide models and genres of presentation for drama activities. When constructing a situation through talk in role, participants do not work in a void, but can make use of both the fictional reality and their personal lives and environments. They do not have to make up the talk and topics, but can rely on a variety of resources when planning and acting in the drama. The co-speakers' prior talk and the knowledge about the characters and the previous events in the drama serve as primary contextual resources for the group, besides understanding about the type and purpose of the activity. In the next drama extract, the pupil in the role of the squirrel gives an account of the incident between her and the porcupine. This is done by using parts of the previous history of the squirrel and the porcupine, i.e. by 'decontextualising' material from the past events. In the new context, the 'recontextualised' material does not necessarily appear in the same light as in the original context. So is the case in the following excerpt, in which the pupil tells the squirrel's side of the story to the parliament of animals (in the third drama, 'The Rains'):

(8)

1	Ella		ok I have to say that I'm innocent I didn't do anything wrong
2			because (.) that porcupine came to me <u>three</u> days ago (.)
3		→	so I have given him food and place to sleep for <u>three</u> <u>days</u> and <u>three</u> <u>nights</u>
4			and after that I said to the porcupine that you now you can go
5			because I have done eve(h)rything I could and want to do to you
6			and (.) <u>then</u> the porcupine said that I have some kind of problem
7			I don't know what he was talking about and I don't <u>care</u>
8			but the main thing is that the porcupine was (1.0) sturbing my life
9		→	and making it uncomfortable and boring and all those things
10			so I wanted to him to go and he wouldn't go so I just ↑<u>little bit</u>
11			tickled him and (1.0) he falled (.) ºit wasn't my ↓faultº

Ella's report to prove the squirrel's innocence is carefully elaborated (lines 1-11). She retains the recurring expressions in the African story which the drama is based on, such as 'three days and three nights', which is linguistic material which has 'travelled' from the story context.

She thus picks the main events from the story, but gives a subjective description of the situation using such adjectives as ‘uncomfortable’, ‘boring, or ‘innocent’. This detailed account in role includes the recontextualised facts about the incident, but they are now presented from the squirrel’s point of view.

According to Linell, building a topic for a conversation starts from a fragment of text and grows into a 'topical episode' or 'topic space'. As a supporter of dialogism, he disagrees with the traditional view on topics as static semantic structures, but sees them as dynamic parts in interaction and discourse practices, related to the tasks at hand. Thus, speakers in a conversation are not talking about a fixed topic, but through topical coherence they are trying to sustain intersubjectivity. Instead of talking about topics, Linell (1998: 182) uses the notion of 'episode' as the basic unit: “Topical episodes are characterized not only by what they are "about” (their “content”), but also by *how* participants shape their discourse and organize their interaction.” Topics are also inherently related to the sequential organization of talk, in which a speaker's suggestion for a topic and another speaker's joining it form an initiative-response sequence. A topic thus becomes a joint accomplishment by the two speakers. (Linell 1998: 181-183.)

There is a connection between topics and tasks, and tasks are not seen as fixed but as something that speakers introduce and sustain as a joint accomplishment with their co-speakers (Linell 1998: 182-183). In the drama activity in which participants interview the accused squirrel (the parliament of animals), the interview structure requires question-answer sequences between the participants. The questioners, however, carry out the task jointly by introducing topics within the interrogation frame in order to find out whether the squirrel used violence when tickling the porcupine:

(9)

1	Ella	→	no no no the only thing I have is a <u>fork</u> and that w(h)asn't v(h)ery (.) wise
2	Anu		ºyou [didn't evenº (x)
3	T	→	[did you use a fork?
4	Ella		no no I didn't all I did think [about it (x)
5	Anu	→	[you didn't even think about it
6	Ella		(x) <u>these fingers</u> ((waves her forefingers)) nothing else these are my these
7			are [my these are my

In this passage, the two questioners pursue their task of questioning by picking up an item in the squirrel’s response and building their next question on this piece of information: In line 3, the teacher (T) picks up the topic of fork from Ella’s turn and asks about it. Later (line 5) Anu

manages to initiate her enquiry (‘you didn’t even think about it’), and similarly builds her question on Ella’s utterance in line 4: (‘no no I didn’t all I did think about it (x)’). In this way, the items which become topics in the questioning, i.e. in the topical episodes of the activity, are first introduced and then sustained jointly in talk-in-interaction as in ordinary conversation.

3 INTERACTION IN THE CLASSROOM

Conversation analysis considers everyday talk the primary form of interaction in which the speakers have somewhat equal rights to take the floor according to a set of turn taking rules. But there are institutional contexts where different turn taking rules are needed for the participants to be able to carry out their task, which also affects the speakers' chances to participate as freely as in a casual conversation. Institutional interactions in schools, courtrooms, hospitals, news interviews and other official encounters are studied to find out how participants orient to these social institutions, i.e. how these institutions are 'talked into being', and how the participants organize their speech in an institutional setting to get their work done. (Drew and Heritage 1992: 3-5; Peräkylä 1997; Raevaara et al 2001.) However, there are no clear boundaries between institutional talk and everyday conversations, but they can be seen to appear side by side at times and the dialogue may 'fluctuate' between these two contexts, still retaining its institutionality (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 94).

As was seen in the drama extracts of the previous chapter, talk-in-interaction in drama displayed activity-specific features and interview-like interaction, but participants in drama were also found to build their talk in a manner used in everyday conversation. In some other drama situations of the data, participants' orientation to traditional classroom practices, such as bidding to answer, also becomes visible. Drama is carried out in an institutional classroom setting, but it has practical goals which are pursued together in interaction. Thus, participants in drama activities often organise their talk like in everyday situations (though the situations are ruled by the drama plan or an interactional pattern), but orderly classroom practices are also followed, which makes the talk in the drama contexts fluctuate between everyday talk and institutional classroom interaction.

This chapter begins with a brief description of the common characteristics of institutional talk along with the discussion of the typical features of second language classroom talk. The second section looks into turn taking, action sequences and repair in first and second language classroom interaction with reference to the drama activities of the data in the present study. In the third section, I will discuss some recent orientations to second language learning and research from the Vygotskian socio-cultural perspective and van Lier's ecological approach.

3.1 Characteristics of classroom interaction as institutional talk

The special interest of conversation analysis is in the institutional processes which display participants' orientation to these processes, that is, how the speakers' use of language becomes institutional interaction. The comparative perspective used by conversation analysis treats mundane talk as a 'benchmark' with which other types of talk-in-interaction can be compared (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 148). The interactions which are studied are not necessarily restricted to any particular setting, and may also take place over the telephone, but they all have something in common: they have institutional goals to fulfil, there are some constraints for participation and participants may also have to make inferences about the interaction (Drew & Heritage 1992: 3-5).

3.1.1 Institutional goals

The difference between ordinary conversation and institutional talk is not always clear, but there are some common characteristics which can be discerned in the orientation of professional and lay participants in institutional interaction. So, at least one of the participants in institutional interaction has an orientation to some goal, task or identity traditionally associated with the institution. These functions and tasks may be pursued in several ways and lay and institutional participants may have varying cooperative, but also conflicting goals within some institutions, like in courtrooms. (Drew and Heritage 1992: 22-23.) The teacher in the classroom follows an agenda which is based on the school curriculum and the daily lesson plans. She may also have other educational, aesthetic or philosophical goals which she hopes to fulfil, but teaching is traditionally seen as her main task. Levinson (1992: 93) considers the central goals of teaching to be imparting knowledge and abilities and organizing pupils' knowledge, in which the teacher's instructionally designed questions have an important role.

According to Seedhouse (2004: 183-187), the core institutional goal of second language classroom interaction is always the same, i.e. the teacher teaches the L2 to the learners, independent of the place or pedagogy which it involves. From this core goal, the three properties of L2 classroom interaction are derived: (i) Language is the object of instruction and the medium which is used for teaching, (ii) the pedagogical goal and interaction have a reflexive relationship which the interactants display to each other, and (iii) all learner utterances are "potentially subject to the evaluation by the teacher in some way". In other

words, teachers use the language which they teach their pupils in their lessons and introduce the pedagogical focus in their talk. Pupils then analyse the teacher's talk and display this by interacting in a particular way. So as the pedagogical focus varies, so does the interaction. Finally, teachers have the right to evaluate the pupils' talk whether they do it openly or not. These properties can be seen as part of the particular 'fingerprint' of L2 classroom interaction, which is different from other types of institutional talk and mundane conversation (Drew and Heritage (1992) as quoted by Seedhouse (2004: 183)), and thus makes the 'architecture of second language classroom'.

Seedhouse (2004: 68-70) also recognises the fingerprint of L2 classroom interaction in all learning environments whose purpose is to teach English (or other foreign languages). Accordingly, even if the pupils talk about a given topic between themselves, their interaction can be found to be normatively linked to the pedagogical focus of the activity, i.e. to have a talk in a foreign language about a topic. Similarly, the ultimate goal of drama activities which are used in language lessons is naturally the same as the purpose of traditional L2 tuition: to teach English to the participants in drama. The make-believe context provides the frame within which the practice takes place, different types of activities have their own pedagogical focus which affects the way in which language is used and the teacher also has the power to evaluate the progress, which she may do afterwards. To put it in another way, according to Seedhouse (2004: 66-70; 1996: 16-24), ordinary talk used in real situations cannot be taken into an instructional setting, i.e. it cannot be replicated in the classroom, and thus he challenges the pursuit of 'genuine' or 'real' talk in the classroom, which is found central in the communicative tradition of language learning, supported e.g. by Nunan and Kumaravadivelu (1993). However, interaction in the classroom should not be considered inferior to ordinary conversation, since classroom communication is valuable as a variety of institutional discourse in its own right, fulfilling the goal of second language instruction (Seedhouse 2004: 77; see also Van Lier 1988: 214).

3.1.2 Constraints in interaction

In addition to an overall institutional goal, the second characteristic feature of all kinds of institutional talk is that they involve special constraints which are treated as "allowable contributions" to the task at hand by one or both of the participants. Since institutions have goals to fulfil, constraints for participation help them operate effectively. Here again there is

variation between the restrictive factors within different institutions, such as the varying degree of formality. (Drew & Heritage 1992: 22-24.) Schools are regarded as basically formal institutions with rules and codes for behaviour which involve differing participation rights between teacher and pupils (McHoul 1978: 183). Inside the classroom, the orderly system can be seen in the way in which the pupils' participation is regulated, and classroom talk mostly follows its own turn-taking rules and includes easily recognizable patterns in teaching, i.e. question-answer sequences and three-part teaching sequences (discussed in Section 3.3). As research shows, a teacher-centred lesson in an ordinary classroom is rather a necessity than a choice because of the size of the class, since turn-taking can only be managed locally in small groups. Thus, the teacher's ordinary role is to act as chairperson who is not only responsible for the agenda of the lesson, but maintains order in class and decides when the pupils may speak, who will speak and for how long. (Edwards and Westgate 1994: 46-47.)

Van Lier (1988: 105-106) points out that the predetermined turn taking rules in formal classroom settings constrain pupils' participation so that they are not able to influence the topic or the proceedings. He observes that pupils are not able to practise the target language in interaction with others, and this hinders their 'intrinsic motivation for listening', which Sacks et al. see to be the result of the turn taking system in conversation forcing speakers to listen to and analyse the talk to be able to join in. In class, there is thus a distinct difference between the turn taking rules of teacher-pupil talk and, on the other hand, those of pupil-pupil talk: the former rules tend to constrain pupils' chances of social interaction, whereas the latter turn-taking practice allows the speakers to build the talk together turn-by-turn (van Lier 2001: 92-104). Lessons in which the teacher manages the talk in front of the class are favoured in schools, but more versatile forms of teaching, such as discussions, are gaining ground (Tainio 2007: 35), which means fewer constraints for pupils' participation. Drama activities, whose contents are created together as a group, fall into the category of versatile classroom practices: their structures vary from classroom-like interaction with the teacher in charge to such talk which is managed by the pupils themselves, and usually the group decides about the developments in the fictional context.

3.1.3 Inference in institutional contexts

The third primary feature which shows an institutional orientation to interaction is that participants may have to use inference and reasoning to be able to understand some specific

institutional contexts correctly (Drew & Heritage 1992: 24). According to Levinson (1992: 71-72), the structure of a particular activity constrains participants' contribution to it and the inferential system is a kind of ‘mirror image’ of the structural constraints of each activity. Thus, the structural properties of an activity determine the ‘inferential schemata’, and in order to be able to interpret the utterances correctly, the participants will have to rely on the tacit information about the structure of the interaction which they are involved in.

Cooperation which speakers use in everyday conversation to understand each other (i.e. Grice’s ‘maxims of conversation’) is also needed for participation in various institutional activities. Not all these encounters, however, are seen as cooperative, such as courtroom interrogations, which can be regarded as exceptional contexts. (Levinson 1992: 76-79.) According to Levinson (1992: 89-91), school activities which consist of the teacher's questions are typical situations in which participants’ reasoning is needed. He argues that special questioning which teachers use to organize pupils' knowledge requires their skills to interpret the questions correctly and develop particular strategies in order to manage in the activity. So to be able to play this language game successfully, pupils must co-operate with the teacher. Margutti’s study (2004) about questioning and answering in an Italian school class displays the participants’ reliance on inference and co-operation in classroom work.

It seems that the three distinctive features of institutional talk are intertwined or interconnected: the goals of a particular institution create constraints on participation, and because there are changes in interaction compared with everyday talk, some inference must be used in the language game in question. Levinson (1992: 92-93) emphasizes the goal of the activity pointing out that a particular procedure can only make sense when it is seen against the background of the goals of the strategy in a particular activity and that activity as a whole.

Drama lessons, whether they are carried out as art subjects or whether they operate as a learning environment for other subjects, involve school activities which are institutional by nature. They also have specific pedagogical and aesthetic goals which are pursued through a set of activities. The planning of drama and the used drama conventions each require a certain type of participation according to the theme and plan, and each drama convention can be treated as a special activity type within classroom drama. Interpretation or inference is also needed in entering the make-believe reality and adopting a role in drama. Further, acting and interacting only makes sense when it is understood as working in a fictional drama context. In the following extract from the second drama lesson of my data, the teacher leads the group to

do ‘sound tracking’, a drama convention to establish the content and to support action (Owens and Barber 1996: 23), which the teacher has introduced at the beginning of the lesson:

(1)

1	T		let’s (.) make our little circle or square now so let’s try to form a house (2.0) ok?
2		→	but remember (.) what do we have to leave there (.) so [that the girl
3	Ps		[(x) door
4	T		yes that’s right we have to remember the door where shall the door be (2.0) ok
5			(xx) leave here so let’s try to make it a square there are no (.) round houses
6	Ps		(xxx)
7	T		ok? is it ↑good now? Ella now you will have to be inside the house and ↑now (x)
8			we try to do some sound tracking (.) so we think of the situation where she is
9	Ps		((snore))
10	T		ok now that was a good idea will we all do that at the same time
11			so her parents are asleep (3.0) ok? (will you try to do it?)
12		→	how do you make it
13	Ps		((snore, breathe heavily, giggle))

The teacher asks the pupils to form an imaginary house (line 1) without explaining this in detail thus assuming that the pupils will reason themselves what ‘forming’ a house means. The teacher’s first question (line 2) about the house receives a prompt response midway through her enquiry: a door is needed so that the little girl can leave for the beach, as the drama plot requires. In lines 7-8, the teacher takes up the doing of ‘sound tracking’. The pupils treat the teacher’s utterance as a request to produce ‘sound tracking’ and respond by doing it with snores. The teacher’s turn treats their contribution as an offer (line 10), and elicits another display of ‘sound tracking’ adding a direct question in line 12. The group responds to her question by producing sounds of snoring and breathing. Compared with a verbal answer, this seems a far more suitable response, as the pupils’ action is fitted for the drama context which is being created by teacher and pupils. In this way, the pupils’ response shows their ability to draw inferences about the context, i.e. to act rather than answer to the teacher verbally, as well as remember the concept of ‘sound tracking’ by displaying their ability to do ‘sound tracking’. The group’s action is thus also a proof of their cooperation.

Following Seedhouse (2004), the core goal of this activity is to teach English to a group of sixth-form pupils. The teacher’s pedagogical focus is on building a new context with the help of an imaginary house and ‘sound tracking’. The group follows the teacher’s instructions and displays their understanding by producing nightly sounds in the house. The teacher also shows with her encouraging comments that the pupils have responded correctly through their

action. In this way, teacher and pupils have talked the second language classroom into being in a lesson which uses drama as a learning environment.

3.1.4 Asymmetry in participation

In institutional settings, there is an inbuilt difference in status and asymmetry between the expert or professional party and the novice, i.e. the non-professional party. While participants in an ordinary conversation have basically equal rights to speak and suggest a topic (albeit not always in practice), institutional talk is typically asymmetrical and characterized by "omnirelevant asymmetries between participants in terms of such matters as differential distribution of knowledge, rights to knowledge, access to conversational resources, and to participation in the interaction" (Drew & Heritage 1992: 49). Professionals, especially through questions, may lead the talk in a particular direction avoiding topics which they do not want to deal with. These questions may also have 'hidden agendas' whose meaning is not obvious to the lay-participants, pupils, patients or clients. (Drew & Heritage 1992: 49- 50.) Studies on interaction in institutional contexts, such as courtrooms and news interviews, show how differentially allocated turns between participants allowing the questioner to take the upper hand, create an asymmetrical situation (Drew & Sorjonen 1997: 102). Clayman & Heritage (2002: 95-96) point out how news interview talk is recognisably done through question-answer sequences which offer asymmetrical resources for the participants, but which may also be dealt with in the process of questioning. In three-party phone-in radio talks examined by Thornborrow (2001: 119-143), it is the mediating action of the host (who is the representative of the institution, but not the questioner) that is found to constrain the callers' chances as questioners, thus creating asymmetry between participants.

Edwards and Westgate (1994: 47-48) observe that classroom talk "displays a clear boundary between knowledge and ignorance". Classroom studies prove this to be the case, and the teacher as the expert in class tends to shape the pupils' answers in the way which is necessary for her purposes, discarding the irrelevant ones and finishing when enough information is obtained. Seedhouse (2004: 102-105) points out this obvious asymmetry between teacher and pupils when the pedagogical focus is on grammatical forms, i.e. pupils are required to produce precise linguistic forms and patterns, for which turn taking is also tightly controlled by the teacher. (Turn taking in the classroom will be discussed in the next section.)

However, modern classrooms have ways of creating more symmetrical environments: a study by Thornborrow (2002: 108-131) shows how the participation roles and rights between teacher and pupils are transformed in the course of a classroom discussion. The teacher's traditional task to allocate turns and act as the primary recipient of the talk is seen gradually giving way to pupils' contributions, so that the talk is constructed together as a multiparty event, i.e. the teacher's regulation of talk becomes gradually smaller. The pupils are seen to build on each other's turns and the emerging themes, while the teacher only manages turn transition at boundaries between two speakers. As Thornborrow (2002: 131) concludes, discussions like these require participants' co-operation, since though the teacher's power in the classroom is taken for granted, pupils can also effectively find ways to resist this power.

The teacher's natural right to examine pupils' knowledge through questions is considered a particular sign of teacher's authority (Tainio 2007: 41). While questions about pupils' suggestions or personal opinions remain a minority in traditional lessons, in some creative classroom tasks, they occur naturally and allow the teacher to drop the expert's role for a while, though she is still in control of the task. The "boundary between ignorance and knowledge", pointed out by Edwards and Westgate above, is broken in the next extract of an activity in which an imaginary kitchen is built together:

(2)

1	T →	or a teapot you want to be a teapot (.) where shall we place the teapot
2	Mari	on the table
3	T	on the table again so you two [will sit together
4	Ps	[((laughter))
5	Ella	how lovely
6	T →	and what about you
7	Anu	I'm a mixer
8	T	ok where should we place that=
9	Anu	=maybe inside the cup board but we don't have that
10	T →	are we going to have a cup board
11	Sara	I can be a cup[b(h)oard
12	Ps	[((laughter))

The passage somewhat resembles nursery talk with the mother supervising a role play for her children and organizing the scene. Here the setting up of the kitchen is also carried out in total cooperation with the teacher only organizing and not suggesting answers to the group. In line 5, Ella joins in with a turn after the group's laughter, in which she treats the activity as a chance of mutual fun and light-hearted talk, which is also its purpose in the lesson. Inevitably, the teacher is the leader of the group, the one who knows the overall plan of the lesson and the

purpose and goal of the activity. In this wider sense, the teacher remains an expert even in non-traditional classroom events. Drama in education allows teacher and pupils to forget their usual classroom roles, but the teacher still has the authority in the group albeit in the background.

3.2 Turn taking in the classroom

A traditional, formal instructional context affects turn taking in the classroom, and it defines the teacher's role as the one who regulates the talk most of the time in order to manage the class and the teaching itself. According to Mehan (1979: 190), school lessons can be considered 'speech events', the concept of which was introduced by Hymes, with routine forms of behaviour within well-defined boundaries. Like other interactional events, classroom lessons are dependent on participation, have a sequential and hierarchical organization and follow the turn taking rules which guide participants to take turns, avoid overlapping utterances and provide for an access to the floor in a systematic way. Despite the similarities between ordinary conversation and classroom talk, classroom procedures have their own unique characteristics which are due to the way in which the speakers' turns are allocated.

McHoul (1978: 187-212) compares the rules of conversational turn taking and the rules which teacher and pupils follow in formal classroom situations. While the turn taking rules in non-formal social contexts involve open-endedness, i.e. 'permutability', these rules are modified effectively when teacher and pupils do the teaching and learning in formal classroom situations. Basically, if the teacher as the current speaker selects the next speaker, a single pupil gets the right to speak, otherwise the teacher continues to speak. If the current speaker is a pupil who selects the next speaker, the right to speak is given to the teacher. If the pupil speaking does not select the next speaker, the teacher is the person who may self-select, but the pupil may also go on until the teacher self-selects. McHoul sums up that it is the teacher who can solely decide about speakership in class, which means that since turns cannot be initiated and competed for by all speakers, there is a potential for gaps and pauses, and overlapping as well as variety ('permutability') for turn-taking are minimal. In this kind of typical classroom talk, there are in fact two parties, the teacher and one of the pupils in turn acting as a representative of the group (Tainio 2007: 33).

Tainio (2007: 34) points out that at least in the context of teacher-led activities McHoul's description above is still valid as a norm, which is learned and something not to be questioned in present-day classrooms, though discussions and other pupil-centred practices have been introduced and established in modern classrooms. McHoul's turn taking rules apply to the kind of tuition (i.e. plenary teaching) when the teacher is standing in front of the class with the pupils acting as an audience, which can also be considered the most public way of teaching. Pupils may thus get the floor by bidding to speak or the teacher may allocate the turns by nominating the next speaker, or some other system can be agreed on. The private talk between pupils is also used in group and pair work, and it may also be carried out outside the general agenda of the lesson, as observed by Sahlström (1999). (Tainio 2007: 35-37.) The way in which pupils get to talk in class has recently been studied by Karvonen (2007), Vepsäläinen (2007) and Lehtimaja (2007). Two common means of getting the floor in the classroom is through hand raising and self-selection, the first of which is the normative practice, and through which more pupils can appear as knowledgeable participants in a class whose size is too big to allow a discussion without allocation of turns (Lehtimaja 2007: 141). Similarly, Sahlström's research (1999) about plenary interaction as a Swedish classroom practice shows that hand raising advances democracy rather than discourages it, i.e. if pupils get the floor through self-selection instead of bidding to answer, it decreases equality in the classroom. Thus, according to Sahlström (1999: 181), hand-raising makes it possible for different kinds of students to take part in plenary interaction, and considers it 'the most effective tool' in constituting equity in the classroom.

The following extract from the second drama lesson of my data shows how the formal turn-taking system is employed in a more conversational manner. The pupils have considered in pairs who could become a friend for the lonely little girl in the drama, and now the teacher is asking about their thoughts nominating each pair in turn:

(3)

1	T	→	and Iris and Lea who would become her friend
2	Iris		a pen friend
3	T		oh (2.0) where from
4	Iris		(x) maybe (.) she or he could (.) sometimes visit her
5	T	→	>that's a good idea< and Anu Timo and Mari who would become her friend
6	Mari		£a boy or some (.) animal
7	T		!an animal! for example what kind of animal
8	Anu		£maybe a fish (x)
9	Ps		((laughter))

Though the interaction is carried out in a ‘non-institutional seating order’, i.e. the group is sitting in a circle on the floor, the talk is organised like any orderly classroom event: it is structured with the same method as in ordinary classroom circumstances, by using turn allocation. The teacher nominates the next speakers, listens to their suggestions, responds to them and makes a further enquiry, and finally nominates the next pupils, thus maintaining the social order in the group. Hand-raising is not needed, because each pair automatically will have a chance to report on their work.

Similarly, in the second language classroom, the context inevitably influences the organisation of interaction, since the pedagogical focus of the lesson affects the use of a specific speech exchange system. Seedhouse (2004: 102-136) points out this reflexivity between pedagogy and interaction in four different L2 classroom contexts, i.e. form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, task-oriented and procedural contexts. As the ‘form-and-accuracy context’ has the focus on linguistic forms, pupils’ contributions are constrained by the need to produce only particular forms. Turn taking is tightly controlled by the teacher, since pupils may only speak after the teacher’s nomination, which creates asymmetry between teacher and pupils. In the ‘meaning-and-fluency context’, which focuses on fluency and the expression of personal meanings, however, learners have more control over turn-taking, either being engaged in pair work or working in groups, in which case the teacher has the mediator’s or collaborator’s role. The meaning-and-fluency contexts are thus more varied sequentially and locally managed, and they allow pupils to initiate and develop topics, which is the pedagogical focus of this L2 classroom context. Both ‘task-oriented contexts’ and ‘procedural contexts’ also display their distinctive turn taking systems: In the former, the focus and goal is on completing the task with one’s partner, so the learners’ turns tend to be minimal to be able to fulfil this goal. In the latter, turn taking does not occur most often, since the teacher usually informs the class about the coming activity, i.e. gives procedural information. Thus, only the form-and-accuracy context employs the turn-taking rules which McHoul identifies as the rules for interaction in formal classroom contexts, and other contexts organise their interaction in the way which matches their particular pedagogical goals.

The drama activities in the three lessons of my data have goals to reach, and in a broad sense, they can be considered tasks which the group as a whole, or sometimes in pairs, are engaged in. Still, these drama contexts are first and foremost meaning-and-fluency contexts, in which participants as a group create, or ‘author’, dramatic events, highlight particular moments or

atmosphere to create new meanings and a continuation to the whole drama story. Turn taking in these drama activities varies according to their particular goal, e.g. it may be only between teacher and pupil as when the characteristics of a good friend are listed, or it may be totally free as in an improvisation in which the pupils themselves organise the scenes.

In their article about conversational floors in classroom, Jones and Thornborrow (2004: 399-423) conceptualise the floor as having 'tighter' and 'looser' organisation of talk, which is tied to the activity at hand and the flexibility of talk within it. This involves the idea of participation (which also includes such features as active listening, interruption, simultaneous talk or flexibility among multiple floors) rather than the idea of 'holding' the floor. This also includes the notion that interaction is affected by the contribution of all participants whether they initiate talk or not. In the drama lessons of my data, the activities are carried out in a variety of ways and 'looser' organisation of talk is also visible at times within a structured activity and more clearly in pair work, drawing tasks or voting and reflection passages.

3.3 Sequential organisation of L1 and L2 classroom interaction

Unlike ordinary conversations, institutional encounters tend to have a standard structure and order which is followed and maintained by the representative of the institution and its clients. As regards the organisation of classroom lessons, Mehan's (1979: 35-49) comprehensive study of the organisation of lessons in American elementary school revealed systematic regularities: lessons were found to be sequentially organized into an opening phase, an instructional phase and a closing phase, and each of the phases had different sequences which were always initiated by the teacher. The instructional part of the lesson was framed by the opening phase which had directive and informative sequences and the closing phase as its mirror image formulating the events of the lesson. Furthermore, elicitation sequences within the sequential organization of lessons were organized around topics. So the instructional phase consisted of 'topically related sets' which the teacher introduced and brought to an end in a regular fashion. The teacher's 'boundary marking work', such as the use of posture, conversational rhythm and prosody, was seen to help to mark the events in the lesson for participants. (Mehan 1979: 65- 79.) Seedhouse (2004: 133-134, 215-219) also observes similar ways in which the teacher marks shifts between contexts or models the expected interaction for learners.

These characteristic instructional features reported above can also be found in drama lessons which basically have a traditional structure with the teacher in charge of the activities. She introduces each new task and closes it at the end of the process. The activities in the drama lesson are usually tied together by a common theme and topic, and the variety of exercises in the lesson is naturally wider, as several types of cognitive and affective skills and areas of expression are practised. Though classroom drama is not noticeably discussed in connection with second language learning, Nunan (1989: 129) introduces a communicative lesson plan which is almost identical with the structure of the third lesson of my data: the sociodrama by Scarcella consists of a warm up exercise, a presentation of the new vocabulary, a story leading into the drama which the teacher stops at a dilemma, a discussion on the problem and the roles involved, after which the solutions to the problem are enacted by different groups in role. Follow-up exercises are also suggested.

The next extract from my research data shows a typical introduction to a new activity in the lesson. The teacher asks the group to settle down and explains the task of 'hot seating', which is to interview inanimate household objects. Before that, each pupil will have to adopt a role of a household appliance. The teacher marks the beginning with a boundary marker and gives the information and directions about the coming activity in a familiar teacher-like fashion:

(4)

1	T	→	ok and this is now this is the last thing that we will do take a seat here (2.0)
2			so sit on the floor and now some of you will be hot seated and I guess you
3			remember it means that the others will interview you
4			so you will have to take the role of, for example- (2.0)
5	Ella		!table!
6	T		for example [table or-
7	Ps		[((laughter))]
8			(2.0)
9	Rita		freezer

In this introduction, the teacher invites the group to make suggestions spontaneously without nomination or hand-raising, which she makes clear by leaving her sentence unfinished (line 4). This type of elicitation of information is not common in the lessons of my data, but which, for instance, Margutti (2004) observes as one way of eliciting responses in an Italian class.

Mehan (1979: 72) emphasizes that interaction in the classroom is a joint accomplishment between teacher and pupils and that lessons are "alternations of verbal and nonverbal behaviour between teachers and students", which resembles the overall nature of everyday

conversation. There are similarities in the sequence structures of ordinary conversation and classroom talk: adjacent pairs, in which the first pair-part requires a particular second pair-part, organise both types of interactions, and question-answer sequences typically govern the interactional sequences between teacher and pupils. (Mehan 1979: 50.) The characteristic sequence in classroom interaction is the three-part teaching sequence, which includes the teacher's response, i.e. an evaluation, to the pupil's answer.

3.3.1 Three-part instructional sequence

The three-part sequence, i.e. the teaching cycle or the IRF/IRE-cycle, is considered the most important and fundamental sequence in instructional interaction (Tainio 2007: 40; Mehan 1979; Arminen 2005; Ruuskanen 2007), which consists of the teacher's initiation of a question, a pupil's response and the teacher's evaluation (or feedback) of the pupil's answer. Mehan (1979: 54) talks about the symmetry which must be obtained between initiation and reply in such an instructional sequence, and thus the evaluation only follows the reply if the teacher accepts it. If the pupil's reply is not right, the result is an extended sequence during which the right answer is sought. In doing so, the teacher may employ different strategies, such as prompting or clarifying, and when the symmetry between the teacher's elicitation and the pupil's reply has been achieved, she evaluates it. In fact this shows the reflexive character of interactional sequences which is apparent in ordinary conversation too, that the second part of the sequence - and in this case the third part of the sequence - gives the meaning to the first part. (Mehan 1979: 63-64.) According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 40-41), the reason for this characteristic pattern lies in the type of activity which the IRF/IRE-cycle belongs to: it is generated out of the management of the instructional activity and the three-part sequence is in fact the instrument which is used for instruction both in school and out of school between child and parent (Seedhouse 2004: 72-73; Arminen 2005). It is difficult to imagine any instructional situation, public or private, in which no feedback or encouragement to a response, even in a form of a smile or a nod, would be given.

The teacher's evaluation of the pupil's response marks the teacher as 'the knowledgeable recipient' (Arminen 2005: 124), and it is also the teacher's responsibility as an educator to evaluate (Mehan 1979: 194). Kleemola (2007: 77-86) observes that the teacher's evaluation may take several forms depending on the type of the offered response: a brief acknowledgement, the repetition of the answer or a follow-up question may be used after the

pupil's right answer (also in Hakamäki 2005: 152), but in case of a wrong or incomplete response, the teacher's evaluation is not given promptly or directly. On the other hand, if the evaluation is left out in a context which focuses on form and accuracy, its absence is understood as a positive evaluation (Seedhouse 2004: 106).

The teaching cycle also appears in the interaction of the drama lessons, one way or another, as the teacher acknowledges pupils' responses to her questions. However, the teacher's role is not to be 'knowledgeable', but rather act as the leader of the activity. In the following group discussion in the second lesson, the talk is about the characteristics of a good friend and the pupils initiate their suggestions freely when they are ready with an idea. So the teacher's initial question 'how would you describe a good friend' covers the whole activity, and the teacher acknowledges each suggestion by repeating it while writing it down on a cardboard on the floor:

(5)

1	T		so today we are going to talk about friends and (.) friendship first what is a good
2			friend like (.) how would you describe a good friend
3	Ps		(xx)
4	T		ok one at a time
5	Pia		honest
6	T	→	honest↑ (5.0) what else
7	Iris		funny
8	T	→	funny↑ (4.0)
9	Boy		[(x)
10	Mari		[happy
11	T	→	happy↑ (4.0) (Kim what could you say)
12	Kim		gentle
13	T	→	gentle↑
14	P		(x)
15	Anu		she or he has (.) a good humour
16	T	→	good sense of humour [right
17	Anu		[good sense (x)
18	T		ok

The teacher sets an additional rule to the activity (line 4) after several pupils have produced their answers at the same time. From that onwards the teacher acknowledges, and so approves of, each given adjective by repeating it, which also makes sure that the added word is heard by everyone. In line 16, the teacher reformulates the suggested item before evaluating it: 'good sense of humour' is used as a repair followed by a positive feedback 'right'. The correct form is repeated by the pupil, which the teacher acknowledges (line 18).

Seedhouse (2004: 71-73) observes that the three-part teaching sequence has been seen by the supporters of the communicative approach to second language learning to contradict with the ideals of language learning, i.e. it is seen as part of traditional teacher-centred classrooms and not part of 'genuine interaction'. He argues against this concept by pointing out that the IRF/IRE-cycle is an interactional feature in all learning environments, and thus its natural place is also within second language learning. Secondly, a careful study of interaction of the IRF/IRE-cycle shows that, instead of being limiting, the teaching cycle can also appear as a flexible and versatile sequence which offers chances for interaction. This is also shown in the thesis by Hakamäki (2005) studying the teacher's 'scaffolded' assistance, and in which the IRF-structure was used both by teacher and pupils in teaching and learning grammar. Different strategies were found to be used to extend the teacher's follow-up move in the sequence, which also other studies in different types of settings confirm (Hakamäki 2005: 175). Cullen's article (2002: 117-127) also argues that the third part of the IRF/IRE cycle as an evaluative and discoursal means is beneficial to learners. Besides the function of giving feedback to pupils' answers, the teacher's follow-up moves, often in the form of reformulations, are seen to have a discoursal role by encouraging pupils' contribution. The dialogue between teacher and pupils is found to focus on meaning instigated by referential questions and also resulting in the use of humour and versatile language use. In classroom drama, the teacher's questions are an important tool in managing and developing the drama and challenging pupils' thought. In the examination of the two drama activities, the teacher's questioning strategies, including the use of follow-up questions, will be one of the foci in the present study.

3.3.2 Classroom questions

Classroom questions appear most often as so called display questions to which the teacher knows the answers. Teachers' referential questions, which are asked to get new information in genuine enquiries, tend to be rare. However, van Lier (1988: 222-224) points out that the difference between these two types of questions may not be relevant, since they both aim at eliciting talk in a language classroom. Instead, attention should be paid to their functions in the classroom and the reasons why teachers ask particular kinds of questions. Display questions in class involve control over pupils' language use and participation, unlike referential questions. However, this view may be too simple, since display questions may have a useful purpose in language learning. On the other hand, referential questions may also

exercise as much control as display questions are believed to do. Nor are display questions only limited to classrooms, but are shown to be common in adult-child talk, in which their function is the same as in the classroom, i.e. to guide and teach (Seedhouse 2004: 73-74).

Margutti's thesis (2004) on instructional sequences in Italian primary school lessons shows how teachers have varying questioning strategies from grammatical questions to other means of questioning to elicit particular kind of participation, the purpose of which is anticipated and understood by the pupils. Different types of elicitations are seen to have different sequential consequences and besides the formats employed for questioning, the teacher's use of intonation, stress, turn design or lexical choices influence participants' interaction.

Thus, classroom questions should not be regarded as a controlling device in class, but their potential as a powerful tool which can enhance pupils' language development should be studied (van Lier 1988: 224). Questions which are used in classroom drama are not seen as the teacher's way to control, and the teacher does not know the answers to them. Though their function varies a great deal, they often work like questions in everyday talk, i.e. they have a practical purpose to find out about things and opinions at hand. The value of questions in classroom drama is recognised as essential in organising talk in negotiation and running games, planning the activity, or carrying out discussions. As interactive tools, questions may thus encourage participants to search for information, present opinions or reflect on the situation, among other things (Neelands 1984: 36-39).

Whether used in a language classroom or in a drama lesson, questions are seen to have a variety of functions. Mehan (1979) classifies classroom questions as initiations whose function is either elicitation, informative or directive. Eliciting questions may appear as yes/no-questions, require factual responses, ask for students' opinions or their reflection on the way elicitations and responses are connected. (van Lier 1988: 224) Two studies by Koshik (2002, 2003) show how yes/no-questions and wh-questions may be used for other purposes than to seek information, i.e. to convey reversed polarity assertions and to challenge (discussed in Section 6.4.2 and Section 6.3). Drama questions are also used for many of these purposes, which is seen in the drama activities of the present data when pupils are asked to express their own opinions, or challenged to seek new solutions and find their own answers to the problems. In fact, all the extracts earlier on in this chapter also involve teacher and pupils

exchanging question-answer sequences, though they have not been demanding types of enquiries which are often used to fuel the drama process.

Classroom questions and interaction in class in general do not basically differ much from enquiries and talk in everyday situations. However, since the goals and purposes of these two types of talk differ, the interactional patterns and the different statuses of teacher and pupils make the traditional, whole-class interaction take its own familiar and recognisable course. Characteristic three-part sequencing, the overall structure of lessons, the special turn taking system, i.e. turn allocation and bidding to answer, which traditionally structure classroom events, have a powerful role in shaping interaction in class. In addition, the teacher as the knowledgeable party is bound to use repair of some kind while supervising and advancing the pupils' learning.

3.4 Repair in the classroom

In an ordinary conversation, speakers themselves usually repair their own talk using self-repair, and if the co-speaker produces other-repair, it is usually done with tact to maintain harmony between the speakers (Hutchby and Woofitt 1998: 66- 69). Classrooms, however, create a completely different forum for repair where repairing becomes a legitimate and necessary action, which is interwoven in the general interactional pattern. As Arminen puts it:

> In classrooms, repairs are part of specific pedagogic use. The third position of the pedagogic circle offers a natural place for initiation of a repair. Instead of reformulation the answer, the teacher may use a repair initiation to mark the insufficiency of the answer, allocate the turn back to the student, and also guide the student towards a satisfactory answer. (Arminen 2005: 129.)

This kind of other-initiated self-repair appears to be most commonly used in classrooms while other types of repair take a smaller share of repairs (McHoul 1990, as quoted by Tainio 2007: 48). Seedhouse (2004: 145-149) finds a similar preference in form-and accuracy contexts in language classrooms, in which the pupil makes a self-repair after the teacher's initiation most often, though the teacher's other-repair also occurs commonly and pupils are also found to self-initiate repairs. 'Teacher-initiated peer-repair' is a typical repair found in this particular classroom context in Seedhouse's data. These results, however, only apply to this type of classroom context in which pupils have to produce precise linguistic forms, and different types of repair (i.e. differently initiated and done) are needed in other kinds of contexts. What

is repaired, Seedhouse points out, depends on the learning goals and repair is thus related to the pedagogical focus of the learning context.

Contexts which focus on pupils' interaction or accomplishing a task (i.e. 'meaning-and fluency' and 'task-oriented' contexts) involve different kinds of repair from 'form-and accuracy' contexts. Here repair resembles that done in ordinary conversation: linguistic errors do not matter, but only problems that hinder mutual understanding or completing the task are cleared out of the way. Since pupils manage the task-oriented context themselves, they are usually the only participants who do repairing in that context. (Seedhouse 2004: 149-158.)
Teachers may also choose an unobtrusive way of repairing talk in contexts which do not focus on grammar and linguistic forms. This kind of 'embedded repair' may thus be treated "as a by-the-way matter" when it is prefaced with agreement or approval (Seedhouse 2004: 63), i.e. the teacher repeats the pupil's incorrect phrase in its right form after expressing acceptance. These reformulations which the teacher and other pupils may do about a pupil's incorrect utterance, i.e. 'recasts', have been studied by Ohta (2001) in a CA-informed study about learners' 'socially distributed cognition' (or how intersubjectivity is achieved) in the L2 classroom (Seedhouse 2004: 240).

Like Seedhouse (2004), van Lier (1988: 187-191) also observes that different learning contexts involve and require different types of repair. When an activity in a language class is classroom specific, 'didactic repair' is used, and conversely when interaction is closer to ordinary conversation, 'conversational repair' is more salient. Moreover, the teacher's repair may be used to help the pupil overcome the problem, or it may have an evaluative function. However, though pupils' mistakes and errors are considered necessary and acceptable, teachers avoid giving direct negative evaluation to pupils. Seedhouse (1997: 547-583; 2004) points out the paradox between the pedagogical recommendations (i.e. that mistakes are natural in class) and the practice that shows that teachers treat their repair action as face-threatening to pupils and try to mitigate it. However, other-repair in the classroom should not be oriented to as other-repair in everyday conversation, but treated as acceptable in the classroom context.

As meaning-and-fluency contexts, the drama lessons of my data mainly focused on communication, such as exchanging information and negotiating, and the teacher did not pay attention to linguistic errors contrary to the general practice in foreign language lessons. So

practically only those linguistic items which the pupils asked to be repaired were taken care of in the interaction, which in some activities were mostly requests for help to find the right word. On the whole, requests for help or clarification, self repair on single words and slips of the tongue did not occur very often during the drama lessons. In the first lesson, which consisted of small, separate activities, it was necessary for pupils to initiate repair to find the right vocabulary in order to interview a kitchen appliance. Pupils could turn to the teacher for help (Extract 6), sometimes another pupil helped out or several pupils may have initiated other-repair without a request (Extract 7):

(6)

1	Ella		when they (2.0) when they when they (4.0) when they are so messy that (.) milk
2		→	and all is (1.0) (mitä on kaa[tunut)
3	T		[spilled
4	Ella		spilled to my (.) £<u>smoo:th</u> [su(h)rface
5	Ps		[((laughter))
6	Ella		↑<u>smoo(h)th</u> surface

Ella tries to adjust and repair her talk, turns quietly to the teacher for help (line 2), then places the given word in the context and is so able to finish her turn successfully (line 4). Searching for the right word is an everyday phenomenon in talk, and van Lier (1988: 194) observes that in second language classes this kind of ‘same-turn self-repair’ is common with teachers and pupils alike in the form of hesitations and word-search, as seen here in line 1. In the following example, pupils initiate an other-repair in chorus, when a pupil has a problem:

(7)

1	Ella		do you ((laughs)) do you ever get (.) that scared (there)
2	Anu		no (I don’t scare)
3			I’m a (3.0) rohkea
4	Ps	→	brA(h)VE? ((laughter))

The group makes a collective other-repair, in which several pupils use the same rising intonation and the increase of volume towards the end of the turn. The repair is supportive and humorously done. Van Lier calls a repair which is meant to help or support ‘conjunctive’, whereas a repair which is designed to be evaluative and challenging is called 'disjunctive' (van Lier 1988: 189-190). On the whole, the context of the drama lesson encourages the former, i.e. a conjunctive repair design.

3.5 Recent orientations to L2 learning and research

This section begins with a brief discussion on recent developments in and orientations to second language learning and research, and moves on to deal with the place of Vygotsky's ideas within these developments. The discussion involves the main tenets of Vygosky's sociocultural theory with reference to the present research and other studies which focus on second language learning. Finally, the central points of the ecological approach which van Lier proposes for a theoretical perspective are looked at.

In recent years, the predominant psycholinguistic theories and research on second language acquisition have been challenged by a variety of approaches which emphasise the social, cultural and interactional aspects in language learning. The critique which Firth and Wagner launched in 1997 against the prevailing psycholinguistic views pointed out the areas in second language learning theories which had been neglected. They argued that the contextual and interactional dimensions of language were not in balance with the cognitive and mentalistic orientations in the field. Their article (Firth and Wagner 1997: 285-300) observed the lack of an emic learner-perspective in most SLA research and demanded for a research methodology that described rather than explained, searched for local rather than universal features in language learning and treated the learner as a resource and not a topic of investigation. Firth and Wagner, in turn, were criticised for the lack of theoretical grounds for language acquisition (Kasper 1997), and the use of the methodological and theoretical practices of psycholinguistic research was regarded as a sound approach instead (Poulisse 1997). All in all, the seminal paper by Firth and Wagner (1997) inspired wide discussion in the field of second language acquisition about the nature of language learning, second language research and the use of conversation analysis as a methodological tool particularly within the sociocultural approaches which had emerged. The special issue of Modern Language Journal 88 (2004) addresses these questions including a number of CA-informed studies such as Kasper's (2004: 551-567) research on learners' situated identities in dyadic conversations, and Mori's (2004: 536-550) study on students' orientations to learning opportunities in a Japanese foreign language classroom.

Many of the theoretical approaches which have started to be recognised and applied in second language acquisition research have their roots in the philosophical and theoretical thinking of the Russian pioneer in psychology, Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934). Vygotsky drew on western

philosophy and psychology, on which he based his theoretical concepts and ideas about the development of the human mind. Vygotsky's perceptions and structures of thought have influenced several fields of study, such as psychology, study of culture and cognition, education and the study of first and second languages. There is no comprehensive theoretical framework for the Vygotskian approach, which involves several theories and ideas sharing the same view of the development of the human mind. The term 'sociocultural perspective' (from Wertsch, del Rio & Alvarez, 1995) has gained ground as a label for research involving the Vygotskian approach, the social constructionist view or the sociocultural theory of the mind. (Alanen 2002: 201-207.)

Vygotsky-inspired sociocultural theories have been developed and applied in second language research ('second and third generation developments'), which see context, language and subjectivity as inseparable, and to be studied and analysed when embedded in situated activities (Thorne 2005: 398). In language research, Vygotsky's sociocultural concepts have become increasingly popular particularly in America, where several aspects of Vygotsky's theory have been used in research. The attraction of Vygotsky's ideas is seen to lie in the principle thought that interaction in a social context influences an individual's thinking, and that an individual, in turn, can change the social context. (Alanen 2000: 102-105.)

The most central tenets of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory are the concept of 'mediation', 'activity theory', the 'zone of proximal development'. As Vygotsky's most fundamental concept, mediation concerns the human mind, i.e. cognition, which is seen mediated by physical and symbolic tools and signs. These tools are artefacts created by human cultures, and then passed on to the next generations. Among the symbolic tools, such as numbers, music or art, language is the most important tool which mediates a person's relationship with the world and himself. When symbolic artefacts are integrated into thinking, a natural brain becomes a culturally shaped mind with higher mental capacities (paying attention, memorising, planning, thinking logically, solving problems, learning, evaluation). (Lantolf 2000: 1-2.)

Recent research has been interested in different mediational processes in language classrooms, such as Swain's study of collaborative dialogue between learners, reforming the learner's identity through the mediation of a new language by Kramsch or playfulness in a foreign language class (Sullivan 2000) (Lantolf 2000: 20-22). Using a 'socio-interactionist'

perspective, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004: 501- 518) have studied situated language learning in a French language class using conversation analysis. Vygotsky's concept of mediation is revised to mean not only collaborative action, but also to mean the activity which constructs the situation at hand. Taking a social constructionist perspective, Sahlström's study (1999) looks into a Swedish classroom and the way in which learning is constituted through interactional mediation. The research shows how the organisation of participation affects the creation of equity in the classroom. Sahlström sees the available possibilities for participation and interaction as 'affordances', employing Gibson's concept (also used by van Lier (2000, 2001) and discussed later in this section). The research seeks to understand how the organisation of turn-taking affords or constrains participation, and how participation constitutes equity in the Swedish comprehensive school class.

In research which draws on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, language playfulness, such as playing with words, is seen to mediate the interaction between teacher and pupils and the language that is being learned, i.e. play is seen as a mediating activity in language learning. In a study about a Vietnamese English university classroom (Sullivan 2000: 115-131), the teacher was found to engage the class in spontaneous, playful and lively interaction in the social classroom context. As language play is an inherent feature in Vietnamese culture, this context contained much laughter and joking while the students responded actively to the teacher's playful turns. The playful talk was thus used to raise students' awareness of the language which they were learning, and the teaching was socially constructed in this particular cultural environment in which the classroom practice was situated.

Playfulness in interaction is also focused on in the present study, i.e. the way it can be generated through participation in drama. The use of the imaginary context and roles may be thought to have the same mediating function as other forms of playfulness between language learners, teacher and the language being learned. The drama context itself may also be considered a specific and clearly defined cultural environment in which the teaching and learning is socially constructed through involvement in a fictional context, orientation to roles and through the features of the pretend activity.

The overall theoretical framework for the sociocultural research is informed by 'activity theory' which A.N. Leontiev developed from Vygotsky's ideas. It states that a biological or culturally constructed need motivates human beings towards goal-oriented objects, and so

motives are only realised in intentional and meaningful ‘actions’. These actions are carried out in particular ‘conditions’ through appropriate ‘mediational means’. (Lantolf 2000: 8.) Thus, human mental actions can be seen to be motivated by culturally constructed needs which direct towards the set goals. The same actions may, however, have different motives, e.g. in the classroom, pupils may be engaged in the same task, but their motives, and the needs guiding them, may vary, and so being engaged in the same task does not necessarily mean being involved in the same activity. This is found in Donato’s study (2000) investigating small group work in a language classroom which displays participants’ differing interpretations of the task at hand. (Lantolf 2000: 11-13.)

Considering drama activities in an English classroom, pupils participating in them may be motivated by different kinds of things, such as a chance to use spoken English, to experience fun together, to express oneself through drama, or to do one’s duty as a pupil. Accordingly, pupils will focus on those areas which they are motivated to practise: getting engaged in interaction, paying attention to expression and enactments or advancing a playful and carefree atmosphere. The analysis of interaction may give some idea of these motivating factors and focuses, but the talk-in-interaction and action which are analysed in this research is examined to find out how teacher and pupils organise their participation and talk in order to carry out the two drama activities.

The third tenet of Vygotsky’s theory is the concept of the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD), which means “the difference between what a person can achieve when acting alone and what the same person can accomplish when acting with support from someone else and/or cultural artefacts” (Lantolf 2000: 17). This widely known and adopted concept involves Vygotsky’s thought that human higher mental abilities appear first on the intermental plane in a social context and then on an intramental plane. Lantolf suggests that expertise in the ZPD can also be seen as a co-constructed feature of the group working together, i.e. opportunities made available through collaboration, which van Lier (2000, 2001) regards as ‘affordances’. In Vygotsky’s theory of development, play has an important role as children’s activity, because children create a zone of proximal development when playing in collaboration with other children. Within this zone they perform beyond what they are able to do currently, and their play is not only fun, but projected to the future. (Lantolf 2000: 13.) In the theoretical principles of classroom drama, children’s thinking and understanding is believed to develop in contact with the teacher and other participants in drama. The zone of proximal development

can be created through the teacher's well-timed and appropriate guidance, 'right' questions and comments (e.g. Bolton 1992: 136).

The zone of proximal development and 'scaffolding' (a concept associated with the ZPD) has interested research widely both within first and second language acquisition research. A recent thesis by Hakamäki (2005) studied the teacher's scaffolded assistance in teaching grammar in teacher-fronted instruction. Scaffolded assistance was given through the IRF teaching cycle which was used by both teacher and pupils and through several strategies which the teacher employed. The thesis also includes an extensive review of previous studies of scaffolding within the Vygotskian framework.

The ecological perspective to second language learning involves Vygotsky's theoretical views on learning (social context, mediation, motivated action and help from more proficient interactants) as well as concepts by psychologists such as Gibson (van Lier 2000; Lantolf 2000). In the ecological approach which van Lier (2000: 246) proposes, a language learner is "immersed in an environment full of potential meanings", which are seen to become available for him through interaction and action in connection with that environment. According to van Lier (2001: 98-102), the central notion in the ecological approach is 'affordance', which means those opportunities which learners have while being actively engaged in symmetrical interaction with others in a linguistic context which involves contingent language. In contingent language, form and function are united and the talk is created spontaneously by speakers who have shared rights and responsibilities in participation. Since it aims at participants' mutual understanding, the talk requires linguistic resources for speakers to be able to do so: Participants need expressions like 'ok', 'now', 'by the way' or 'listen to this' for planning or predicting , and signal with eye contact, back channels ('uhuh, hm') or empathy markers ('oh, wow, really') to their co-speakers during their talk. For summarising or rephrasing, speakers need such expressions as 'oh, I see', 'so', or 'do you mean x?'. These 'proactive', 'concurrent' and 'reactive resources' are needed in negotiation in talk that is conversational in character.

I

n van Lier's view (2001: 98-104), two questions are seen as relevant characteristics to language learning: an issue of symmetry which involves participants' joint construction of talk, and the issues of equality and inequality, including participants' power and access to talk. Partners in talk do not necessarily have to be equal with each other, but the talk should be

oriented towards symmetry. This orientation is visible in the way in which utterances are contingent with other utterances as well in interactants' shared knowledge of the context and the world in general. The utterances also raise expectations of the next utterances. In other words, the talk is dependent on the context and creates the context at the same time (Drew and Heritage 1992).

The ecological approach to language learning provides a perspective through which a drama context as a learning environment can be viewed in a versatile way. Such questions as participants' access to talk and their opportunities to interact in a way which allows participants' 'shared rights and responsibilities' are addressed in van Lier's approach. In addition, the learner's role as an active agent in the learning process is central as well as the influence which the teacher and other learners can have on learning in the zone of proximal development which is thus created in the social context. The analysis and description of the drama contexts aim at displaying the characteristics of a fictional learning environment, which will be discussed in the light of van Lier's concepts in the final chapter of the present study.

4 CLASSROOM DRAMA

When entering a drama context, participants become involved in social events and relationships much like in real life. The drama context is fictional by nature, in that participants interact both in role and out of role, but it is a social context like any other context with the exception that it is created and sustained through participants' mutual work, consent and imagination. While an ordinary classroom context is a familiar and safe environment where pupils have their usual roles as learners, having a role in drama may involve taking risks and requires other skills, such as openness, spontaneity and a willingness to play, which differs from the everyday classroom work. Process drama, as an established name for the genre of structured classroom drama (e.g. Heikkinen 2002, 2005), consists of several successive activities with which the drama is developed. Thus, its structure resembles the organisation of the traditional classroom in which the lesson consists of different instructional phases which are introduced and brought to an end by the teacher. However, a drama lesson which is structured as process drama deals with one theme and topic to be worked on and developed together. The phases in the lesson also have more variety as movement and other non-verbal action make an essential part of participation in a make-believe context, i.e. the play which drama necessarily involves.

The theoretical framework for drama education largely draws on Vygotsky's concepts of child play and his sociocultural theory of mind (Bolton 1979, 1992; Heikkinen 2002, 2005; Vygotsky 1978). As a holistic teaching method, increasingly seen as a way to create, explore and experience drama worlds together (Heikkinen 2002: 75- 79), classroom drama involves many areas of learning, theoretical considerations and practices, which makes the scope of educational drama wide and demanding. This chapter aims to discuss those questions and background theories which seem relevant to understanding participation in classroom drama in a foreign language class.

The first section of this chapter discusses the way in which a drama context resembles any 'real life' social context, how this make-believe context is built and sustained through dramatic playing, and how the element of theatre is necessary to pass drama as an artistic activity. This leads to the discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of classroom drama, much of which is based on Vygotsky's sociocultural concepts of development and learning. The third section looks at the goals of classroom drama in general and the goals of the drama

'The Rains', which the primary data of this research is part of. Play in drama and child play, the use of roles and the teacher's questioning in drama are discussed in the fourth section. The fifth section introduces the use of drama conventions which structure the drama lesson. The last section focuses on the functions of language which participants use in drama.

4.1 Fictional context as a social context

The building materials for the drama context are naturally derived from the social contexts in which participants are used to acting and interacting. Both social contexts and fictional contexts require that the participants make them work by recognising the type of participation that is needed and by acting accordingly. The drama context also demands a conscious effort to believe in the fictional reality and make it work, much in the same way as children do in their make-believe play. This section discusses these two contexts by using the views of two present-day English drama educators, Gavin Bolton and Jonothan Neelands, whose ideas seem feasible in discussing drama which is used as a learning environment in the first place, not only as an art subject. Their drama theories also have similar bases as those second language learning theories, such as Vygotsky's sociocultural approach, which emphasise the social context of interaction.

According to Bolton (1992: 2-11), participants in an everyday social context, such as a meeting or a party, have to 'submit themselves' to it and make their participation role credible. The implicit rules of social situations help participants to believe in the nature of that particular social context which they are in, whereas the actual experience of 'giving oneself' to the situation is spontaneous and has an 'existential quality' to it. If there is a danger of disruption of the context, the participants signal or 'describe' to each other what the nature of the social context is, after which they can adopt the existential mode again. In the same way, participants in drama need to submit themselves to the situation and experience the unfolding drama events from the inside, and draw on these skills that they have learned in everyday social contexts. In this kind of participation, i.e. 'dramatic playing', however, participants have to work consciously at the drama context, which in a social situation is only needed initially or in case of a problem.

Bolton (1992: 2-11) points out the common existential feature of both dramatic playing and participation in a social context, which is that they cannot be repeated. So they differ from such classroom performances or small group plays for which the dialogue is rehearsed beforehand and performed in front of the class. In this type of drama, participants use the 'descriptive mode', whereas both existential and descriptive behaviour are needed when participating is dramatic playing. Thus, submitting to a spontaneous make-believe situation as well as making a conscious effort to create a drama context are required from participants in drama. In fact, participants in dramatic playing are experiencing the 'real life' social context and the drama context at the same time, i.e. in Augusto Boal's words, they are experiencing 'metaxis', and this experience creates the fun, power and the 'imperative tension' which are present in dramatic playing. Heikkinen (2002: 100-101) sees the teacher's role to be crucial in making pupils aware of the two contexts in which the group works in drama. Neelands (1984: 83-84) observes that the rules of the drama reality are partly the same as those in the actual reality, and though drama is clearly fictional, participants should experience it as 'real' and behave according to their roles: "'as if' I were this other person", "'as if' I were in this situation", or "'as if' the object stands for something other than itself". Participants in drama also have a choice to decide the level and degree of their participation. However, as Heikkinen (2005: 187) points out, this freedom is counterbalanced by the drama contract between teacher and pupils, which asks for participants' commitment for the drama work.

Dramatic playing, which as spontaneous action resembles acting in everyday situations, is the type of participation which is also under study in the present research. The two drama activities as the primary data have their own interactional patterns, focuses and participation frameworks, but they are spontaneously developed and pupils have a choice to join in the talk or adopt quieter participation roles. Though the teacher does not specifically make a drama contract with the group before each of the three lessons, she has made an agreement with the class to try drama in English. Thus, the teacher and pupils are willing to enter a shared experience which allows a shift in the usual classroom roles and gives a chance to play. Dramatic playing is not only used in the primary data of the two activities, but the group is also involved in it in two earlier lessons. In the following playful activity from the first lesson, the pupils have chosen roles of kitchen appliances which are now placed in the kitchen with the teacher's help in her instructional organising role.

(1)

1	Tea	I'm going to be a microwave oven
1	T	ok and I think that the microwave oven could be rather (x)
2		or what do you think (.) where should we place it (2.0)
3	Tea →	I can't be on the floor (1.0) I need a tab<u></u>le ((laughs))
4	Ps	((laughter))
5	Ella →	I don't th(h)ink [((laughs)) (I d(h)on't th(h)ink so I think you've gotta be
6	Ps	[((laughter))
7	Ella	on the floor)

In this passage, the teacher, much in her classroom role, negotiates with pupils, who respond accordingly as in any classroom situation. But the group also acts and interacts in the drama context, which is sustained with a response given in the role of a kitchen appliance (line 3), with an added, humorous comment (line 5) and the group's laughing response (line 6). In this way, there is a conscious effort to make the activity a joint, playful occasion, though the form of the exercise is not very challenging as such. The group is involved in dramatic playing, which thus cannot be repeated and performed in the same way, i.e. it does not have imitative or illustrative/performance quality (Bolton 1992: 10).

Once participants have created and entered the drama context, their own action develops it step by step. Neelands (1984: 49) calls this the 'co-authorship' in the drama, in which the teacher in role leads the action and provides clues for the pupils in role to interpret and act accordingly. In this sense, story and drama are similar and 'meanings' are constructed in the same way in both of them: the teacher's clues are like the ones in the story creating expectations, and the participants learn to 'read' them and 'write' more drama themselves. In the present study, the 'co-authoring' of the two drama activities, i.e. the primary data, occurs in a particular way which the activities require, which is negotiating about pupils' proposals and questioning in the parliament of animals. The analysis of the interaction hopes to show the mutual work between teacher and pupils in developing the drama, and the way in which drama roles may allow participants more choice for expression.

Finally, the drama context cannot be exactly the same as a social context, or should not be so, according to Bolton (1992:18-22): though participants in a dramatic playing activity are creating a social context by relying on the qualities of behaviour in everyday life, a drama context has to have the 'aesthetic' dimension to it. Only when the art form of theatre is included in the make-believe playing, does it become 'dramatic art'. In everyday social activities, the aesthetic dimension may be seen in ritualistic events in the use of clothes, space,

music or gestures, in which the meaning of the event is 'encapsulated' in its form. These aesthetic moments in everyday life are drawn on in drama and theatre in addition to the necessary elements of drama, i.e. tension, contrast, surprise, constraint and repetition. The third aesthetic dimension can also be the quality of dialogue. It is the very use of form, such as manipulating silence or space that distinguishes drama from everyday events or children's make-believe play.

Since participation in drama, i.e. exploring the drama worlds, involves forms of theatre expression, meeting these artistic and expressive requirements of participation in drama may not seem so easy in the drama context of a language lesson, and getting confidence in these areas may need more practice and experience. However, in a trustful, relaxed atmosphere, participants may find their own resources to create something that lifts the mood and observation of the group. In the second drama of my data, the drama was based on a story which the teacher read to the class at different stages of the drama. Someone was needed to take the role of the main character, and one of the girls volunteered to act as the little girl in the story. Her part would have been later on in the drama, but when the teacher started the narration, the pupil in the role of the little girl began miming the action that the story described. This created an aesthetic moment, and the group watched keenly how the story was portrayed for them. The second analysed activity of the present study, i.e. the parliament of animals, also offers the group an opportunity to use some interactional and ritualistic elements which highlight the character of the occasion, which will also be noted in Chapter 7.

4.2 Theoretical underpinnings of classroom drama

This section discusses the theoretical views and tenets on which Bolton (1979, 1992) and Neelands (1984), draw when conceptualising classroom drama. Kuuluvainen (1994: 10-14) points out some basic differences in their views: Bolton emphasises participants' individual experience and the social context in drama, whereas Neelands focuses on the child as an active learner who learns through story and play, and uses his intuitive knowledge together with what he learns at school. Neelands also sees drama as a means to learn language skills and other school subjects. Bolton's theoretical concepts are found in child psychology, i.e. the theories of Piaget and Vygotsky, and in social psychology, while Neelands's theoretical roots lie in psychology and pedagogics. However, Bolton and Neelands agree with other drama

educators on the origins and essence of drama: it is part of human culture and has its roots in the past human communities.

Bolton (1979: 20-22) considers Vygotsky's perspective about child play important to his theoretical concepts. According to Vygotsky, in his pre-school years a child learns to think beyond the concrete objects and create another meaning for an object through imaginary play. The emphasis in the play is on the meaning and not on the action, and the meaning is created in interaction between the two concrete things, the 'real' action and the pretended action. The same, in Bolton's view, is true with drama. Further, two kinds of meanings can be created through the interaction between 'real doing' and 'pretended doing', viz. subjective and objective meanings. The subjective meaning refers to individual, personal and emotional meanings whereas the objective meaning includes common, social and cognitive meanings. Play and drama can teach the child a variety of skills and objective knowledge, but the deepest change may only take place at the child's emotional level in creating the subjective meaning. Bolton (1992: 138-141) points out that 'meaning-making' occurs through pupils' enactment, it is helped by the teacher in role in the drama context. Thus, 'meaning-making' is the essence of the whole classroom drama, i.e. something that the participants in drama are pursuing. Bolton (1992: 136) also sees the help of the teacher-in-role in the light of Vygotsky's concept of 'zone of proximal development', in which the learner exceeds his previous skills with an adult's help.

Neelands's theoretical perspective to educational drama has much in common with Bolton's theoretical framework, and he especially focuses on the child as a learner who himself is a valuable asset in the classroom, not an object to whom information is passed. The child's earlier, personal and intuitive involvement in the world, i.e. his "mastery in vernacular forms of knowledge" (Neelands 1984: 4), is an important resource which he uses in learning and to which he can add the new information, i.e. the impersonal and objective knowledge. Classroom drama is able to make use of the child's existing cultural resources, such as language, motivations and interests. These resources are developed and shaped by new knowledge in interaction with the group during the drama process, in which new meanings are discovered by the learners themselves. In other words, the child uses his existing experience as a tool to make sense of the new experience. (Neelands 1984: 2-4.) The constructivist approach to learning is seen to guide drama education in its concepts

(Heikkinen 2005: 37), and this can also be found in Neelands's theoretical views on learning in drama.

According to Kristiansen (1998: 18-21), the roots of the cognitive-constructivist theory can be traced to the thoughts of Dewey, Piaget and Vygotsky. The pioneering thoughts were Dewey's emphasis on the active role of the learner and the problem-solving nature of learning, and Vygotsky's view of social interaction as the basis of all higher human functions. Constructivism also includes Vygotsky's concept of 'zone of proximal development'. Kristiansen (1998: 21-24) points out that constructivism has a long developmental history involving multiplicity of thought. Knowledge is seen to be constructed by a learner through his own action. This takes place in social interaction, in a context-bound situation and such factors as the learner's observation, earlier concepts and metacognitive skills are central. The learner uses the knowledge he already has acquired, and the new information complements and changes the previous knowledge.

Neelands (1984: 6) finds the teacher's role important as a provider of new forms and ways of knowing into the child's experience. This kind of 'teacher intervention' particularly helps to develop the child's personal and cultural experience. Thus, Neelands's view is similar to Vygotsky's concept of the 'zone of proximal development', which sees that the learner's development takes place through more expert help. Neelands (1984: 25-26) also shares Vygotsky's view on the children's idea of play and game, according to which children voluntarily set rules which they follow to carry out the game. Classroom drama as an 'extension of play activity' builds on this tradition, in which there is an inbuilt control inside the game, which the drama rules and conventions can control implicitly.

Thus, the general theoretical concepts underpinning classroom drama agree that an active participant develops new meanings for himself while interacting with others in the drama context, and it is through this imagined personal experience that a change in concepts, thoughts and skills may take place. The constructivist perspective on learning and Vygotsky's concept of 'zone of proximal development', which are increasingly used as theoretical bases for second language learning, also guide practical drama work and theoretical thinking. In drama, learning is thought to occur in different areas through participants' personal involvement in supportive interaction with others. The areas of learning are stated as goals for classroom drama, which is discussed in the next section.

4.3 Aims and goals of drama in education

Educational drama is used for different kinds of classroom contexts and purposes, and its objectives are varied covering several areas of human mental development. Some drama practitioners have particular areas of emphasis in their goals for classroom drama, and in addition to this, the aims of classroom drama may be tailored to suit the needs of some classes or school subjects. This section starts by discussing the aims which Bolton and Neelands have set for classroom drama including the generally accepted and pursued goals. Moreover, I will explicate the goals set for the drama lesson, 'The Rains', which includes the two activities in my primary data.

The overall purpose of drama for Neelands is "to effect change", which may result from the drama experience in several areas of learning concerning a level of understanding, attitude, expectations of role-play, social behaviour, existing language experience and awareness of others. Neelands believes that useful drama brings about change, but it is not always easy to say which areas the change takes place in. (Neelands 1984: 85.) Similarly, a change in learners' understanding is the ultimate goal of drama for Bolton (1984: 149). There are, however, more specific areas of learning which all drama teachers consider their main aims, i.e. content, participants' personal growth, their social development and teaching about the dramatic art form. For Bolton, content and form cannot be separated, and he considers them the cornerstones of drama as interdependent elements: the components of drama, such as focus, tension and constraints and rituals are needed to be able to do drama work on the content. However, the dramatic activity is related to knowledge which is connected to values or principles, not to skills or facts, and so it is impossible to identify what has been learned. Learning is indirect, as participants focus on creating an art product or a drama context in dramatic playing. Learning in drama is conceptual by nature, and the results which are hoped for may take a long time to become visible. (Bolton 1992: 108-116.)

Further, according to Bolton (1992: 117-121), learners' personal growth is associated with skills of expression involving the use of language and movement, which can be seen as an ongoing aim in drama. Advancing learners' self-esteem and opportunities for expression can be considered 'soft' objectives of drama, whereas the goals concerning the content/form of some piece of work can be described as 'hard' objectives. Learners' social development involves their work with others as a group. In drama, participants have a chance to learn from

each other, and much depends on the group dynamics. In order to succeed, drama needs the group's 'positive interaction' between its members. These general goals are agreed on as guidelines for drama in classrooms.

The drama pretext 'The Rains' by Allan Owens and Keith Barber (1997: 109), which the two drama activities of the present study are part of, has also set precise aims and learning outcomes for carrying out the drama. As possible learning areas, the writers name learning to handle difficulties, understanding about oppression, fairness, justice and compassion through one's own experience. It is probable that some of these goals can much better be achieved and identified if the drama session is used as a basis for a long project with the group, but it is conceivable that some understanding about these topics may also be enhanced in a shorter drama experience in a single drama lesson. Other learning outcomes for 'The Rains', which are in the area of social skills, are likely to be achieved in the course of a single lesson, such as participants' role behaviour, how they relate their knowledge to the context or plan and present their ideas.

The overall aim for 'The Rains' is "to take pleasure in the 'game of drama'" (Owens and Barber 1997: 109), for which the setting, topic and the form of the drama are well-suited: 'The Rains' is based on an African story in which the roles for participants are animal roles, which involves playfulness as a natural ingredient. In addition, the interaction which revolves round the opposition of the two views, or two ways of behaviour, create a game-like setting. The empirical analysis in the present study aims to show the way in which participants deal with the topic through negotiation, adopt a role and play the drama game collaboratively. In Chapter 8, I will also discuss the findings of the research from the perspective of drama goals and objectives.

4.4 Play and roles for working in the drama context

The fictional reality is created and sustained mainly through play and roles during the drama. Unlike the theatre roles which the actors interpret and perform after careful studying, these roles are made instantly, and participants use their previous experience about people and situations in creating them. In this way, the drama context resembles a real-life context, in which the requirements are not too complicated or demanding if the participants want to submit themselves to it and accept the fictional reality, i.e. to play the game.

4.4.1 Play in drama

Child play, in which a child is engaged in an imagined activity alone or with other children pretending to be somebody else, is a most common and natural phenomenon and an integral part of childhood. Child play is at the heart of educational drama, according to Bolton (1979: 17), and understanding drama requires understanding the quality of child play (see Section 4.2). Play and art go side by side in drama: Neelands (1984: 7) places child play at one end of a continuum and the art-form of theatre at the other, while classroom drama remains between these two poles. The former represents the starting point of drama and the latter its farthest development as an art form. Owens and Barber (1997: 5) see that in drama, human beings' need to symbolise meaning through art and play becomes fulfilled: "By giving children and adults the opportunity to 'take their play seriously', we create the opportunity for a powerful form of learning in context." According to Heikkinen (2005: 33), drama is playful by nature, and this fuels participation in drama to explore and create something new, whereas art in drama comes through the use of roles and other means of theatre.

Heikkinen (2002: 148) has studied play and playfulness in drama education from the philosophical perspective through Huizinga's concept of 'serious playfulness', and sees playfulness as 'a serious mode of human behaviour', in which the rules of the actual reality are suspended, and which uses stories to explore issues in the social context of drama. According to Heikkinen (2005: 33-37), serious playfulness is most centrally based on the following premises: Drama is a world which the group is willing to enter in order to explore meanings through drama without any outside obligation. Moreover, participants have to invest something in the game themselves, for instance, venturing in the exploration or learning to know the group. When the players play the game seriously, they become the winners in the game in which they have made the investment. Further, participants in drama have to make a contract about playing the game, which also defines the drama frame and rules to be followed. Finally, the aim of drama is to create mental spaces in fictional contexts in which meanings can be studied and created through play, seriously.

Thus, playfulness in drama is seen as a necessary attitude when working in drama, i.e. willingness to believe in the drama context, following the rules set for it and playing the game in earnest. Playfulness does not necessarily involve a lot of laughter, especially when dealing with serious social topics. Some drama pretexts, however, seem to invite participants to have

fun when the setting or topic for the drama is fantastic and open for humorous turns. These types of drama processes involve pupils not only in the game of pretence, but also in having fun as in any other playful context, since playfulness or pursuing enjoyment is a natural and important part of everyday social situations (as discussed in Chapter 2). 'The Rains'- pretext, used for the primary data of this study, with its animal figures and game-like qualities is likely to instigate playful interaction. How the group in the present study plays the 'serious drama game', i.e. how they submit themselves to the drama context, and how teacher and pupils create fun through talk and laughter are among those features of participation which the analysis aims to make visible.

4.4.2 Teacher's double role in drama

The teacher running a drama lesson can be regarded as one of the group, but she still remains a teacher and in charge of the whole drama process (e.g. O'Neill and Lambert 1982: 13-21; Morgan and Saxton 1987; Heikkinen 2005). The latter quality does not, however, diminish the change which working in drama with the group brings to the teacher's usual role in the classroom. The biggest difference between these two teacher-roles perhaps concerns knowledge: in an ordinary lesson, the teacher is an expert who usually knows the answers to the questions which are dealt with, but in the drama lesson, the group together has the 'knowledge' concerning the events, results and decisions during the process. As regards the lesson plans, the teacher is responsible for the organisation of both these lessons, i.e. in a traditional classroom with instructional phases following one another, there are set learning goals to achieve, and similarly, classroom drama is a structured and organised lesson with a focus and plan.

Both teacher and pupils will find themselves in new teacher-pupil roles in the drama lesson, whether they work in role of out of role. Neelands (1984: 46-47) points out that pupils' traditional roles will undergo a more fundamental change in drama than the teacher's role: children will participate in the negotiation in different roles rather than as themselves, but the teacher is always in her instructive role, even though she seems to be acting as a fictional character. The teacher's double role also proves an effective learning device, since pupils are now allowed to approach the learning material more directly "through the lens of the dramatic context", which allows the power relationships between teacher and pupils to be changed, and the group is free to "make sense for themselves" (Neelands 1984: 47).

According to Morgan and Saxton (1987: 38-42), the technique in which the teacher appears in role, i.e. the ‘teacher in role’ strategy, is the most effective technique, since the teacher in role is able to follow what is happening in the group, control the pace and tension of the work, support the pupils and discover something new with them. The teacher is always teaching in drama directly or indirectly, and the writers recognize three teaching stances which the teacher may adopt: those of a manipulator who ‘handles with skill’, a facilitator, who ‘promotes or helps forward’ and an enabler, who ‘empowers a person with the means to do’. These stances can be used in and out of role and each involves a different status, which becomes manifested in roles. So a king's role is high in status and has a stance of a manipulator, which leaves full authority to the teacher.

In the lessons of my research data, the teacher only has roles in the last drama, ‘The Rains’, which is carried out in the two activities of the primary data. The teacher appears in the roles of the porcupine and the king of the forest, both of which have a high status, and the latter is close to a chairperson’s role at a meeting. In role, the teacher is able to direct and keep the activity going from inside the drama (O’Neill and Lambert 1982: 138), as in the next example. In line 3, there is s shift from her narrator’s role into a fictional role:

(2)

1	T		so the king of the forest was just walking round the corner and
2			<he saw what happened> (4.0)
3	→		<↑I saw you do that little squirrel>
4			<is that a way to treat our fellow [creatures in this kingdom> **no**
5	Ps		[((laughter))
6	Ella		!can I say something! (.) ((looks down and speaks timidly))
7	T		you will **have** to say some[thing.
8	Ps		[((laughter))

According to O'Neill and Lambert (1982: 138-139), a role with authority resembles the ordinary teaching role, which makes working in role more accessible for an unaccustomed teacher. On the other hand, a teacher in role can demonstrate appropriate language, attitude or action, as in this example as an angry king.

The power relationships between teacher and pupils are changed not only due to their shared responsibilities in creating the drama, but also because pupils are free to express their views in role and even challenge the teacher (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 41). In the third drama, ‘The Rains’, the teacher in the role of a rude porcupine has the whole group as her opponent in the

game. In the following passage, one of the pupils responds to the porcupine's argument with a playfully impertinent phrase:

(3)

1	T	!oh (.) but <u>how</u> am I going to <u>tra</u>vel in that rainy forest
2		when it's raining so heavi[ly!
3	Pia →	[ºit's your proble[mº
4	Ps	[((laughter))

Pia joins in the teacher's questioning with a phrase which has appeared earlier in the drama story, and expresses an opposing stance to the porcupine.

All in all, the teacher's double role, which involves teaching and participating in the drama process, makes versatile ways of interaction between teacher and pupils possible and often increases pupils' chances to take the floor. The teacher can also follow the pupils' progress and give them more responsibility when the group gets accustomed to working in drama. 'The parliament of animals' in the last drama of this research (i.e. the second activity of the primary data) allows pupils to manage the talk and do much of the questioning. However, many of the teacher's tasks in drama lessons in general are similar to those in traditional lessons, such as organizing groups, setting things in motion and helping to carry out the activities (discussed in Section 6.3 and in Sections 7.2. and 7.3.3).

4.4.3 Teacher's questions in drama

The teacher's questions in drama serve several kinds of purposes at different stages of the drama process. O'Neill and Lambert (1982:141) point out that their nature is not the same as in traditional lessons, as they do not expect one particular answer which may be ready in the teacher's mind, but they are a means of achieving interactive collaboration between teacher and pupils in building and maintaining the drama context: the teacher's questions lead the group along, but the pupils take the steps themselves and may also decide about the route. When the drama is started, the context is created through questioning, later on the group's thoughts are deepened with it, and finally the drama experience can be reflected on with the help of the teacher's questions. Though pupils have a say in the drama, the questioner still appears to have the ultimate power. Bolton (1992: 31-34), however, observes that the teacher (using a teacher-in-role technique) loses her power in the drama process. When the teacher leads the pupils into drama through questions in role, he invites them to participate 'in the existential present'. At this point, the teacher seems to have all the power involving

knowledge, which he loses when he has to cope with the pupils' answers. The teacher may also empower pupils by making them questioners.

Morgan and Saxton (1987: 68-82) observe that most importantly, the teacher's questions deal with the knowledge which the pupils bring to the drama context, and they also give an idea of learners' understanding, needs and feelings. Questions about rules, content, plot and action or questions helping to shape pupils' inner understanding are typical in the drama context, and while asking them, the teacher is 'weaving the fabric of learning'. The teacher-in-role strategy is particularly seen to offer a chance to create a 'zone of proximal development (Bolton 1992: 136), and the teacher's questions do this by challenging pupils' thinking.

In the drama lessons of my data, the teacher's questions are used to introduce or manage the activities, and they are employed for planning, organising, negotiating, challenging and arousing interest. In the two activities which form the primary data, questions have a central role: in the first one (the problem solving game), they are the teacher's means of running the game, and the second (the parliament of animals) engages both teacher and pupils in questioning. In the following extract from the third lesson, the teacher acts both as the porcupine and in the teacher's capacity in the problem-solving activity receiving proposals from pupils. The teacher responds to the suggested idea with a wh-question:

(4)

1	Asta	they should (.) do agreement (.)> you know<
2	T →	>what kind of agreement<
3	Asta	yes but everybody and who is squirrel's friend↑ (.) would take that
4		porcupine for <u>three</u> <u>days</u> and would give him a bed and food
5		so he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs, draws a circle in the air))

Here the teacher's follow-up question prompts the pupil to elaborate her proposal. Besides wh-questions, the teacher also uses challenging and probing yes/no-questions in the problem solving game, such as 'Do you really think that the porcupine would go?' In general, closed questions are not found as effective as open questions, but they may be used for checking or summarising (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 80), and with pupils who are not used to drama (O'Neill and Lambert 1982: 141). The analysis of my research data aims to pinpoint the functions of different types of questions and other means of negotiating understanding which the teacher uses during the drama process.

Asking questions and receiving answers in drama may also differ from an ordinary classroom situation. The teacher's eye contact, use of voice, paying attention to pupils' answers and to the atmosphere in general are part of questioning skills in drama. The question itself should be justified, have "reason, focus and curiosity", and be open to multiplicity of answers. (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 69-71) Whether it is done when teaching a foreign language or some other subject, ordinary classroom questioning differs from questions in the drama context quite naturally, i.e. in traditional classrooms, questions are asked about issues known to the teacher, but questions in the drama lesson deal with information and events which are often new to all participants, since they are created together. Thus, though the teacher shows professional interest in the pupils' answers in a language lesson, in the drama context, she is likely to receive their responses with a similar expectant or enthusiastic attitude as in any social context. The teacher's interest in drama may also rise from the common experience, working together in a playful context or in the challenge of coping with pupils' answers. In the analysis of this research, the role of prosody and the non-verbal features of talk in the teacher's questions are also observed when possible, especially in such instances when the teacher enacts her role figure, in order to see how they may influence the development of talk-in-interaction between teacher and pupils.

A recent pro gradu-thesis (Inha (2007) examines the way in which the process drama is carried out by the teacher in the primary school classes. One of the focuses of the research is a discussion which the teacher manages in role, (i.e. she uses the teacher-in-role technique), and the institutional and non-institutional features which can be found in the interaction between teacher and pupils. Through the findings of this CA-informed research, the interaction is seen to have features of traditional classrooms, such as the IRF-cycle and repair, but also the use of narrative and negotiation between teacher and pupils. Thus, Inha's interesting and thorough investigation and the present study cover some common ground. However, the overall focus of this research is on the participation and interaction of both teacher and pupils in the two drama contexts, whereas Inha's research focuses on the teacher's strategies in role and out of role in discussions and also pays attention to the effectiveness and success of the used strategies.

4.4.4 Pupil's roles

Taking a role is essential and central to drama, but it does not mean the same as having a role in a theatrical play. Drama roles are closer to participation roles in everyday social contexts (Bolton 1992: 2-5; Neelands 1984: 72), as discussed in Section 4.1. Suihko (1995: 143) points out that different social roles can be tried out and developed in the safety of the make-believe context, through which different areas of life can thus be experienced. According to McGregor at al (1991 as quoted by Suihko 1995: 145), participants also learn about other people through their own reactions in different situations on both symbolic and real levels, as well as when negotiating and making decisions as themselves, on the real level.

According to Neelands (1984: 84-85), participants entering a drama role should consider the disposition connected to this role which is within their experience. Thus, instead of presenting a particular person, participants should demonstrate a type of person, i.e. to display a particular attitude rather than a role character. Being in role in a drama situation involves feelings, but they should be evoked by the situation of the drama and be tied to the fictional reality and not be created on purpose. At the same time, Neelands (1984: 83) points out, the make-believe reality offers "psychological security" to participants, as the fictional context is removed in time and place from the actual situation, which allows children to explore issues and be protected by "the safe middle-ground of the fiction". In this way when stepping into the shoes of a lonely child or a homeless traveller, participants in drama are free to pass the responsibility of opinions and actions to their role figures inside the drama world which operates like the real one, but following its own rules while the drama proceeds. The participation framework (discussed in section 2.2) which is used in talk, is in constant movement when participants change their footing speaking at times in their actual classroom roles and then 'authoring' their role characters' words.

The nature of drama roles, which thus involves expressing the attitude of the role figure rather than acting out the role in the drama, seems significant in creating the drama context which is distanced from the actual reality but which echoes and resembles the real world. In the drama of the present research data, the teacher points out this way of adopting animal roles in her instructions to the group at the beginning of the lesson. Consequently, in the problem solving game, pupils make proposals as themselves, but express and adopt the squirrel's view and position against the ruthless porcupine. In the parliament of animals, participants appear in

animal roles, and have a chance to take their roles into account when questioning the two accused animals. It is up to the participants how much of their animal roles are displayed, and questioning as such can well be managed without reference to their role characters.

However, not all pupils' roles have the same status, but some pupils may have more central roles, as is the case with the two animal roles in the parliament of animals. Morgan and Saxton (1987: 30-35) have categorised student involvement in different types of roles, and the two lowest categories ('dramatic playing' and 'mantle of expert') involve students working as themselves, which is believed to be productive in activities which focus on the task. The third type of involvement, 'role playing', resembles Neelands's concept of being in role (1984: 85): participants deal with problems by expressing an attitude or point of view, but now they are in role identifying themselves as performers. The group of the present study participates in the two drama activities in both ways mentioned by Morgan and Saxton. The fourth category, 'characterization', means identifying with the character more deeply and more comprehensively, which should also involve expressing the character's inner thoughts and feelings more completely (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 30-35). However, Neelands (1984: 79) observes that even though the participants act in their 'assumed' roles, their 'actual' roles are also being tested, and emerging into a role is very seldom complete.

In the parliament of animals, which is a whole group role play, two pupils have the central roles of the squirrel and the porcupine and the rest of the group have minor animal roles, in which they appear as questioners in the parliament. Drama teachers are well advised to use strategies when giving roles, taking responsible roles themselves or suggesting certain types of behaviour to the group (Neelands 1984: 79). In the drama of the present study, one of the pupils volunteers to take the squirrel's role and later the teacher suggests the porcupine's role to another girl. Both the girls in the central roles can cope with their tasks, and while they are interrogated by other animals in the parliament, they also have a chance to characterise their role figures through talk and non-verbal means, which will also be focused on in the analysis.

All in all, taking in role in drama does not differ from acting and interacting in real life situations. Participants in drama work in role without planning the outcomes beforehand, and while they negotiate, pupils' thoughts, actions and feelings become the building material in the drama, which generates the spontaneous and immediate qualities of drama. (O'Neill and Lambert 1982: 139.) Further, joining in the drama is considered voluntary and participants

should feel that drama is about “a willing and conscious suspension of disbelief” (Neelands 1984: 84). Thus, participants’ own choice to initiate talk is similar to the practice of everyday talk, but participants in drama as well as interactants in a conversation may feel a social obligation or necessity to join in at least to some extent, if only with eye contact or shared laughter. But participation in a make-believe situation is likely to add other qualities, such as playfulness and a sense of mutual fun, to the interaction. The present study hopes to examine the way in which the participants make use of the fictional reality and their roles in the drama, and observe how this affects the talk-in- interaction which is created.

4.5 Using theatre elements and drama conventions

To become ‘dramatic art’, ‘dramatic playing’ needs to have an aesthetic dimension to it and a focus on the use of form and the drama which is derived from ‘real life’ (Bolton 1992: 18-20). As O’Neill and Lambert (1982: 137-138) observe, drama inherently involves tension which is built through confrontation and opposition under threat or pressure. Adding to the tension, drama involves elements of contrast, which create moments of surprise and unpredictability. A clear focus on the action is also necessary to be able to deal with the topic in question. The use of these and other elements of theatre form, such as metaphor, symbolic objects, time, space, role and ritual create images which hold meanings in drama (Neelands 1984: 65).

Drama practised in classrooms needs the same dramatic elements as theatre on stage, but without a ready-made script, it requires a method of organizing the drama process. This can be done with different drama conventions, which structure dramatic activity and provide the necessary theatre form through which meanings can be explored and communicated. Drama conventions are recognizable and conscious conventions of form, similar to the ones in other art forms, and the difference between a real-life experience and the experience of theatre is distinguished “by the conscious application of form to meaning in order to engage both the intellect and emotions in a representation of meaning”. (Neelands 1990: 3.) Thus, conventions represent the action in an expressive form to suit a particular stage in the drama process. Owens and Barber (1997: 22) define the use of conventions as a way of organizing “time, space and action to create meaning”, and this allows the group's participation in drama in an organized and creative way. Conventions are used to arouse interest, establish the content and advance the participants' commitment and engagement, and they can also be used to reflect

and evaluate the drama. Conventions do not only derive from the theatre, but also have their origins in literature, psychology, therapy and the arts.

Some of the drama conventions involve acting out in role, such as small group role play, whole group role play, teacher-in-role or hot seating. These conventions are used for the making of the drama, and as the most dramatic activities, they are the centre of action and interaction in drama. Other conventions are used to help engagement, like games at the beginning to slow down or highlight the action. Action may also be framed by a narrative or focussed on through a frozen image. A dramatic scene may be accompanied by sound tracking to create a particular atmosphere. (Owens & Barber 1997: 22 -28.) These conventions are also employed in the drama sessions of my research data, and the ones which are part of the analysable data will also be introduced in the chapters of analysis.

According to Neelands (1984: 63), participation in a whole group role play, i.e. working with the teacher-in-role, has the closest resemblance to a real experience in which participants have a chance for creative partnership. On the other hand, working in a whole group role play is thought to be the most demanding way of working in drama and is safest in the hands of an experienced teacher. A meeting as a drama mode, however, provides teacher and pupils with a convenient choice to try a whole group activity: pupils are more easily got into roles for this drama mode, and the roles themselves involve expressing opinions or viewpoints. In the parliament of animals of 'The Rains', the teacher acts as chairperson and the group carries out a well-defined task of questioning. In the present study, which involves a fairly inexperienced drama group using a foreign language for talk, this kind of drama context should offer enough challenge and support.

Finally, the names for conventions are a practical means to avoid long explanations, and when the pupils are taught the terms of the used conventions from the very beginning, they will be able to make decisions about form along with the content in drama (Owens & Barber 1997: 22). Neelands (1990: 3) points out it is through drama conventions that interactions, social codes and meanings are shaped and represented, and if participants apply these forms consciously, they may also understand something about the medium of theatre. The drama group in this research was also taught the terms and the use of conventions at the beginning of each drama session. The intention was to increase pupils' interest in drama as an artistic medium, but also to make classroom drama appear a 'serious' exercise and fitting for a

language class for its own sake. Further, the topics of the drama lessons might also have seemed childish to a sixth-form class, though the same drama lessons or projects can be carried out with participants from a wide age group.

4.6 Language uses and functions in drama

Language is considered the cornerstone of classroom drama. It is characteristically involved in role-play, in which the drama is realized through the speech of both teacher and pupils. In the same way as the teacher's various questions work as a tool in the drama lesson, the different drama contexts give a chance to use language for many functions and thus extend pupils' language skills. Language in a drama lesson is embedded in the context where both teacher and pupils can use it when organizing the context, for instance, to create a situation, regulate an activity, define the roles or bind the group together. (O'Neill and Lambert 1982:17-18) The fact that language is used as a resource in creating and maintaining the fictional context, makes drama a valuable tool for language learning whether it is the question of one's mother tongue or a foreign language. Neelands (1992: 16-19) points out the acknowledged merits of drama in education, i.e. drama provides a variety of talk contexts in which learning is situated in 'real life' situations, and in which pupils act as 'live' participants:

> Through working inside dramatic contexts as participants, young people can try out audiences, registers and respond to purposes which are clearly defined and bound to the context. They can respond to the context, and test out a wide range of points of view in a real way, but, without having to suffer the consequences of their actions as they would in life.
> (Neelands 1992: 19.)

Neelands 1992: 9) observes the connection between drama education and such approaches to language learning which see language as a central tool for human activity and development "as a tool for socialising, thinking, communicating, expressing emotions, forming ideas and action", and as a tool whose different functions can be developed and identified in the drama contexts. It is in this central aspect of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory that educational drama and learning a foreign language have the same goals, i.e. a person's overall development and language learning takes place through participation and interaction in a social context.

Depending on the task, convention and the stage in the drama, language is put into a variety of uses within a drama lesson. Besides the teacher's talk, such as instructions or managing the drama, describing real and imaginary past experiences, instructing and explaining, reasoning, convincing and persuading as well as planning, predicting and deciding are considered central language functions which pupils can practise in the drama process (O'Neill and Lambert 1982: 19). In the following example, a pupil reasons her opinion and makes a moral statement. This occurs after the questioning of the two animals in the parliament of animals when the pupils are asked to consider the matter of punishing the animals for their behaviour:

(5)

1	Asta	if the squirrel will get a punishment too (.) he never will help
2		anyone again (.) because he tried to help but now he is getting
3		a punishment from for that (1.0) and it's not right

The argument against punishing the squirrel sounds convincing: the squirrel should not be punished, because she has tried to help the porcupine. The reasoning is followed by a final comment which has a moral point, i.e. it is not fair to make such a decision (line 3). Since drama in education involves problems of everyday life and also difficult issues, such as prejudices or homelessness, participants are given a chance to ponder on these matters in earnest, which is also visible in this short extract.

Thus, the construction of fictional contexts in drama requires language as a resource which has several functions, such as organising the activity, displaying roles or communicating feelings. These contexts offer participants ample opportunities to develop their language skills in very concrete situations which are embedded in a bigger drama context. The same opportunities are also available for foreign language learners, for whom a drama context which is built, sustained and developed through talk, in role and out of role, creates a different learning environment from separate language activities even though they involved a use of role characters. Viewed from the Vygotskian socio-cultural perspective, which has been taken in the present study, learning a foreign language can best be achieved through its use in different contexts and for different functions. The description and analysis of the data hopes to shed some light on the way in which language is used for organising these drama activities, and ultimately on the nature of a fictional drama context as learning environments for foreign language learning.

5 THE PRESENT STUDY

This research is a case study which examines and analyses the characteristics of interaction in two drama activities in a sixth form English class. Educational drama that is used here is viewed as a means of providing an opportunity for interaction for second language learners with their teacher, whose participation in two drama activities forms the material for the research. The two activities under study are part of a whole-lesson drama context which consists of several drama activities and which involves play as its natural ingredient. Both activities also have their individual patterns in which the interaction may occasionally resemble practices of some institutional contexts or everyday conversation. However, the interaction in the drama contexts is shaped by the overall institutional classroom context, sometimes more and sometimes less, defining it as a classroom variety of institutional talk.

A drama session, like any English lesson, is managed by the teacher, and pupils are likely to orient to it as part of their English studies. When 'doing drama', participants create their own context within the drama frame, which is thus built through talk in collaboration with others. Compared with a traditional teacher-centred language class, drama requires other types of participation and contribution from both teacher and pupils involving a readiness to redefine the teacher-pupil roles. Participants also have to be willing to 'play the game' by acting and interacting in a fictional context as well as regard interaction as an essential part of language learning, which can be practised in many kinds of learning environments. In the following, I will present the research questions, the data of this research, outline the theoretical and methodological approach taken in the present study and explain the nature and organisation of the three chapters of analysis concerning the two drama activities.

5.1 Research questions

My study aims to answer the following research questions, the first three of which are connected to each other: First, how do the participants organise their talk in the two activities and what institutional and non-institutional features can be found in them? Second, what access do the pupils have to talk individually or collectively as regards the type of activity and the turn taking system which is used? Third, what kind of action sequences are built in the drama activities? Accordingly, to answer these research questions, the present study seeks to look into the way in which the interaction is carried out between teacher and pupils and

between pupils without the teacher, viz. the way in which the turns are taken and constructed and how the interaction is sequenced in both drama activities under study. The fourth complementing research question deals with the fictional reality in the drama context and runs: What is the role of the fictional context in the interaction between the participants in drama? This also involves a question about the ways in which the participants make the imaginary context visible in interaction, i.e. how they talk the drama into being.

All in all, the study of the interaction in the two drama activities hopes to give an insight to those patterns of interaction, i.e. those language games, which the participants adopt for both activities when they act and interact in a fictional setting.

5.2 Description of data: participants and setting

In this section, I will first tell about the participants and the arrangements for carrying out the drama lessons for the data. Next, the three drama lessons which work as a background context for the primary data of the two drama activities will be introduced, i.e. I will briefly take up the themes and structure of the first two lessons, and in more detail sum up the contents of the third lesson of which the primary data are part.

5.2.1 Participants and setting

The data of altogether three drama lessons come from a class of first year pupils in a Finnish rural sixth form college, where the class with their teacher were willing to try drama in their English lessons. The first-year pupils were 16 to 17 years of age, and their attendance to the lessons varied between 16 to19 pupils, so that 19 pupils were present in the third lesson where the primary data are taken from. The lessons were held during their third English course, and the group had studied the two previous courses of English with the same teacher who acted as the teacher of these drama lessons. The class had started their English studies in primary school at the age of nine. The lessons were video-recorded with one camera and the first and the third lessons were also audio-recorded. Since there was only one camera available, this meant that the speakers' expressions or gestures were not always visible on the tape, unfortunately. The group's Finnish teacher and I observed the lessons writing down general impressions, but were not equipped with any scheduled observation sheets. The drama lessons

were held in a classroom with a large floor space where the group could sit in a circle or assemble in groups or pairs when need be.

The English teacher who held the three drama lessons was young and recently qualified without any earlier experience in classroom drama, but interested to try it out in her English lessons. I had become familiar with classroom drama at Chester College, where I had had a chance to attend drama lectures and sessions at the college as well as to follow drama lessons in three different schools. With the help of the drama pretexts (i.e. plans for the lessons) and exercises as well as the similar lessons held by myself, the English teacher was prepared to carry out the drama lessons on her own.

The classroom drama was introduced to the group as a chance to ‘do drama in English’ in the three lessons, which would also be recorded for research. Each lesson began with the teacher’s brief introduction of the drama conventions that would be used during the lesson. This was meant to give information on dramatic expression and help the group to orient to the drama as a worthwhile activity and not treat it as a game too childish for 16- to 17-year-old young people. Wordlists of new vocabulary were also provided for each drama session, which were held in the group’s successive English lessons. The pupils were also asked to keep a diary on their drama experience after each lesson and record what they had considered the most significant moment in them. Later, they wrote an essay at home in English, for which they were also asked to use their notes. This was to be part of their course writing assignments, and I collected the copies of the essays to get some idea of the participants' drama experience. Moreover, about half of the pupils in the group volunteered to watch part of the recorded lessons in groups of three and comment on their own participation. The teacher's experience was also mapped in the same way. This 'stimulated recall' method informed about the participants' feelings and thoughts immediately after the sessions.

Collecting the pupils’ comments about their drama experience worked as a back-up system to make sure that there would be enough material to work on, since I did not have a working research plan yet. As it turned out, after the approach and the focus of the research were found, this information did not seem necessary to complement the data, i.e. the recorded interaction in a drama context. As regards the amount of the data in the present research, three drama lessons seemed to be the number of lessons that could be conveniently reserved for the drama practise from the English course plan. The drama lessons were placed on successive

days with a supposition that in this way, the pupils would sooner get used to ‘doing drama’ and overcome potential shyness. Further, the first lesson comprised small drama activities, whereas the second and the third lessons each dealt with one topic and theme, so the group, as beginners, was introduced to drama work gradually. The primary data of two drama activities were selected from the activities in the third drama lesson in which the pupils were likely to feel even more at ease and relaxed than earlier. The main criterion for the choice of the two activities in question, however, was the fact that both involved roles and questioning, but used different turn exchange systems and participation frameworks.

I hope that the observations and findings which are rendered through the analysis of the two drama activities are keen and versatile enough, despite what may seem a small amount of the data, and will justify their use. Seedhouse (2004: 88) points out about the adequacy of the research data that since conversation analysis uses a qualitative and emic paradigm in the study of interaction, the quality of the analysis rather than the size of the data is related to the validity of the research.

5.2.2 Three drama lessons

This section will briefly introduce the three drama lessons which made the group’s entire ‘drama experience. The lessons are treated as ‘background data’ in the sense that they initiated the group into classroom drama. The third lesson also forms the drama context for the primary data, and it is constantly used as a contextual resource in talk-in-interaction.

The first drama session consisted of activities (i.e. drama conventions) which introduced the pupils into drama work: a warm-up activity involving movement, story-telling in pairs and groups of four to establish confidentiality, portraying events in freeze frames for the group, putting up a kitchen through miming, and interviewing inanimate objects, i.e. ‘hot seating’. Some of these activities were connected to each other, and the structure for the first lesson was adopted from a drama class in Chester. At the beginning of the lesson, the teacher introduced the drama activities, i.e. drama conventions, which would be used that day in class.

The second drama was built on the theme of friendship. ‘My friend Whale’ (a drama pretext used as drama practice at Chester) was based on a children’s story about losing a friend, the

themes of which were developed with different drama conventions. The lesson consisted of a warm up-exercise, a discussion about the characteristics of a friend, sound tracking (sounds and voices used to support action), a pupil acting in role and an improvisation of a scene in groups. The improvisations were also presented to the whole group. The drama on the theme of friendship ended with a brief activity in which pupils expressed sympathy to the boy.

The third drama called 'The Rains' formed the drama context for the two activities which became the data of the present research. This drama pretext was taken from Dramaworks by Owens and Barber (1997), and was slightly adapted for the purpose of a foreign language class. Those activities which seemed to require more experienced drama skills or courage to participate were modified, e.g. pair work was added to give a chance to plan together. The main topics of the drama pretext were fairness and oppression which were dealt with through different activities, i.e. by using drama conventions. The teacher introduced the drama in several successive stages: first, she explained the new concepts of 'dilemma' and 'allegory' in collaboration with the group and informed that animal roles would be adopted. Next, she gave a wordlist of new vocabulary for the drama with names of different animals, read it through and had the class repeat the words. Then the pupils picked a name that started with the same letter as their own names, and gave them to the teacher who walked round the circle and listened to them (e.g. Asta the Ant). Movement was also involved in this phase so that pupils were asked to stand at the point when they were picking out a name for themselves and sit down when they had found one. The introduction ended with the teacher's instruction about the use of the animal roles, i.e. they would be needed later on, but they would not involve acting out, but a focus would be on the attitude that the animal figure expressed.

The next phase in the drama began with the teacher telling an African story of a considerable length about the squirrel and the porcupine. The story ended at the point where the squirrel was faced with serious trouble because of the rude porcupine, and this difficult situation became the problem to be dealt with in the problem solving activity, which is the first activity of the data. (The story will be told in more detail in the analytic chapter.) The pupils were advised to find ways of solving the squirrel's problem, first in pairs, and then making suggestions to the porcupine, whose role was taken by the teacher. The problem solving activity developed into a game between the two sides, in which the pupils' proposals were always questioned by the teacher in one way or another according to the drama plan. When finally the teacher accepted a proposal, it was acted out: with this group the squirrel tickled

the porcupine who fell from the tree into the river. Next, the group voted for the porcupine's fate and it turned out that the porcupine survived.

The following activity was the whole group role play in the form of the parliament of animals, which gathered to interrogate the squirrel about his deed. This questioning phase in the parliament was chosen as the second drama activity for the data of the present study. It involved all the participants in roles, i.e. the teacher as the king of the forest, two pupils in the roles of the squirrel and the porcupine and the other participants in their animal roles. The questioning started with the squirrel, after which the search party found the porcupine, who was also questioned. Then the group decided which animal should be punished: with this group the compromise was suggested by the teacher and both the animals were found guilty and ordered for community work. The drama session had a brief evaluative or reflective ending in which each participant had a chance to say something to one of the main characters, i.e. the king, the squirrel or the porcupine.

In brief, the focus of the research is on two different drama activities as the primary data which involve a fictional reality. Both the activities offer their characteristic language games for participants to learn and play and require different kinds of participation from them. I hope that the description and analysis of these two activities will be able to draw a clear and truthful picture of each particular type of interaction in a fictional context. The use of questions in the drama process is at the core of the research, as questions are the means which help the group to find their own answers and solutions, i.e. to make sense of the drama. In addition, the whole lesson which the two activities are taken from forms a necessary part of the research while it provides the overall context for the activities, which is made use of in the discourse of the drama. The two other preceding drama lessons also have a function as an introduction to the ways of working in drama. Before presenting the primary data, the next section states the methodology and the analytic approach of the present research.

5.3 Methodology and the analytic approach

The data used in the present study are qualitative in character, giving a viewer a glimpse of one type of English language classroom, "a slice of the world that is being examined" presenting a great number of complex phenomena, only part of which can be focused on within one study. The data which have been collected without any outside interference can

thus appear as an illustrative extract of the world which it belongs to, but cannot describe the whole world. (Alasuutari 1999: 74-78.) The present research is carried out as a case study, which looks into the interaction of a single group in a fictional foreign language learning context focusing the detailed analysis and description on two drama activities as the primary data. As a case study, this research studies the phenomena in context observing the characteristics of a single unit trying to give a detailed picture of what is going on in a particular setting, i.e. how this particular group acts and interacts in a drama context. The starting point for the research is thus the data and not a theory of language learning, i.e. the research begins with the questions and not a hypothesis (Nunan 1992: 56, 77).

The analysis of the present study draws mainly on conversation analysis as a methodological tool, but the analytic framework also involves elements from other approaches to the study of interaction, i.e. Linell's (1998) theoretical approach of dialogism, the concept of activity types by Levinson (1992), the participation framework by Goffman (1974) and theoretical and practical insights of second language learning by van Lier (1988, 2000, 2001), Edwards and Westgate (1994) and Seedhouse (2004). With the help of the analytical framework, this research aims to show how participants act and interact in the two drama activities, how they orient to the situations in question and what interactional patterns emerge. The analysis and description of the interaction in the activities also involves looking into the way in which the dramatic discourse is carried out, i.e. how topics are created, recontextualised and organised, and roles constructed and sustained in different participation frameworks.

The present study includes the transcripts of the primary data (Appendix 2) to give a comprehensive picture of the context which the transcribed passages are part of. The interaction which is described and analysed is, first and foremost, accessible to the reader in the chapters of analysis. According to Seedhouse (2004: 255), the validity of the analysis can be tested by the reader's own analysis, and the presented analysis of the data is thus made "repeatable and replicable". As regards the internal validity of CA informed work, Seedhouse (2004:255) points out that it is guaranteed by the development of the emic perspective, i.e. the participants' perspective, since "the participants document their social actions to each other in the details of the interaction by normative reference to the interactional organization". The external validity about the generalisability of the findings may also be met, since the institutional discourse is often analysed simultaneously on the micro and macro levels. Moreover, the research findings can also be seen ecologically valid and applicable to

everyday life, i.e. naturally occurring talk is used as data for the analysis. Finally, conversation analysis reveals the interactant's construct in his orientation to the organisation during interaction, not the linguist's construct, which meets the requirements of construct validity in CA studies. (Seedhouse 2004: 254-257.)

The present study is located within the theoretical framework of such second language learning theories which regard interaction in a social context as the site of language learning, and which use the interaction-based approach in research. For my research, which looks into participation in a drama context, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory seems the most natural perspective, since Vygotsky's concepts have also greatly influenced the theoretical views of classroom drama. In the discussion, I will view the findings of the present study from the Vygotskian perspective.

5.4 Case study: two drama activities

For the present study, I have chosen two different kinds of drama activities from the three drama lessons held with the sixth form group. The main criterion for their choice is that they both involve as many participants in talk as possible, viz. that all the pupils have access to talk whether they decide to make use of it or not. The second factor relevant to the choice is that both activities can be recognised as imaginary contexts at least partly, i.e. one or more participants appear in imaginary roles, which adds an element of play into the activity. This allows the examination of the fourth research question about the role of the fictional context in the interaction between the participants in drama.

Further, both the drama activities under study involve negotiation in which participants use question-answer adjacency pairs as the main type of interaction. The first activity is a problem-solving game in which pupils make proposals to solve the problem and the teacher's responses mainly consist of different types of questions concerning these proposals. In the second drama activity, the pupils have the questioner's role in the parliament of animals where two pupils are being questioned or interrogated. This activity also has more varied participation roles for teacher and pupils than the first problem solving game, in which the teacher has more power as the organiser of talk, even though she appears in role. The different interactional patterns in the two drama activities also make it interesting to make comparisons between the types of emerging talk. By using conversation analysis as a research method, I

will look into the turn taking of the participants as an instrument through which the organisation of the discourse is carried out. The use of different types of questions and other means of negotiation, such as formulations and partial repeats, will be examined as important tools for negotiation in both the activities, and the varying participation roles will be focused on in the second activity. This will address the research questions concerning the organisation of talk, pupils' access to it and the action sequences which are built.

A drama lesson consists of a selection of drama activities, i.e. drama conventions, which structure "a dramatic encounter, through the use of space, action and time, to create meaning" (Owens and Barber 1997: 11). In this research, the term 'drama activity' is used instead of 'drama convention', because in a foreign language class, drama activities serve the purpose of speech activities and are not, first and foremost, used to teach expressive drama skills, though these may also develop in the process. Consequently, the focus of the research is on the interactional features which become visible in these activities and on the kind of context that the imaginary activities involving play creates for the participants in a language class. Moreover, it seems convenient to talk about drama activities, since these activities can be seen as particular communicative activity types, which according to Levinson (1992), have special goals, presuppose particular orientation and participation and require participants' inference about the nature of the activity as well as their cooperation.

Different activity types require playing different 'language games, the rules of which are learned in interaction (Levinson 1992). Similarly, participants in drama learn the rules of each activity, sometimes helped by the teacher's instructions, but essentially by doing the activities. They act like players in some sports game, some skilled and eager, others adopting a quieter position in the sidelines. In one way or another, the rules for their game in the drama differ from the ones that are followed in an ordinary language class, but whether the participants will always rely on the 'new rules' or the familiar institutional patterns of interaction, is also an interesting point for observation.

In the next two chapters of analysis and description, I will look at the participation of teacher and pupils in the research data, i.e. how the 'language games' are played in the two fictional contexts. Chapter 6 examines the interaction and participation in the problem solving activity whose structure is closer to the structure of a traditional lesson, in which the talk is mostly between teacher and pupil and not between two or more pupils. Chapter 7 looks into

questioning in the whole group role play in which the teacher's role is less dominant and there is thus more symmetry between teacher and pupils than in the previous problem solving game. As an introduction to the two activities, both chapters of analysis will begin with information on the activity in question and on the type of interaction that it requires. Chapter 6 will also include some background information on the whole drama lesson where the two activities occur as well as the main points of the African story, which leads the participants to the drama. This is to make the following of the interaction easier and to place the activity into its context. As I present the drama activity in question stating its goal and purpose, it reveals the agenda of the activity from the point of view of drama in education. With the analysis itself, I hope to show how the agendas of the activities are carried through, that is, how the participants act and interact in the fictional contexts and talk the activities into being.

6 COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

In Chapter 6, I will look at the ways in which the teacher and pupils participate in the first of the two activities, the problem solving activity, and focus on the participants' organisation of talk through proposal sequences until the task is brought to a satisfactory end. The teacher who leads the group's participation in the drama game employs a number of devices while responding to pupils' proposals or keeping the activity going, such as questioning and turn allocation. I view this activity primarily as an act of mutual collaboration between teacher and pupils due to the type of interaction which is carried out in the game, viz. making proposals and negotiating about them. Though teacher and pupils represent two opposing sides in the game, the teacher's side and the pupils' side negotiate collaboratively towards the common goal to find the solution. This is achieved through the pupils' proposals and the teacher's responses to them following the rules of this particular drama activity.

The group's adoption of the rules here is similar to Wittgenstein's concept of 'language games' whose tacit rules are learnt in interaction, and which offer guidance to interactants. In class pupils learn the rules of different activities through practice without any instruction. The rules only make sense against the background of the goal pursued in the activity, and following them requires cooperation between teacher and pupils. (Levinson 1992: 89-93.) In the same way, the pupils in the drama activity learn to presume what the teacher expects them to do, i.e. to make proposals and find arguments, which, in order to work out, requires cooperation. Moreover, the pupils' side in the drama game can be seen to work collaboratively at times while initiating ideas and responding together. Finally, the problem solving activity has basically an institutional nature as regards the participation and turn taking. The teacher leads the activity towards the set goal mainly through question-answer sequences between teacher and pupils, which may also involve typical classroom behaviour, such as bidding to answer and nomination. However, there is another, non-institutional orientation visible in the game: both the teacher in her use of role and the pupils in their collaboration in dealing with the proposals find their tools for interaction in everyday talk. In this way, there is a continuing interplay between institutional and non-institutional interaction in the unfolding talk of the drama activity.

My aim in this chapter is to analyse and describe how the teacher and pupils participate and work collaboratively to find the solution to the problem. The first part of the analysis looks

into the ways in which the teacher manages the drama activity by eliciting talk and by responding to the pupils' proposals with questions, formulations and repair. The second part of the analysis deals with the pupils' collaborative participation, i.e. how they initiate proposals and respond to the teacher's turns individually or as a team and participate through shared laughter. The analysis and description also aim to show and depict the varying and interchanging institutional and non-institutional orientation of the participants. The chapter begins with two sections which give some background information on the activity: The first section outlines the nature of the problem solving activity as a drama exercise and describes the way in which it is carried out in the lesson of this data. The story on which the problem solving is based will also be introduced here. The second section discusses proposals in everyday talk, compares them with the proposal sequences which comprise the interactional pattern of the activity, and introduces the main proposal types in the drama activity.

6.1 Problem solving activity in the drama

Problem solving between the teacher and pupils activates pupils to use their imagination as well as to reason and negotiate. Since it involves two parties, i.e. teacher and pupils, this activity has a game-like quality about it: the pupils on one side offer suggestions to the teacher who, as the opponent, finds ways not to accept the proposals and responds to them accordingly. The activity ends when one proposal finally becomes accepted, a satisfactory solution to the problem is thus found and the drama can move on. In this way, problem solving affects the plot of the whole drama story and by making their proposals, pupils can have an active role in the developments of the drama.

The problem solving activity is part of the drama called 'The Rains', which is the third and last drama of my data. 'The Rains' is a drama pretext from Dramaworks by Owens and Barber, and as such it provides a teacher with a complete work plan for a drama lesson: a "text that allows groups to quickly engage in drama and then create their own quality drama within and from that liberating structure" (Owens & Barber 1997: 4). In 'The Rains', an African dilemma story leads the group into the drama. The teacher tells the class, all sitting in a circle on the floor, a lengthy narration about a squirrel and a porcupine and finishes the story at the point where the main character is facing a serious problem. I will now briefly sum up the main events of the African story, which gives the starting point for the classroom drama and creates the imaginary context for the participants.

> In an African rainforest the rainy season is about to begin again and a little squirrel is rightly pleased having well prepared for it: he has gathered enough food to take him through the rainy season and he has managed to make his home big enough for him. When the rain is pouring down and the path is turning into a torrent, he offers help to the drowning animal that he sees in the river. It turns out to be a huge porcupine. Since it is the custom of the country to welcome visitors for three days and three nights and offer hospitality, the squirrel puts up with the inconvenience that the porcupine is causing him by sleeping in his bed and pricking him with his quills whenever he turns. More alarmingly, the squirrel's food supplies are getting shorter by the day and after three days and three nights the squirrel asks his guest to leave his home, because otherwise neither of them will survive the rainy season. The porcupine protests rudely to the timid squirrel suggesting that it is heartless that he should go out into the rain and to his death. The porcupine refuses to leave and the narration ends with this dilemma. The porcupine's last words become the punch line of the whole story: 'I don't have a problem. You do!' (Owens & Barber 1997: 100-103)

Drama involves conflict, and the story in The Rains' sets the scene for the drama to begin. It is now the group's task to solve the little squirrel's problem and find a way to get rid of the porcupine: the teacher adopts the role of the porcupine and the group starts making suggestions to their ruthless opponent. The purpose is to have as many proposals made as possible, which the teacher will prove unacceptable with a suitable argument until she finally accepts one idea.

On the whole, the group of my data carried out the problem solving activity following the general guidelines that had been drawn for 'The Rains' in Dramaworks (Owens and Barber 1997). Some changes for the lesson, however, were made to help the pupils who were new to the use of drama in class, such as giving them a chance to collect ideas for proposals in pairs. Another change to the original problem solving activity was made about the presentation of the proposed idea: instead of acting out every suggestion in the role of the squirrel, the pupils made their proposals verbally. Only the last proposal that was to be accepted as the solution to the problem was first acted out, and so the squirrel tickled the porcupine who fell into the river.

In the following, I will show how the teacher leads the group to the problem solving activity after finishing the story in which the squirrel is left with the problem: the porcupine refuses to leave the squirrel’s home. The teacher shifts from the storytelling to a preparation phase, in which the pupils plan in pairs. She starts by creating the drama context and then introduces the pair work as a separate task in a straightforward manner:

(1)
1 T and this is where the story ends (2.0)
2 and I will take the role of porcupine.
3 so this is little squirrel's home >like this< ((gestures and gazes down))
4 and (.) you will have to take a partner and
5 think of ways in which (.) little squirrel could solve the problem.
6 >ok take a partner<

The teacher informs the class that the story will not go on any further and after a pause states her future role as the porcupine (line 2). Next she creates the physical scene for the drama by showing with a gesture and with her downward gaze the place where the drama will occur (line 3). It happens almost as a side comment, after which the teacher instructs the class to work in pairs (lines 4-5). She finishes off with a directive which works like an exit device from the instruction phase into the action itself (line 6). The pupils settle down to work still sitting on the floor. Some pupils need clarification about the task and the teacher answers them in English. This preparatory phase lasts about four minutes, after which the teacher calls the pupils back to the circle and begins the activity in the role of the porcupine. The opening sequence with which the teacher launches the problem solving will be shown and analysed in Section 6.3.

6.2 Proposal sequences as interaction units in problem solving

The interactional pattern of the problem solving activity consists solely of proposal sequences in which teacher and pupils negotiate about the given proposals. Unlike proposals often in everyday talk, these suggestions are not accepted after they have been talked over between the two sides, but every negotiation ends with some kind of non-acceptance of the suggested idea, which, again, leads to the initiation of the next proposal. This chain of proposal sequences comes to an end when a proposal is finally accepted and the problem is solved. In this section, I will first discuss the characteristics of proposals in everyday conversation using examples of proposals in telephone conversations (Houtkoop 1987), and compare these with the construction of proposals in the drama activity. This will be followed by the introduction of the main types of proposal sequences in my data.

Houtkoop (1987: 1-3) points out that proposals can be seen to cover a range of actions that are expressed to a co-speaker, such as invitations, requests or offers. With the response, i.e. acceptance or rejection, they are seen as conversational actions which interactants produce

collaboratively and interactionally in order to make a social arrangement. These proposal sequences can be further considered 'conversation units' with opening and closing, which are not part of the surrounding talk. Conversation analysis usually treats proposal sequences as adjacency pairs, in which the proposal makes the first pair-part and the acceptance or the rejection appears as the second pair-part. These, however, may also be interpreted as, or often turn out to be, 'adjacency triplets', i.e. three-part structures, in which the third part is produced by the first speaker as an assessment, acknowledgement or appreciation to the second speaker's response. As Houtkoop (1987: 38-50) notes, the initial speaker in a proposal sequence is normatively oriented to expressing his view on the recipient's response, which is similar to the common use of three-part sequences in institutional interaction, such as classroom talk. An offer or a proposal is put forward in the following example (Houtkoop 1987: 48):

(2)
1 A. Should I get her for you?
2 C. Ja:, if uh (.) if possible, ja.=
3 A. =Okay.
((A calls her))

In this example, the initial speaker acknowledges the recipient's response with an 'okay'-receipt, which Heritage (1984) (as quoted by Houtkoop 1987: 46) calls a 'sequence exit device'. It also appears generally with other sequences, such as question-answer adjacency pairs or proposal-acceptance sequences (Houtkoop 1987: 46). An 'adjacency triplet' is not, however, the general form of proposals in the problem solving activity, since the teacher’s intention is to negotiate and not to accept the suggested proposal. In fact, it appears only once at the end of the game as part of the closing procedures when the teacher suggests that the proposed solution should be tried out:

(3)
159 T but if we are thinking of porcupine's nature and character (1.0)
160 I'm a ↑little bit (x) shall we ↑try it?
161 Ella yes
162 Olli n[o
163 T [ok

Teacher and pupils have exchanged opinions on the proposal which the teacher has found a promising solution (not shown here), and the game is about to finish with the actual acting out of the situation, in which the squirrel gets the porcupine out of his house, by tickling, as it is decided. The teacher makes a proposal to the class and gets responses form Ella, the initiator of the accepted idea, and from Olli. The teacher uses an 'Okay'-token as a 'sequence exit

device' which closes the proposal sequence. She may not hear Olli's negative response or may decide not to attend to it with her turn overlapping with most of his turn (lines 162-163).

Not all proposals in everyday talk, however, are negotiated and carried out immediately, and in the case of particular types of proposals which do not require immediate action, the exchange of talk between the speakers may be extended to a five-part proposal sequence, as the next example shows (Houtkoop 1987: 1-4) :

(4)
1 S. But come over here,
2 so we can all talk
3 about it in peace.=
4 R. =Fine.
5 S. Yah?=
6 R. =I'll be there in
7 a minute.=
8 S. =O:kay.

The proposal is followed by an acceptance 'Fine' (line 4), for which the initial speaker seeks confirmation (line 5). The recipient confirms his previous acceptance (lines 6-7) and the initial speaker "closes the collaborative action" with an 'Okay'-receipt (Houtkoop 1987: 2). This five-part proposal sequence is closer in form to the sequences in the drama activity, since it involves a negotiation between the speakers and the exchange of more than three turns. In the problem solving activity the negotiation takes place in sequences which vary from four-part sequences (two adjacency pairs) to 17-part sequences. However, all the drama sequences are constructed in a particular way, in which the recipient of the proposal first responds to the suggestion with a question or a comment, with which she may, for instance, seek more information about the suggestion. This begins a negotiation which usually takes several exchanges of turns, and which invariably results in the non-acceptance of the proposal.

The teacher's questions as responses to pupils' proposals are one of the characteristic features of the proposal sequences in the drama activity. In this, the sequences resemble more closely those everyday proposal sequences in which the recipient of the proposal responds to the suggestion with a question. In such a case, the recipient usually needs more information to be able to accept the proposal, as in the following example (Houtkoop 1987: 102):

(5)
1 F. Hey, will you be coming too?
2 M. Where?
3 F. Here?

4 M. Oh that's alright.

Here the recipient of the proposal asks a clarifying question (line 2), and it is only after the initial speaker's response that he or she is able to answer the original question: 'Oh that's alright'. In the next example from the problem solving activity, the teacher's response to the pupil's suggestion at the beginning of a proposal sequence has a similar function, i.e. to find out more about the proposal:

(6)

86	T	Asta
87	Asta	they should do (.) agreement (.) >you know<
88	T →	>what kind of agreement<
89	Asta	yes but everybodys who is squirrel's friend↑ (.) would ((gestures with hands))
90		take that porcupine for three days and would give him
91		a bed and food and he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs, draws a circle))

In this passage, Asta outlines her proposal in a very general way, and the teacher has to ask a clarifying question to be able to accept or reject the suggested idea (line 88).

In this way, the interaction in the proposal sequences often resembles a negotiation about a topic. I have used the term 'negotiation' to refer to the proposal sequences between teacher and pupils, and understand it as a broad term simply as a talk about a shared topic. Thus, 'negotiation' refers to the process that takes place for a while after each proposal, usually only for a few turns, and the result is not a mutual consent. The tone of the talk remains playful, often resulted by laughter, and the two parties, i.e. teacher and pupils, clearly treat the interaction as a shared game, rather than as a forum of an argument between two opposing sides. Some topics create more talk and negotiation than others, and the length of the sequences varies. The construction of the sequences does not follow the same pattern either, which will be discussed next.

In this problem solving game, the pupils make ten different suggestions for getting rid of the porcupine, and thus the game consists of ten proposal sequences (or proposal units), some of which are elicited by the teacher, while in other instances a pupil or pupils initiate a proposal after the closing of the sequence or bid to make a proposal. In the four cases where the teacher elicits the proposals, she reminds the group about their task by asking them a question, e.g. 'How would Little Squirrel make the porcupine get out of the house?' These questions are

institutional in character, and the teacher asks them in her teacher's role as the organiser of the activity.

In the four proposals which the teacher elicits during the activity, she uses slightly varying questions which still have the same overall function, that is, to keep the group focused and the game going. In the next example of teacher-elicited proposals, the teacher's elicitation occurs after a lengthy negotiation about a proposal, and it seems to signal that it is time to move on. The elicitation in this case rejects the previous proposal and initiates a new proposal sequence at the same time:

(7)
113 Ella now I (.) d don't th(h)ink he would go (.) but I think (xx)=
114 T =but if [he says that] **I'm not going anywhere** (.)
115 T → what would you do then (.) if you were those little squirrels
116 Tea well [this
117 Ps [(xxx)
118 T [shut the door and (.) >Tea<
119 Tea ok this l(h)ittle sq(h)uirrel (1.0) err have to has a ↑k(n)ife bec(h)ause [(.)

The teacher's response is latched to Ella's turn, which is a response to the teacher's question about the previous proposal (line 113). The teacher rejects the suggestion, marking it with ‘but’, and acts out the porcupine's refusal to leave the squirrel's home (line 114). Then she addresses the group by reformulating the basic question (line 115): what can the little squirrel do to get rid of the porcupine. In line 118, Tea is nominated as the next speaker. The teacher has here used a familiar classroom practice by deciding when and what to ask and nominating the next speaker.

In the six remaining sequences, pupils' proposals are not elicited by the teacher, but the instigation for a new proposal comes from the pupils as follows: In four instances, a pupil or pupils initiate a proposal when they see or interpret that the previous sequence has closed or is about to close. On the other two occasions, a pupil bids to answer and the teacher nominates her before she initiates her proposal. The sequence in which the proposal is initiated by a pupil without the teacher's elicitation may consist of several exchanges of turns as well as involve conjoined participation, as the following passage from such a proposal sequence shows. Here the pupil's initiation of a proposal occurs at the point when the teacher is responding to a pupil's turn in the previous sequence:

(8)

100	T	it's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally
101	Ella →	[(x) act(h)ually a ship
102	Ps	[((some excited talk))
103	T	(£)a ship
104	Ella	yes=
105	T	£=who's going to build the ship
106	Ella	£ the ↑squirrel
107	Ps	((laughter))
108	Anu	and all (1.0) her (.) or his friends (1.0)

Ella seems to interpret that the previous sequence is coming to an end, and she interrupts the teacher's turn with her new proposal in line 101 (part of which is inaudible). The teacher's response (partial repeat), which is uttered with a tinge of smile, is confirmed by Ella's one-word affirmative (line 104), after which the teacher initiates a follow-up question about the ship. Ella responds (line 106) and after the group's laughing response, Anu joins in and continues Ella's idea (line 108). The talk in the sequence is built together in much the same way as ordinary conversationalists would do, negotiating about the topic through questions and answers and joining in the talk. The participants in this sequence, as elsewhere, use and adapt the practices of everyday conversation to the institutional organisation of the talk.

In the proposal sequences of the problem solving activity, pupils' suggestions are never really accepted (until the very end), but the teacher as the recipient of proposals does not explain them away immediately or turn them down with a blunt argument. Instead she responds to pupils' proposals either with a further question or some other argumentative response, which invites an answer in its turn. All these questions and arguments invariably have an in-built, non-accepting purpose, and they are the necessary moves of the game which challenge participants' thinking and require their responses. The teacher works as the director of the activity: Firstly, she supervises and keeps the game going by eliciting pupils' proposals through questions. Secondly, she runs the negotiation by non-accepting pupils' proposals through further questions, challenging enquiries, formulations and repair. Thus, the interactional pattern of the drama activity consists of a chain of proposals which all involve negotiation between teacher and pupils, and the teacher manages this chain by employing particular methods, i.e. elicitation and non-acceptance of proposals. The participants of the activity yield to the rules of the interactional game and build the talk-in-interaction in collaboration. The next two sections will deal with the ways in which the teacher maintains the interactional chain by eliciting proposals and by not accepting pupils' proposals.

6.3 Teacher's elicitation of proposals

The teacher elicits pupils to make proposals four times during the problem solving activity. While she adopts her drama role as the porcupine in the game, the teacher tends to use her institutional role when eliciting proposals. This is particularly clear at the beginning of the drama activity when the teacher uses elicitation for the first two proposals and asks the pupils to find a way how the little squirrel could get rid of the porcupine. In both cases, pupils also bid to answer, and this, followed by the teacher's nomination, makes the two sequences not so different from traditional classroom interaction. However, the beginning of the drama activity also shows participants' orientation to other, non-institutional identities, which is visible all through the problem solving game. The first sequence appears a clear illustration of this orientation, and it seems to set the mood for the whole activity. The first sequence also leads to the second teacher-elicited sequence without a pause. For these reasons, I will describe and analyse the entire first sequence, not only the teacher's elicitation as with the other cases.

In the first opening sequence, the teacher introduces herself, the situation and the task to the class: she starts off by instructing the group in role, but resorts to a more direct form of elicitation:

(9)

1	T		I'm the huge porcupine now and I'm sitting in the doorway (.)
2		→	ok so what is little squirrel going to do about me (.)
3			because I've just told him I haven't got a problem
4			he has got one
5			(1.0) ((gazes around the circle))
6		→	ºwhat could little squirrel doº (.)
7			ºhave you got any suggestionsº
8			Ella
9	Ella		ok I would say to you that I know I have a ↑problem
10			and the problem is you (.) because you have those (.) quills
11			and if you are willing to (.) take off those quills
12			a:ll those quills we can live together
13			(1.0)
14	Olli		£ºuhhu[hº

The teacher addresses the group in role in the first person: 'I'm the huge porcupine now and I'm sitting in the doorway', and by doing so she creates the dramatic setting for the group. Similarly, she formulates her first question to the class in role using the tense implying immediate action and the first person to refer to herself: 'what is little squirrel going to do about me' (line 2). Moreover, she elaborates by reciting the porcupine's words from the story

(lines 3-4), which further reinvokes the context already described in the telling. There is no immediate response from the group, and, after a noticeable pause, the teacher asks two more questions (line 6-7) looking round the circle. They are different in character from the teacher's first question (lines 2-4) and can no longer be identified as the porcupine's words. (They may also be seen as a response to pupils' non-response to her introduction in role.) The first question is an open question about the problem and the use of the conditional seems to distance the action from the dramatic setting: '°what could little squirrel do°' (line 6). Thus, the problem has become hypothetical and the immediacy of the 'here and now' in the drama is lost. The teacher's second yes/no-question addresses the group directly asking for their suggestions: 'have you got any suggestions' (line 7), and it echoes the purpose and tone of the previous question being clearly spoken by the teacher out-of-role.

It seems that the teacher has, towards the end of her turn, given up her imaginary role and taken out her teacher's toolkit to make the class respond: the coaxing in lines 6-7 sound like questions in class where teachers do not usually wait for an answer in silence, but tend to formulate their questions in different ways in order to activate the class. While speaking, the teacher looks round the circle and her eye may have caught Ella's willingness or readiness to answer (not seen on tape) and she nominates Ella as the next speaker (line 8). Ella takes the floor and responds with a long, elaborated turn (lines 9-12). It consists of three sentences, each with a main clause and a subordinate clause, all tied together with conjunctions into a coherent suggestion.

Ella begins with an ok-token as an acknowledgement of the task she has been given. It also signals that she does not treat the teacher's question as an information-seeking enquiry. Next she frames her proposal with a reporting clause in the conditional: 'ok I would say to you' (line 9). Her choice of the conditional matches the teacher's question 'what could little squirrel do' (line 6), which has shifted the interaction from the drama context into more ordinary classroom questioning. Ella's response makes a similar shift only in reversed order: i.e. Ella first matches her response to the last units in the teacher's questioning turn before adopting a different discourse identity, i.e. speaking in role.

In line 11, Ella addresses the teacher using the second person singular and so invites the teacher to respond in the role of the porcupine. Ella's turn begins as indirect (hypothetical) speech ('ok I would say to you', line 9), but shifts gradually to direct speech ('I know I have a

problem and the problem is you', lines 9-10), as is often the case in conversation. Despite the teacher's lapse from the porcupine's role and her two classroom-like questions before Ella's turn, it seems that Ella wants to collaborate and play the game in the spirit of make-believe and participate in role. She speaks clearly and expressively looking at the teacher giving special emphasis to the key words: 'the problem is you because you have those quills' and 'if you are willing to (.) take off those quills' (lines 10-11). The elongated a:ll (line 12) in a repeated phrase at the end of Ella's turn adds emphasis to it. Olli, sitting beside Ella in the circle, self-selects and acknowledges her suggestion smiling and looking at Ella while uttering '£ºuhhuhº" (line 14).

It is the teacher's turn to respond to Ella and, instead of evaluating or discarding the suggestion, she initiates a follow-up question with her turn slightly overlapping with Olli's turn:

(10)

14	Olli	(£ºuhhu[hº)
15	T →	[but how can a porcupine take off his quills
16	Ella	I don't know
17		that's you:r pr £problem ((points at the teacher with her finger at 'your'))
18		now I don't have a prob[lem any more£ ((points at herself and laughs))
19	Ps	[((laugh[ter
20	T	[!remember I'm bigger than you (.)
21		that's the basic problem (.)

In line 15, the teacher's wh-question seeks some grounds for the suggestion: if taking off his quills is going to be a solution, is it possible for a porcupine to take off his quills? She begins her turn with the conjunction that indicates disagreement with the prior turn, i.e. 'but' signals that the idea cannot be accepted as such. Rather the teacher's enquiry sounds a rhetorical question for which there is no right answer, and the purpose of which is to show that the proposal is problematic. In situations of disagreement wh-questions can have a rhetorical and challenging role (Koshik 2003: 70-72).The teacher does not overtly speak as the porcupine, which would require the use of the first person, and her footing here remains somewhat ambiguous.

Ella, on the other hand, systematically retains the drama reality: her turn is directed from the squirrel to the porcupine (lines 16-18). Ella responds without any hesitation with a turn that first seems uncooperative. The beginning 'I don't know' can in an ordinary classroom be seen as an uncooperative answer, as Thornborrow (2002:127-128) observes in the context of

classroom discussion: the pupil who responds with 'I don't know' to the teacher “is not playing the game” and does not want to join in the activity. Here the similar response can be understood in a different light. ‘I don’t know’ here does not indicate unwillingness to participate, but seems to work as a preface to the rest of the turn, stating that it is the porcupine's problem, not hers (line 17-18). Though the latter part of Ella’s turn may first sound equally uncooperative or impertinent, it is a phrase from the African story that the teacher read to the group. Ella has promptly recontextualized this detail about the problem and serves it with a smile and a gesture, i.e. pointing at the teacher. The laughing response from the group overlaps with the end of Ella's turn (line 19), and to use the tennis counterpart: the laughter signals the point that Ella has scored in the game between the two parties. It is possible that the humorous impertinence of Ella's answer alone has instigated the cheerful laughing response, but the group may also have recognized the repetition of the squirrel's problem, which has been the punch line in the story, and also appreciated Ella's turn because of that.

The teacher initiates a response to Ella's turn promptly and it overlaps with the laughter (lines 20-21). The first part of her response turns down Ella's proposal by stating that the problem remains the same: the big animal can easily beat a smaller animal. The second part repeats the problem motif that Ella has used. The teacher's rejecting turn matches Ella's previous turn in tone, and this sequence seems to prove that it is quite acceptable to challenge the teacher in drama, which may not be the case in an ordinary lesson. The teacher's similar relaxed tone and playful impertinence on her part, proves that she has found Ella's turn acceptable, and that the drama reality works by its own rules and frees its participants from the usual classroom constraints.

The four-part proposal sequence at the opening passage of the drama activity clearly bears similarities to both ordinary classroom interaction and everyday conversation. On the one hand, the teacher elicits participation and nominates a pupil as she would do in any lesson, on the other hand, the sequence is built like playful talk between two speakers. This is followed by a listening audience that responds with laughter, which may occur in ordinary non-institutional settings as well as in classroom contexts. In this way, there is a working interplay between the institutional context with familiar classroom routines and everyday context with playfulness that is created and achieved in the situation at hand without a pre-planned agenda.

The first proposal is dealt with according to the rules of the game: the teacher non-accepts the suggestion with suitable responses (here with a rhetorical question and a rejecting statement). Unlike in everyday proposal sequences, it is the teacher that closes the sequence and not the initiator of the proposal. The teacher's final non-acceptance here and at the end of most of the proposal sequences thus reminds of the teacher's institutional role, which involves power.

Almost with the same words as in the first sequence, the teacher continues to elicit the second proposal: she initiates it in the same turn which closes the first sequence without a pause, as if to make sure that the activity will go on smoothly and fluently. Like a player serving the next ball, the teacher thus retains her turn and briskly addresses the whole group asking for new suggestions:

(11)

19	Ps		[((laugh[ter))
20	T		[!remember I'm bigger than you (.)
21		that is the basic problem (.)	
22	→	but if we (1.0) think that porcupine can't take off his quills	
23		what else (2.0) could little squirrel try to do	
24		(4.0)	
25		Esa	

Midway through her turn here, the teacher changes her footing in participation: there is a shift from the porcupine's role into the teacher's traditional role as she directs the question to the class (lines 22-23). Her use of 'but' marks a new start: the first negotiation is over, and it is time to move on. The teacher's 'but' here and a few times later on in the activity seems to have the same function as 'so', 'now', all right' or 'okay' in the classroom, viz. to start a new episode in the activity and, thus, mark a discourse boundary between a previous episode and the next one (van Lier 1988: 177). Here 'but' may also mark the teacher's shift back to the institutional role in which she resumes the main task, which thus functions as a 'resumption marker' (Mazeland and Huiskes 2001).

The teacher reformulates the outcome of the previous suggestion in a way (line 22) which makes the shift to the topic of the problem solving smooth: by using the pronoun 'we' she does not appear as the opponent to the group, but presents the squirrel's problem as something that they together are going to deal with, like any topic under discussion and observation in a classroom. And just as at the beginning of the activity, the question about the squirrel's problem becomes hypothetical and is expressed in the conditional: 'what else (2.0) could little squirrel try to do' (line 23). The teacher may have resorted to her usual classroom role in order

to make sure that the activity moves on successfully, but she may also have picked her institutional footing instinctively, as a natural stance when asking a question. Having asked the question, the teacher looks round the circle, especially directing the question to the class and hence guiding the activity as a whole and making sure that everyone is focused on it. There is a noticeable pause in the interaction and finally she nominates Esa. The teacher has given the group some time for thinking, which is considered one of the characteristic features of classroom discourse along with the minimal amount of overlapping (McHoul (1978) as quoted by Thornborrow 2002:110). At the beginning of the activity only some of the teacher's turns overlap slightly. The second sequence in the activity develops into a seven-part sequence including a repair and will be discussed in Section 6.6.

The first two elicitations of proposals appear to be the teacher's way of getting the drama activity under way as smoothly as possible at the beginning of the drama game. In the two other cases occurring later on, the teacher's elicitations have a different function: they are a means of structuring and managing the pace of the game signalling that it is time to move on or finish the game. They also work as non-acceptance devices in these teacher-elicited sequences.

The third time the teacher uses elicitation occurs after a lengthy negotiation about a proposal, in which she finally questions the feasibility of the idea, and gets a response from the initiator of the proposal. The teacher's elicitation that now follows also non-accepts the previous proposal in the following way:

(12)

112	T	[do] you really think that the porcupine would go
113	Ella	now I (.) d don't th(h)ink he would go (.) b(h)ut I think (xx)=
114	T	=but if he says that **I'm not going anywhere (.)**
115	→	what would you do then (.) if you were those little squirrels
116	Tea	well [this
117	Ps	[(xxx) ((boy sitting next to Tea lifts her hand))
118	T	[shut the door and (.) >Tea<

The teacher's 'but' indicates her disagreement with the suggested idea as well as resumes the problematic situation. She uses a drama mode to make her point, and acts out the porcupine's words slowly in a loud animated voice (line 114). The teacher begins the turn as a reporting statement of what the porcupine says, and switches to direct speech giving voice to the porcupine, i.e. she changes her footing. After the dramatisation, the teacher elicits the next

proposal by reformulating the key question, which, as before, is in the conditional. But unlike the earlier elicitations, she makes this enquiry more personal and challenging by addressing the group directly: ‘what would you do then (.) if you were those little squirrels' (line115). This kind of question leads the pupils to look at things from the drama character's point of view, and thus the question also meets the ideals of classroom drama. The teacher uses the plural form of the squirrel when addressing the pupils, which may be a slipshod, but the plural also gives an impression that each participant should consider the squirrel’s problem.

The teacher’s last elicitation of proposals occurs at the end of the game and leads to the winning suggestion. The prompting question resembles the third elicitation above, in which the teacher’s question also has the function of rejecting the previous proposal. Here a dramatisation of the porcupine sitting in the doorway follows the elicitation question:

(13)
132 Asta ((laughs unsurely)= err somehow (1.0) go (.) tai >sillee<
133 that porcupine's emotion feelings (.) that (.) that (.) squirrel should say that
134 £if you came here and I had food for myself
135 but now when you are here we both will die
136 so it's better that just you will [die ((laughs))
137 Ps [((very loud laughter))
138 T → ok yes but (1.0) err (.) how would little squirrel make porcupine
139 get↑ out of his house
140 >I mean> (.) he wouldn't go ((emphatically))
141 <!he is just sitting in the doorway being very [big!>
142 Ps [((laughter))
143 Ella £tickling

The teacher begins by responding to Asta's turn (line 138). Her response is an indirect disagreement which starts with an affirmative, but continues with a disagreeing part: 'yes, but ...', which is a typical preface for a rejection of a proposal (Houtkoop 1987: 149). The question which follows, however, does not seem an information-seeking question, but rather like a challenge: ‘ok yes but (1.0) err (.) how would little squirrel make porcupine get ↑out of the house’ (lines 138-139), the latter part of which, ‘>I mean< (.) he wouldn’t go’ (line 140), supports the first part. Being in the conditional, the question looks like the other elicitation questions, such as 'What could the little squirrel do?', but here it has a more challenging formulation. Without a pause, the teacher continues her turn in line 141, and elaborates by recontextualizing a scene from the story: the porcupine is filling the doorway refusing to leave. The teacher dramatises the scene by using animated voice and uttering her line slowly

and emphatically, and the use of voice is clearly a central part of the way in which the teacher forms the turn. This is duly followed by an appreciative laughing response (line 142).

There may be two features to indicate that the teacher is directing the eliciting question to the whole group: Firstly, there is a loud, explosive laughing response from the pupils overlapping with Asta's suggestion, which gives the impression of their full support to her idea and her humorous way of presenting it. This might make the teacher, almost instinctively, address her turn to everybody and take control in order to discipline the class. Secondly, at this point the teacher may conclude that it is time to finish the activity, and, thus, to address the group in an engaging way and elicit the last proposal. Accordingly, Ella, and not the previous speaker Asta, self-selects and promptly produces the winning proposal (line 143).

By eliciting pupils' proposals to solve the squirrel's problem in the drama game, the teacher keeps the group focused on the task and takes the activity to a successful end which is acted out: the squirrel tickles the porcupine who falls into the river. While the teacher addresses the group collectively, speaks out of role or nominates the next speaker, she works in her traditional classroom role. Accordingly, the pupils' participation is also in line with the familiar behaviour in class at the beginning of the activity, e.g. they bid to answer. The participants thus show orientation to the institutional setting and identities by using and submitting to a traditional way of managing a lesson. However, in the last two elicitations, the teacher partly speaks in role (example 4, line 114) and dramatises a scene (example 5, line 141), which in both cases leads to pupils' self-selection. It seems that the livelier, non-institutional interaction between teacher and pupils has been, at least to some extent, affected by the teacher’s use of play and drama.

All in all, the teacher in the drama lesson can never forget her instructive and organizing task, but has to supervise the activity and keep it moving. By repeating the key question 'What should the little squirrel do?', with which she elicits proposals, the teacher keeps the group focused and reminds them of the original task in the game. Though the teacher has to repeat it only a few times, this question is central and, in fact, the only question for the group in the whole activity. The teacher receives answers in the form of suggestions without accepting them. Instead, she asks follow-up questions or makes question-like comments, whose purpose is to non-accept, and finally rejects the idea until the activity comes to a satisfactory end. The turns between teacher and pupils do not look like the three-part teaching exchanges, but they

serve the same purpose: the overall question (though seldom expressed in words) is being 'answered' by the group and those answers are evaluated by the teacher. The teacher's power to accept or reject answers makes her the leader of the game, which is the same institutional role as she, as a rule, has in the classroom. Pupils do not seem to have more power than in any other lesson, in this respect, but the structure of the problem solving game that allows the teacher to evaluate, also helps to carry out this activity: it is the exchanges of the players' turns that keeps the game going. The next section discusses the different ways in which the teacher non-accepts pupils' proposals during the negotiation.

6.4 Teacher's non-acceptance of proposals

When a new proposal is made, the teacher's task is to non-accept it one way or another, and in this problem solving game the teacher makes use of various kinds of responses which have different functions in the negotiation. One of the teacher's tools in the game is asking follow-up questions about the proposals, which she does with grammatical wh-questions. Second, she asks yes/no-questions to point out that something about the proposal is problematic. Third, the teacher sums up proposals with formulations which also function as questioning. Fourth, the teacher livens up the talk by using partial repeats to respond to pupils' proposals. Finally, the teacher also manages the negotiation through repair when necessary.

The grammatical (syntactically-formed) wh-questions and yes/no-questions comprise about one third of all the teacher's turns in the activity (17/44). If the formulations (statement-formatted utterances), which are also used for questioning, are added to this, the share of the teacher's questions amounts to c. half of all her turns 21/44). The rest of the teacher's turns consist of partial repeats (3 cases), repairs (5 cases), and turns which include agreement, nomination or non-accepting comment, and which form a miscellaneous group of turns.

The teacher's grammatical questions and formulations (i.e. statement-formatted questions) do not produce similar kinds of responses from the class: Grammatical follow-up questions about proposals and brief enquiries about pupils' opinions (when the teacher speaks out of role) mostly get practical responses, whereas the teacher's formulations, often spoken in role, bring more varied, playful responses from the group. The latter is also true with the partial repeat which the teacher uses a few times. This kind of fluctuation between institutional and non-institutional interaction, i.e. how the participants orient to each other's turns during the

negotiation, makes an interesting point for observation. The following sections will deal with each type of response that the teacher uses to non-accept pupils' proposals while negotiating, and the analysis tries to highlight the typical interactional patterns as well as the interplay between institutional and the non-institutional talk.

6.4.1 Teacher's follow-up questions

In the drama activity, grammatical follow-up questions seem to serve their original institutional purpose to get more information as the teacher uses them as responses to pupils' proposals. Their function is basically the same as teachers' questioning in ordinary lessons, in which the function of questions is to study the topic at hand. An extract from a science lesson in which the teacher instructs a class with precise wh-questions, illustrates the point (Edwards and Westgate 1994: 39):

(14)

T --- You remember what happened when we burnt a candle under a bell.
What happened? Well?
P The water came up, sir.
T Yes, but why did the water come up?
P Because, er, there was a vacuum.
T Yes, but why was there a vacuum?
P Well, the candle kind of sucked up the water, sir.
T How did it do that? Yes?
P Some of the air got burned up.
T That's not right is it?

The teacher starts dealing with the topic with an elicitation question, then acknowledges the given answers briefly with an affirmative and adds the next part into the chain of instructional questions. This makes the exchange between the teacher's display questions and the pupils' answers fluent and goal-oriented. Questions are teachers' stock and trade in science lessons and drama lessons alike, but the starting point for the questions differs considerably. In the problem solving activity it is the pupils' proposals that instigate a set of further questions, whereas in a science lesson the teacher's questions usually concern an objective phenomenon under scrutiny. The drama teacher also has to be ready to come up with appropriate questions unprepared as well as she can. This is likely to make the talk spontaneous and not too predictable, which may often be the case in a lesson where the teacher knows the right answers, as well as the right questions.

Moreover, in the problem solving activity questions and answers between teacher and pupils have another model or counterpart in ordinary everyday proposals. So when the teacher responds to a proposal with a question which is then answered by the pupil, we can see a question-answer adjacency pair inserted in the proposal sequence, since the teacher has to get more information on the suggestion to be able to decide. This may also occur in everyday talk: before being able to accept or reject the proposal the addressee may have to find out more (Houtkoop 1987: 102). So the non-institutional practice involving questions can also be seen being employed in an institutional setting in this game.

The teacher uses a follow-up question four times to respond to a pupil's proposal and twice later on during the negotiation. The term ‘follow-up questions’ in my analysis is only used to refer to such questions which are targeted at the earlier suggestion made directly in order to elicit more information or an explanation or question the idea, and they are different in character to questions which, for instance, ask for an opinion. The teacher's follow-up questions are all wh-questions and their formulations and functions or pupils' respective responses vary in these situations.

In the sixth proposal sequence, the teacher uses a follow-up question twice. First, she responds to a pupil's proposal with a follow-up question to elicit elaboration for the proposal. Later on in the negotiation, she uses a wh-question for another purpose, i.e. to question the whole idea. Asta initiates her proposal (line 86) and introduces her plan in a conversational way:

(15)

86	T	Asta
87	Asta	they should do (.) agreement (.) >you know<
88	T →	>what kind of agreement<
89	Asta	yes but everybodys who is squirrel's friend↑ (.) would take that porcupine
90		for three days and would give him a bed and food
91		and he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs and draws a circle in the air))
92	Ps	[((laughter))
93	Asta	so nobody's food would end >eiku<
94	T	°↑yeah that's right↑°
95	Asta	yes and everybody would survive (.)

The teacher nominates Asta as the next speaker after she has shown her willingness to speak. Asta makes a proposal of a general nature, and the teacher initiates a clarifying follow-up question to elicit a more appropriate response (line 88). On the other hand, the teacher's question may also have a social function: Asta's turn in line 87 ends with a conversational

'you know', which seems to signal the potential end of the turn, and, thus, create a need for some kind of response. The teacher duly provides her with a suitable question, after which Asta starts to elaborate her proposal. Asta's response is an extended turn which is interrupted by the group's laughing response. The turn continues in line 93, but ends with a repair initiator (‘eiku’), which is followed by the teacher’s acceptance of the response (latching with Asta’s turn), and Asta’s continuation of the answer.

Now it is the teacher's turn to take the next step in the negotiation, and she initiates a further question speaking in role:

(16)
96 T → !oh (.) but <u>how</u> am I going to <u>tra</u>vel in that rainy forest
97 when it is raining so heavi[ly!
98 Pia [ºit's your proble[mº
99 Ps [((laughter))
100 Tit's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally

The teacher begins her response with a surprised oh-receipt. An 'oh' in similar everyday situations shows that the speaker has received new information and that he or she does not accept the proposal as such (Houtkoop 1987: 78-79). This marks the teacher's question different from the display questions which are mostly used in ordinary lessons. The teacher also prefaces her argumentative question with a 'but', which is also a sign of non-acceptance after a proposal or an offer (line 96). The teacher's question itself is practical: it is raining heavily, so how can she, that is, the porcupine, travel in the forest (lines 96-97). This is the only grammatical question that the teacher asks in role, and it seems to create freer participation, i.e. Pia initiates an answer instead of Asta, and repeats the problem-motif which has appeared earlier in the story as well as at the beginning of the activity. The teacher's good-humoured but opposing, counter-argument follows the group's laughing response (line 100), and it ends the long sequence. It is correctly interpreted as a non-accepting turn, which is interrupted by another proposal. This begins the seventh proposal sequence which will be discussed as the next example.

The teacher's follow-up question here is not a response to a proposal but a later enquiry to get more information about the presented idea:

(17)
101 Ella [(xx) act(h)ually a ship
102 Ps [((excited talk))
103 T (£)a <u>ship</u>

104 Ella yes=
105 T→ =£who's going to build the ship
106 Ella £the ↑squirrel
107 Ps ((laughter))
108 Anu and all (1.0) her (.) or his friends (1.0)

Ella's suggestion about the use of ship (line 1) and her confirmation of it (line 104) are followed by the teacher's follow-up question requesting for more information in line 105: '£who's going to build the ship'. Ella gives the explanation with a playful one-word turn, which instigates the group's laughing response. This is followed by a self-selection from Anu, who joins Ella's proposal. The tempo of this first part of the sequence is rather fast and the short turns are exchanged fluently. The teacher has quickly come up with a question that the pupils find relevant answers for, and this keeps the game going.

The negotiation in the eighth proposal sequence, where the teacher responds to a proposal with a grammatical follow-up question, is brief (four turns altogether). It is elicited by the teacher, and Tea finally gets a chance to make her suggestion after more than one pupil have spoken simultaneously. Her turn becomes rather long and rambling because of the laughter and self-repair. The teacher's follow-up question has a managing function in this case:

(18)
118 T [shut the door and (.) >Tea<
119 Tea ok this l(h)ittle sq(h)uirrel (1.0) err have to has a ↑k(n)ife
120 bec(h)ause [(.) bec(h)ause yeah (x) when he have to has ↑k(h)nife
121 Ps [((laughter
122 Tea and then (.) [an(h)d h(h)e
123 T → [what would he do with a [↑knife
124 Ps [((loud [laughter))
125 Tea [(xx) and knife an(h)d s(h)aid
126 to the p(h)orcupine that y(h)ou **have** to go (2.0)
127 Tºokº ((tentatively))

The teacher nominates Tea whose hand is lifted up by the boy sitting next to her. Both the pupils laugh (not shown here), and Tea starts off to make her (or their jointly prepared) suggestion (line 119). When her turn comes to a possible 'transition relevance place', i.e. the general idea of her proposal becomes clear, the group responds with laughter, possibly in response to the aspect of violence, which is unacceptable in the school environment. Tea goes on with her turn, but she repeats her earlier turn in the same laughing manner trying to repair her talk (lines 120, 122). The teacher's initiation of a follow-up question concerning the use of the knife (line 123) interrupts Tea's turn. Her entry may be occasioned by the pupil's

trouble which is displayed by her self-repair and the disruption caused by the group's laughter (line 121). Here the teacher's quick enquiry seems to help the pupil to finish her turn (part of which not audible), and it works as a means of managing the sequence by steering the topic.

The last of the teacher's grammatical questions that she uses to respond to a proposal has a function which differs from that of the previous questions that the teacher has asked to get more information or to manage the talk. Here the teacher's question does two things at the same time: it non-accepts the humorously presented suggestion and thus prevents any further negotiation about the new proposal, and it is also an elicitation question to the whole class (this elicitation question is analysed in more detail in Section 6.3):

(19)

132	Asta	((laughing unsurely)= err somehow (1.0) go (.) tai >sillee<
133		that porcupine's emotion feelings (.) that (.) that (.) squirrel should say that
134		£if you came here and I had food for myself
135		but now when you are here we both will die
136		so it's better that just you will [die
137	Ps	[((very loud laughter))
138	T →	ok yes but (1.0) err (.) how would little squirrel make porcupine
139		get ↑out of the house
140		>I mean< (.) he wouldn't go ((emphatically))
141		<!he is just sitting in the doorway being very [big!>
142	Ps	[((laughter))

In lines 133-136, Asta makes her proposal addressing it (finally in direct speech) to the porcupine as a humorous statement, which asks the porcupine to leave: they both cannot survive. The teacher does not, however, respond in the role of the porcupine, but appears in her institutional role. First the teacher acknowledges the proposal and then elicits a question which she elaborates by dramatising the scene (lines 138-141). Though not in role, she uses animated voice and speaks slowly. Her response is the familiar elicitation question that she has used three times earlier to elicit a new proposal. Here it seems a logical choice, since Asta's proposal has not suggested any special means of solving the problem, except the power of words. It is also time to bring the problem solving game to an end and ask for one more proposal.

In sum, the teacher uses grammatical follow-up questions as responses to pupils' proposals or turns in the negotiation. Their function is to instigate more talk by asking for explanation, further information or by managing the proposal sequence. In the activity, the teacher, except for one instance, asks these questions out of role, and the questions in their grammatical form

and function resemble teachers' questions in those classroom discussions in which referential rather than display questions are used as a rule, too. However, the teacher's use of animated voice when uttering the question 'what would he do with a ↑knife' (Extract 18, line 123), or her interested response '£who's going to build the ship? (Extract 17, line 105) bring the talk-in-interaction closer to everyday conversation. Non-institutional features become visible more clearly when the teacher animates a turn, as in the last extract, and speaks in role expressing surprise like speakers in everyday encounters: '!oh (.) but how am I going to travel in that rainy forest when it is raining so heavily!' (Extract 16, lines 96-97). In those passages which resemble ordinary talk, the teacher's turns convey cheerful playfulness, which is either created through the use of animated voice or the imaginary role. Both derive from the playful drama context, and can be understood only against that background. Another type of enquiry that the teacher uses in the game is questioning the feasibility of the proposal. This is done with yes/no questions.

6.4.2 Teacher's probing yes/no-questions

Besides the follow-up questions about the pupils' proposals, the teacher uses other types of enquiries when dealing with the proposed idea. During the activity, she uses yes/no-questions five times in three proposal sequences. The function of these questions is mainly to question the plausibility of the proposal, i.e. they show that something about the proposal is problematic. As is the case with most of the follow-up questions (i.e. wh-questions about the proposals), the teacher's drama role is not apparent in these enquiries, viz. she does not ask them in the role of the porcupine. Still, the use of yes/no-questions, i.e. what they do in the negotiation, is in line with the status and stance of the teacher's role in this activity. She is the authority who challenges the pupil's side and has a high status. The teacher's stance as the opponent can also be seen as that of a 'devil's advocate', which is one of the teacher's roles in classroom drama. 'Devil's advocate' challenges the group's decisions from within the group through tone of voice or facial expression, and so pupils have a chance to defend their ideas (Morgan & Saxton 1987: 45-46). Here the teacher does not act out her yes/no-questions, which she may do when she uses formulations, but as the leader of the game she challenges the pupils' thinking and points out the flaws so that the group can reach a satisfactory solution.

Yes/no-questions restrict the answer to either of the two types of response, and they can also be designed grammatically so that they prefer either a 'yes' or 'no' answer usually so that affirmative questions have an expectation of a positive answer. However, in a particular institutional context, yes/no-questions may convey a 'reversed polarity assertion'. According to Koshik (2002: 1851), this type of questioning tends to be used by teachers in one-on-one writing conferences in North American colleges to help students to diagnose their problems. There seems to be some similar features or at least the same premise between these yes/no-questions and the teacher's yes/no-questions in the drama activity, i.e. both types of questions point out a problem and in both situations the teacher has the stance of a knowledgeable speaker.

In Koshik's data, affirmative yes/no-questions convey a negative assertion which shows what is problematic about the student's text and points out to a possible solution. The action that the questions perform and the speaker's knowledge state or epistemic stance help the student to interpret them correctly, i.e. instead of treating them as information-seeking questions, the student orients to them as questions which prefer a negative answer that aligns with the stance displayed in the teacher's question. The following example (Koshik 2002: 1867-1868) shows the teacher's question which implies "a veiled criticism" of the text under scrutiny and the student's orientation to the reversed polarity assertion that the question makes and the teacher's evaluation:

(20)

32	TJ	[is that what this paper's about?
33		[((TJ moves head to side as if to meet ST's eyegaze))
34		(0,8)
35	ST	no:.
36		(0,5)
37	TJ	right. ** ((ST eyegaze on paper))
38		(0,2)
39		that's the problem

Instead of saying directly 'But this is not what your paper is about', the teacher expresses her criticism in the form of a question 'is that what this paper's about?' (line 32), and receives the student's consenting response 'no'. The teacher's 'right' in line 37 suggests that there was a right answer to the question, which makes it a 'known-information' question and not an information seeking enquiry (Koshik 2002: 1868).

In the drama activity, the teacher's affirmative yes/no-questions take up a problematic aspect in the proposal that has been made. These questions are designed to represent the stance of the rude porcupine and also show the teacher's status as the leader of the game, who ultimately has the power to make the final decision, i.e. the teacher is the 'knowledgeable' participant in interaction. The yes/no-questions are her opposing turns in the game and their purpose is to show that there is something not quite right about the proposed solution. If teacher and pupils were playing on the same side, the preferred aligning answer would be 'no', as in the writing conference above, but since this is a game between two parties, the pupils' side opposes the teacher's side by responding with an affirmative in order to defend their idea. I will start the analysis with the third sequence, during which the teacher uses yes/no-questions three times and gets responses from individual pupils, several pupils and the whole group. The two other examples of the teacher's yes/no-questions in the game will be dealt with in the order of their appearance.

The third sequence begins with Arto's proposal which apparently involves the use of an umbrella, but the exact wording remains unclear, since the beginning of the proposal is unfortunately not audible on the tape. Several pupils nearby join in by repeating the key word 'umbrella':

(21)

37	Arto		(xx) umbre[lla
38	Ps		[um[brella
39	Pia		[that's your pro[blem
40	T		[an £umbr↑[ella
41	Ps		[((lau[ghter))
42	T	→	[do squirrels have umbrellas?
43	Ps		£ye[s
44	T		[because I lost my umbrella when I was (1.5) I was there
45			>down at [the bottom of the river bank<

The teacher's response to the jointly made proposal begins with an exclamation (line 40), which is a partial repeat. (In line 39, there is also a belated response to the teacher's non-acceptance of the proposal in the previous sequence.) The teacher's 'an £umbr↑ella', uttered at a higher pitch and sounding interested, seems to appreciate the pupils' proposal. The group responds with laughter instead of the confirmation which a partial repeat usually receives (line 41). Now the teacher continues her turn directing the yes/no-question to the whole group and speaking with a rising intonation: 'do squirrels have umbrellas? (line 42).

The yes/no-question points out a problem in the suggested plan. It displays the stance that defends the porcupine's side, i.e. if there is no umbrella, the proposal cannot be considered. Instead of asking this question, the teacher could have turned down the proposal by stating that squirrels do not have umbrellas, which might have stopped the negotiation about the proposal, or opened a new question about getting an umbrella for the porcupine. Further, the teacher's double role as the opponent in the game and as a helping instructor becomes visible in the yes/no-question about the use of an umbrella: It opposes the group by pointing out a flaw in the proposal probing at the same time about the circumstances in the make believe context. Still, the teacher's question is uttered in a smiling way, and the teacher uses a rising intonation, both of which seem to encourage the pupils to give an affirmative response. Teachers typically direct their yes/no-questions to the whole class that usually answers in unison (Margutti 2004: 169). In line 43, the group produces their choral response in a smiling manner ('£yes'). It is a dispreferred turn from the teacher's point of view, i.e. the pupils do not agree with the teacher's doubt that squirrels may not have umbrellas, but disagree with the teacher.

Later on in the same proposal sequence, the teacher uses another challenging yes/no-question. It is preceded by a different type of yes/no-question, in which the teacher seems to suggest an idea for the group to consider. In this exchange of turns, the teacher makes a new effort to continue the negotiation about the use of an umbrella. She takes up the topic of a prior proposal which has suggested that the porcupine should take off her quills to be able to stay at the squirrel's house:

(22)

51	T	[>but I guess that I would take the quills with me
52	→	would it be a good idea to leave all the quills[in the k squirrel's house<
53	Ella	[no
54	Ella	well if you leave the <u>quills</u> (.) you may be able to goes live somewhere else
55	Ps	((lau[ghter))
56	T	[oh (x) [I see your point
57	Ella	[(you ma(h)y (have a cha(h)nce)
58		(2.0)
59	T →	◦but do you think that the porcupine would go◦ (.)
60	Ella	£no I don't think [so
61	Olli	[º£ye:sº
62	Ps	((laught[er))

The teacher establishes a new line of questioning with a statement: First, the initial 'but'-conjunction marks a new topic for the group to consider. Then the teacher frames her

statement with the fragment 'I guess' which expresses her stance about the preceding events: now that she has an umbrella she could almost consider leaving the squirrel's house, but perhaps keep her quills. 'I guess' in sequence-initiating actions displays a speaker's acquired stance or an evaluative conclusion that has been formed on the basis of the previous interaction. 'I guess' also invites other participants to give their own expressions of opinion. (Kärkkäinen 2005: 109, 123) The teacher's question in line 52, asking ‘would it be a good idea to leave all the quills in the squirrel’s house’, seems to probe the familiar topic. It appears as a proposal suggesting an idea that the group should now consider as if the porcupine himself needed some advice from the group, though the question is neutral and not clearly 'spoken' by the porcupine in role. So this question is different from the challenging yes/no-question, and the teacher is thus offering a candidate solution to move forward in the game: the quills have been a problem between the squirrel and the porcupine, and leaving them altogether seems useful. As this idea has been proposed by the pupils (in fact Ella’s proposal), the teacher knows their opinion about the matter and in this way she aligns with the pupils’ side in the game.

The teacher’s second question (line 59) differs from the first enquiry (line 52): now she asks a challenging yes/no-question, which indicates that she is still doubtful about the proposal: 'º but do you think that the porcupine would goº'. It is uttered in a slightly wondering tone and in a quiet voice after a noticeable lapse in talk. The teacher’s turn may also signal a difficulty to decide how to proceed from here. The yes/no-question, with the initial ‘but’, which may project a problem and imply that there is something to consider, again expresses some doubt about the result of the suggested plan: the porcupine may still not go. The question expresses a negative assertion and, resembling the idea of reversed polarity questions in teacher-student conferences, it shows that there is still a problem to be solved. The question seems to get an equally doubtful response from the group, and particularly its formulation seems to encourage the group to reason and give their opinion about the matter. A single yes/no-question 'Will the porcupine go?' would easily result in receiving a choral response, but by beginning her question with 'do you think', the teacher's question asking for opinion could well instigate longer responses.

In this passage, the teacher works like the ‘devil’s advocate’ using challenging and probing questions, whose task is to make the group consider and defend their ideas. The negotiation in the whole third sequence also shows how the teacher, through questioning, can keep the

drama context logical and coherent. This exchange about the topic of the umbrella displays how the drama context is used as a resource, and also how the participants create new contexts while negotiating. The teacher's drama role and the institutional role appear side by side so that the actual questions are asked out of role.

In the brief fifth sequence, the teacher uses two yes/no-questions as her tools of questioning (lines 80 and 83). The first question resembles her enquiry at the beginning of the third sequence: 'do squirrels have umbrellas?' It is the teacher's opposing turn that shows that something about the proposal appears problematic, and the pupils also orient to it in a somewhat similar way as in the third sequence and give a joint response. Again an affirmative yes/no-question conveys a negative assertion:

(23)

75	Anu	[but may[be
76	T	[actually I'm feeling rather comfortable here (.)
77	Ps	((some laughter))
78	Anu	but maybe but maybe the squirrel could (.) <u>teach</u> porcupine
79		to build own house in the [(x) ((gazes at the teacher))
80	T →	[but] could they <u>do</u> it (.) while it's raining
81	Anu	y[es
82	Ps	[yes
83	T →	do you think so
84	Ella	[(x(h)x)
85	Ps	[(xx)

Anu tries to initiate a new proposal (line 75), but the teacher does not attend to her, possibly because she is preparing her non-accepting turn to the previous proposal. In line 78, Anu starts with 'but' which seems to mark a new idea about building a house for the porcupine. The teacher's question in line 80 ('but could they <u>do</u> it (.) while it's raining') overlaps with Anu's turn, and the use of 'but' here marks that there is some problem with the proposed solution. In the previous negotiation, the teacher has spoken in role (not shown here), but now her question is clearly asked out of role referring to the characters with 'they'. She again picks up an aspect from the drama reality that makes it difficult to carry out the proposed idea, i.e. with her enquiry she questions the conditions. Here it is the rain, which makes a valid argument against the proposal itself. The teacher's question, especially beginning with the but-conjunction, seems to present a stronger case against the proposal than the similar question in the third sequence. And compared with the brisk, smiling choral response of the third sequence, the one-word affirmatives here do not come quite as readily and simultaneously: Anu, as the prior speaker, gives a one-word affirmative and is accompanied by a similar,

almost simultaneous response by several pupils (line 82). No further grounds are offered to support the proposed solution, and the teacher initiates another opposing doubtful turn 'do you think so', which asks the pupils to take a stand in the matter. The responses in lines 84-85, which unfortunately cannot be heard, again show the group's orientation to the teacher's question, i.e. that the enquiry is seen to be addressed to all participants. By casting doubt on the suggestion, the teacher has not accepted it and the negotiation goes on about a new proposal. Next the teacher nominates a pupil who is ready to make another suggestion (not shown here).

In sum, the teacher's yes/no questions work as her questioning tools in the negotiation, which point out that there is something problematic about carrying out the proposal, and with which she implicitly rejects all the proposed solutions. From the teacher’s point of view (i.e. the porcupine’s standpoint) they prefer a negative response, though the yes/no-questions are affirmative in their design. The pupils, however, usually answer in the positive as they naturally want to defend their side. The yes/no-questions do not, as a rule**,** create much talk in this activity: apart from two longer responses, they mostly produce short one-word answers**.** Yes/no-questions in drama lessons are considered the least useful types of questions as they can be answered briefly, but they may be acceptable, for instance, if participants are unused to drama (e.g. O'Neill and Lambert 1982: 141). The yes/no questions with this drama group may have helped to produce responses and may particularly have activated the pupils to participate as a group. The teacher's doubtful yes/no-questions are the only enquiries that get choral or joint responses in this problem solving activity. Since these questions usually require a limited amount of information from a recipient and restrict the answer to either yes or no, it may have helped the pupils to produce short replies and orient to the activity jointly. The questioning technique which presents a problem in a form of a positive question thus brings variety and movement into the activity and may also give some confidence to participants through joint action.

6.4.3 Means of negotiating for mutual understanding

Grammatical questions comprise the majority of the teacher's turns while she negotiates about the pupils' proposals. However, there are other means of negotiating for understanding visible in the negotiation, i.e. the teacher formulates the suggested idea, acknowledges and shows interest or appreciation through partial repeats to the given proposals and she initiates a repair

or repairs talk when there is some problem in understanding or language production. While grammatical questions in the drama activity often resemble interaction in institutional settings (e.g. the teacher speaks in her institutional role or questions receive choral or joint responses), formulations, partial repeats and repair, in most cases, have a non-institutional character, which also draws on the pretend play context. The most significant feature about them is that the teacher mostly speaks them in her role as the porcupine and so creates playfulness in interaction. But they are also able to do other things: formulations help the participants to focus on the gist of the proposal (often in a humorous way) and they may treat a proposal as successful, thus giving positive feedback to participants in drama, or as impertinent, which creates a humorous scene. The function of partial repeats followed by a question seems to be to establish a level of understanding between the two parties, whereas single partial repeats may also treat a proposal in a particular way, e.g. as successful or problematic. Repair is occasionally needed in the negotiation, and the few instances mostly resemble repair in everyday talk (conversational repair) rather than institutional repair in class (didactic repair). This section will discuss the use and functions of these three essential kinds of turns in the interaction of the activity.

6.4.3.1 Formulating understanding

In the problem solving activity the teacher uses four declaratively formatted utterances, or formulations, which summarise the gist of the prior turn(s). Three of these statements are spoken in role bring a cosy and playful character, i.e. a non-institutional tone, into the interaction. The formulations in the activity, in fact, do two things at the same time: they refer to the proposal that the pupils have made and also describe the course of action which is suggested to be carried out in the future. In this respect, the teacher's formulations resemble the interviewer's declarative statements in news interviews, in which something may be picked as a topic from the prior report, inferences may be made about it and the interviewee's subsequent response to it can thus be invited (Heritage 1985: 104; Clayman & Heritage 2002). I will first briefly show two equivalent cases in news interviews from Heritage and Roth (1995: 11-12). The first formulation brings up the gist of the interviewee's prior talk:

(24)

15	Interviewer	So is- so you are
16		saying that basically <u>nothing</u> has happened since (.)
17		thuh cold war came to an e:nd, and we're supposed to be
18		friends with Russia?

19 Interviewee Ah: not- I'm not saying that. Something has happened . . . .

Both interviewer and interviewee are referring to the interviewee's earlier words which are here clarified and corrected. The opposing remarks 'so you are saying' and 'I'm not saying' preface the issue that is taken up again. In the next example of a hypothetical or future-oriented statement, two hypothetical choices are presented (Heritage & Roth 1995: 12-13):

(25)

7 Interviewer =In other words, I don't understand the logic of
8 this:, uh Mr. Blunkett, if things are going well, and
9 the, the atmosphere of international detente continues
10 (.) you're quite happy to negotiate the weapons away,
11 but if things (.) go badly, and I assume by that you
12 mean some kind of return, to some kind of cold war
13 atmosphere, then you'll (.) give them away [anyway.
14 Interviewee [Well I: I
15 I'm not talking about giving anything away. . . .

The interviewer wants to confirm and clarify the interviewee's opinion and future action which have remained ambiguous in the course of the interview, and by summing up the presented view, he questions the logic of the whole idea. In the examples from the activity, the teacher uses similar techniques to the ones in the two formulations above, i.e. she refers to what has been said or suggested and also summarises what future action the proposal will apparently involve. But unlike in the examples above, the pupils' responses do not contradict with the teacher's statements, but each time the teacher's formulation brings out a smiling agreement. Thus, the function of the formulations in the drama activity is not to take up the topic to be discussed in more detail, but rather to present an elaborated summary of the proposal to be continued, highlight the drama aspect in the game and, as it seems, to make the group appreciate their own efforts. In this section, I will show and analyse three examples of the teacher's formulations.

The teacher formulates a proposal in the third sequence when the negotiation about the pupils' proposal is beginning (i.e. it has been suggested that the porcupine should be given an umbrella). The teacher's wording is similar to that in Example 1 from Heritage & Roth (1995). However, the teacher's formulation is uttered in role in a clear, even voice as if to express the porcupine's resentment at such an idea:

(26)

47 T → ok so you are telling me to go away with a little [umbrella and some food
48 Ps [(some laughter and talk))

49 Olli º£that's righ[tº
50 Ella [y(h)es (x(h)x) ((laughs loudly))
51 T [>but I guess that I would take the quills with me
52 would it be a good idea to leave all the quills in the k squirrel's house<

The teacher begins with an ok-receipt and then she formulates the proposal from the porcupine's point of view speaking in role. The use of 'ok' may also mean that the teacher wants the group to focus on her words, since there has been some quiet talk during her previous turn (not shown here). Van Lier (1988:177) lists these two markers, 'ok' and 'so', among those used at discourse boundaries between two episodes in the classroom activity. The teacher summarises the proposal in a precise and clear manner: 'ok so you are telling me to go away with a little umbrella and some food' (line 47). She repeats the proposal about the umbrella and elaborates by adding a descriptive 'little' and the previously made proposal about giving food. However, the teacher's formulation may also have another, more practical, repairing function: the pupils' jointly made proposal of an umbrella was not loudly produced, and the word 'umbrella' was the only clear part of it. But clearly the teacher's formulation treats the joint proposal as an idea that does not please the porcupine, and the group sees the humorous side easily enough: the teacher's turn gets an overlapping laughing response, a smiley '£ºthat's rightº" for confirmation and another agreeing response (lines 49-50). The teacher's formulation has thus summarised the gist of the previous talk, received confirmation and agreement as well as functioned as a well-received dramatisation of the porcupine's state. It has given pupils an opportunity to interact and join in the negotiation in a particular way, that is, with turns which oppose the porcupine and take sides in a playful way

In the fourth sequence, the teacher's response to a proposal is in the form of a dramatized exclamation. Though not in a form of a formulated summary, it still sums up the essential information from the proposal. It is the teacher's opposing response to a proposal which has started with a repair exchange between teacher and pupil (not shown here) and is now produced:

(27)
70 Ella branch so I think there is another branch too (.) so that's where the (1.0) err (.)
71 porcupine can sleep and maybe that squirrel [(x)
72 T → [**outside?**
73 Ella >ye[s<
74 Ps [((la[ughter))
75 Anu [but may[be
76 T [actually I'm feeling rather comfortable here (.)

Ella elaborates her suggestion about a branch stating that the porcupine could sleep on the branch of the tree (lines 70-71). The teacher's response **'outside?'** overlaps with the end of her turn, which unfortunately cannot be heard, and it is uttered in an animated, loud voice, i.e. it is clearly acted in role. The teacher's emphatic response expresses disbelief and surprise and treats the proposal as impossible and preposterous (line 72). It can be seen as a type of candidate understanding that seems to seek confirmation for a particular way of understanding. The confirmation is given promptly by the prior speaker (line 73). The exchange of turns between Ella and the teacher is rewarded by the group's laughter (line 74). The negotiation about the branch ends with the teacher's non-accepting response, still in role 'actually I'm feeling rather comfortable here' (line 76).

The final example occurs in the last proposal sequence of the activity. In a bright voice, Ella makes a proposal 'tickling' thus suggesting that the squirrel should tickle the porcupine. The teacher treats it as a promising idea by using various ways of displaying understanding: she repeats the proposal, gives an assessment of it and finally formulates the idea for the group. Unlike in the other formulations, she now speaks in the teacher's role:

(28)

143	Ella	£tickling
144	T	↑tickling
145	Ps	((laughter))
146	T	↑that's↑ clever by the way
147	Ps	((some laughter))
148	T	ºthat's clever I've never thought about thatº (1.0)
149	→	so when little squirrel would tickle (.) porcupine
150		it would fall out of the tree=
151	Ella	=[y(h)es ((laughs))
152	Ps	[((some talk))

The teacher responds to Ella's one-word proposal 'tickling' by repeating it in a high-pitched rising voice, which is followed by the group's laughter. Then she goes on with an evaluative utterance, which is clearly spoken out of role (↑that's↑ clever by the way) thus attending to Ella's turn (line 146). With this evaluative comment, the teacher shows appreciation of the proposed solution. Her tone of voice is wondering as if spoken to herself, after which the group laughs in a pleased way. Having repeated the appreciative assessment in a quiet voice (line 148), the teacher begins to formulate the proposal: 'so when little squirrel would tickle (.) porcupine it would fall out of the tree'. The use of the conditional 'would' makes it sound like a hypothesis that needs testing. While speaking, the teacher looks at Ella who, as the prior

speaker, initiates a laughing confirmation in line 151. The function of the formulation seems to be to expand the one-word proposal to make sure that it is correctly understood, and Ella also treats the turn as one seeking for confirmation. Its purpose may also be to express the one-word proposal in a more precise form to offer the group also a chance to consider it, since the teacher has not yet accepted the proposal. Though it seems obvious that this is going to be the winner (i.e. the delighted repeat, the appreciative tone confirmed by the group's happy laughter), the squirrel's problem is not declared solved, but the teacher will still ask the group's opinion about the matter. Thus, the formulation may also be meant to help the pupils to focus on the proposed solution.

In sum, one of the teacher's techniques in the activity is to use formulations to summarise the prior talk during the negotiation instead of asking grammatical questions, and in each case they have been interpreted as questions seeking for confirmation. They do not in these instances create much talk, but brief continuing or agreeing responses from the pupils. Formulations display the speaker's understanding and draw the group's attention to the proposed idea, but with her formulations the teacher can also give the proposal a more comprehensive or precise form, as in the last example (Extract 28). Formulations can also add an element of fun by treating the proposals in a particular way, e.g. as successful, too demanding, preposterous, or as in the case of a repair, as problematic (discussed in 6.4.3.3). As we saw above, laughter or laughing responses from the pupils occur after the teacher's formulations one way or another. Thus these formulations, which the teacher mostly makes in role, bring a non-institutional character into the interaction with their humorous contents and the consequent laughter that they occasion. The partial repeats that the teacher uses as responses share similar non-institutional features with the teacher's formulations. Such repeats appear in everyday proposals when the recipient finds the proposal unexpected.

6.4.3.2 Partial repeats

In five proposal sequences the teacher does not respond to the pupils' proposals with a grammatical question, but repeats part or the whole of the proposal instead, i.e. uses partial repeat. Two of them are repair initiators and they are also interpreted as such by the pupils (discussed in 6.4.3.3). The partial repeats in the activity seem to occur in active or humorous passages where they acknowledge a proposal, but also display surprise and interest, or treat the suggested idea as successful. This is also heard in the teacher's interested or animated

voice, which further seems to add more fun to the lively context. In everyday situations, the use of a partial repeat after proposals means that the recipient of the prior utterance "displays that he has been informed", but that he does not accept the proposal. Something needs to be clarified, and the use of partial repeat may mean that the speaker needs more time to consider the proposal (Houtkoop 1987: 81). In the problem solving, the teacher's partial repeats have a similar function, and in three cases they are followed by the teacher's question. So a partial repeat may work like a buffer for the teacher's enquiry for further information, i.e. it is part of her opposing turn and seems very much in place in the problem solving activity, in which the teacher's task is to challenge each proposal. In this section, I will show and analyse only one instance in which the teacher uses a partial repeat. The partial repeats which are part of longer turns which question or evaluate pupils' proposals are discussed in their respective sections: 6.4.2 (Extract 21) and 6.4.3.1 (Extract 28).

In the example from the seventh sequence, the proposal about a ship is produced when the teacher is still responding to a pupil's turn after a lively passage:

(29)

100	T		it's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally
101	Ella		[(xx) act(h)u(h)ally a <u>ship</u>
102	Ps		[((some excited talk))
103	T	→	(£) a <u>ship</u>
104	Ella		<u>yes</u>=
105	T		£=<u>who's</u> going to build the ship
106	Ella		£the ↑squ<u>i</u>rrel
107	Ps		((laughter))

Ella initiates a new proposal in a bright smiley voice in line 101, which is unfortunately partly inaudible. This also interrupts the teacher who seems to hesitate where to move after negotiating about the prior idea (line 100). There is some excited, but rather quiet talk also going on and Ella's turn makes the group focus on a new idea. The teacher's '(£) a <u>ship</u>' (partial repeat) sounds interested when it acknowledges Ella's turn (line 103). Ella treats this as a 'communication-check' (Houtkoop 1987: 81) and affirms ('<u>yes</u>'), and she does not offer any further information about her plan. So the teacher has to do the necessary follow-up move, which gets Ella's smiling one-word response: it is the poor squirrel that has to do the job himself. The group also sees the humour of this and responds with laughter.

In brief, the teacher's partial repeats acknowledge or express interest or some other affect towards the suggested proposal and question it, but they also bring fun and a cheerful tone

into the interaction and often instigate laughter. They seem to be oriented to establishing a level of mutual understanding between the participants and also to treating the proposed solution in a particular way. Compared with the teacher's practical, grammatical follow-up questions, the teacher's surprised repeats do not sound critical, but collaborative while matching the lively interactional environment. They are occasioned by proposals that are initiated by one or more pupils, whereas the teacher’s grammatical questions tend to occur after proposals for which the teacher has nominated a pupil, i.e. in which case the talk-in-interaction appears more institutional. Two of the partial repeats initiate a repair, which will be discussed in the next section.

6.4.3.3 Repair

In the problem solving activity, repair is needed a few times. The teacher is involved in all these cases, though she is not always the initiator of the repair. Since I view repair as a means of clearing up the trouble (or possible trouble) during the negotiation, the analysis does not include those instances when participants occasionally hesitate or repeat an utterance, i.e. self-repair their turn, without anyone else's involvement in it. All the repairs thus involve both teacher and pupil one way or another. The problem solving game is both 'message-oriented' (focusing on transmission of thoughts, feelings and information) and 'activity-oriented' (with a focus on organization, rules and structure of the activity), and it does not deal with the forms or functions of the target language (van Lier 1988: 187-188). Thus, the teacher does not repair or correct any mistakes occurring in pupils' language use. In this kind of learning environment where the interaction is closer to ordinary conversation, repair is often 'conversational', i.e. the same kind of adjustment of problems as in everyday situations, and not ‘didactic repair’ the purpose of which is pedagogic. However, both kinds of repairs can be done in a 'conjunctive' or 'disjunctive' way: 'conjunctive repair' is designed to help, support and enable the pupil to repair his talk, whereas 'disjunctive repair' is designed to evaluate or challenge. (van Lier 1988: 184-191.) In the following, I will show how the participants in drama organise the repair and will also discuss the types of repair that are done by making comparisons with repair in ordinary everyday situations.

Misunderstanding, a loss of a word, or an accidental use of Finnish create an occasional need for the use of repair in the problem solving activity. In two cases, pupils initiate a repair (followed by self-repair or other-repair), and in three other situations, it is the teacher who

finds the pupil's turn problematic and initiates a pupil's self-repair or repairs the turn herself. Thus, in all these cases it is the teacher who is involved in clearing up the problem, which seems to be part of her institutional and natural role in class. In the following, I will first deal with the instances of a pupil's self-repair and a pupil-initiated other-repair, move on to two pupils' teacher-initiated self-repairs and finish with the other repair by the teacher.

In the first example, a pupil starts repairing her turn in Finnish (self-repair), which is cut short by the teacher's reassuring evaluation. This is in the middle of a negotiation sequence:

(30)

89	Asta		yes but everybodys who is squirrel's friend↑ would take ((gestures with hands))
90			that porcupine for three days and would give him a bed and food
91			and he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs))
92	Ps		[((laughter))
93	Asta	→	so nobody's food would end >eiku<
94	T		= °↑yeah that's right↑°
95	Asta		yes and everybody would survive (.)

In line 93, Asta initiates a self-repair: she probably starts to doubt the correctness of her elaborated turn and initiates a repair in Finnish (‘so nobody’s food would end >eiku<’). The teacher cuts in quickly in a brisk and reassuring way: "°↑yeah that's right↑°" (line 94). Her turn appears almost automatic while latching with Asta's slipshod, and it conveniently stops the use of Finnish, but also encourages the pupil to go on. The teacher's turn is a typical evaluation turn in the IRE sequence which here seems to encourage Asta to continue, i.e. it is an unobtrusive and quietly-uttered turn, which does not seem to interrupt or aim at taking the floor, but allows Asta to finish her turn. Asta has also shown that she wants to continue since her intonation at the end of line 93 is not falling. Now she acknowledges the teacher's turn with an affirmative and finishes her turn (line 95). The teacher's reassurance occurs in the middle of Asta's turn, but it is an aligning turn and does not interrupt Asta's train of thought.

The second example is a pupil's self-initiated other-repair, in which the problem is not-knowing the word that is needed for the proposal:

(31)

65	Ella		so is it a big tree where the squirrel is living ((gazes at the teacher))
66	T		it's huge
67	Ella	→	so I think there's mitä on oksa ((gazes at the teacher))
68	Olli		(xx[x)
69	T		[a branch
70	Ella		branch so I think there is another branch too (.) so that’s where the (1.0) err (.)
71			porcupine can sleep and maybe that squirrel [(x)

In line 65, Ella is ready to make the fourth proposal in the activity, but she needs some information concerning the drama and turns to the teacher for the answer: Is the tree where the squirrel lives big? Having that settled, she starts her suggestion, but apparently notices that she cannot remember the key word, code-switches into Finnish and asks the question ‘so I think there’s mitä on oksa’ (line 67). So her turn initiates a 'self-initiated other-repair' in which a pupil needs a more competent speaker (the teacher or another pupil) to help overcome the linguistic problem. This form of repair occurs quite regularly in L2 classrooms, but not in general conversation (van Lier 1988: 201). Both Olli, sitting beside Ella, and the teacher respond. Olli's response comes a little earlier (his turn is not unfortunately heard), but Ella gazes at the teacher and thus considers her the principal recipient of her question. Having heard the teacher's response, she repeats the word and proceeds to make her proposal (lines 70-71). The fact that the pupil turns to the teacher is natural, because she is a sure source of information in class. The teacher assists the pupil who has needed information and asked for help, and the repair is conjunctive by nature. The focus of the repair is on the language use (i.e. a medium-oriented goal).

The next example is a teacher-initiated pupil’s self-repair. It deals with a suggestion which appears unclear, and the pupil who has made it has to repair his turn. The teacher's counter-argument works as a repair-initiator and later she also helps with the repair by rephrasing it in English:

(32)

25	T		Esa
26	Esa		£the squirrel should give porcupine some food
27	T		some <u>fo[od</u>
28	Ps		[((so[me laughter))
29	T	→	[but he's been giving it to me all the time and what do you do then
30	Ps		((smiles, talk, 5 sec.))
31	Esa		◦£(xxx) mukaan◦ ((addresses the teacher))
32	T	→	oh so that you could give me some food <u>with</u> me (.)
33			and then I would go away
34	Esa		[ºye(h)sº
35	T		[remember the <u>rain</u>

In line 26, Esa makes a proposal suggesting that the squirrel should give the porcupine some food. In her response the teacher uses a partial repeat emphasising 'food’, which works as a repair initiator (line 27) (The group's laughter occurs at this point and it is unclear what it is targeted at: the teacher's cheerful surprise or Esa's proposal) The teacher's partial repeat and her further statement followed by a question ('what do you do then’) show how Esa's turn is

problematic (line 29): the squirrel has been giving the porcupine food all the time, so why should he go on feeding him. This explanation and question by the teacher makes a better suggestion relevant, and Esa starts a repair for his non-successful turn by code-switching into Finnish (line 31). He directs his repair to the teacher and since he is sitting almost next to her, he is able to settle the problem rather quickly in a quiet voice. Esa may have picked up Finnish as an easier and more reliable medium to clear up the misunderstanding. And having resorted to Finnish, he may have wanted to settle the case privately and not violate the unwritten rule that Finnish should not be used in an English lesson.

In lines 32-33, the teacher formulates Esa's proposal in English thus producing an other-repair ('oh so that you could give me some food with me (.) and then I would go away'), looking at Esa and addressing her words specifically to him. She begins her formulation with an oh-receipt which can be seen as a receipt of information, that is, she is now an informed recipient of talk, and also as a sign of alignment (see Nofsinger 1991: 116-117). The teacher formulates Esa's idea in role in a good-humoured tone, and unlike in her prior turn (line 29), in which she refers to the squirrel in the third person singular, she now includes Esa in the drama frame addressing him as the squirrel: 'so that you could give me some food with me (.)'. The teacher's formulation of her new understanding of Esa's proposal also includes the porcupine's suggested future action: 'and then I would go away' (line 33) in a similar way which is used in formulations in news interviews (e.g. Heritage and Roth 1995). Esa gives his confirmation in line 34 simultaneously with the teacher's next turn. The teacher does not wait for Esa's confirmation here, but her turn argues against Esa's idea in the form of a directive 'remember the rain' (line 35). This seems to redirect the focus of talk to another aspect in the drama situation.

After Esa's privately made repair, the teacher's formulation, Esa's subsequent confirmation and the overlapping rejection (lines 32-35) take the interaction back to the general forum and set the activity back on its track. Firstly, the teacher uses here her normal pitch, which means that she also directs her talk to the whole group, not only to Esa whom she is talking to, which is also the interviewer's task at news interviews, i.e. the talk should be "talk for overhearers" Clayman and Heritage 2002: 97). Secondly, the teacher retains the drama context by speaking in role when she rephrases Esa's clarification, and this also gives the impression that the problem is settled and the game can go on. The teacher expects Esa to explain and clear up the misunderstanding and allows him to do it as if privately in Finnish, which seems the most

considerate way of dealing with the problem. In brief, the teacher has used conversational repairing that focuses on the information that the pupil is transmitting (i.e. a message-oriented goal), viz. her counter-argument has initiated a repair in which the trouble-source is cleared up by the speaker himself.

The fourth example concerns a teacher-initiated self-repair. It occurs at the end of the activity after the teacher has considered one of the proposals a promising one, i.e. the squirrel could tickle the porcupine so that he would fall out of the tree. Now the teacher wants to ask for the group's opinion about the idea and thus get their acceptance. Iris initiates a one-word turn after a short lapse:

(33)

153	T		what do you think of this solution
154			(1.0)
155	Iris		cruel
156	T	→	↑cruel?
157	Iris		£but great
158			(2.0)

Iris's one-word turn receives the teacher's response in line 156 (repair initiator), which repeats Iris's turn and is uttered with a rising intonation. It shows surprise, but also questions the opinion: Is tickling such a cruel way of getting rid of the porcupine? Iris indeed changes her opinion slightly and adds a positive evaluation of the suggested solution. Again this repair, though it is not initiated by the current speaker, can be labelled as ‘conversational repair’ that could occur in everyday situations and without the danger of much or any loss of face. Its function is to question the thought that the pupil is expressing (i.e. a message-oriented goal).

It is clear that the focus during the whole activity is on the smooth running of the game and the teacher never corrects pupils' mistakes in the use of English. However, the last example shows that language can matter, if Finnish accidentally replaces English. Here the pupil starts her proposal in Finnish, and the teacher instructs her to use English instead:

(34)

129	T		(x) Asta
130	Asta		täs pitäis niinku
131	T	→	>ok say it in English you know how to do it<=
132	Asta		((laughs unsurely)) =err somehow (1.0) go (.) tai >sillee< ((gestures))
133			that porcupine's emotion feelings (.) that (.) that (.)squirrel should say that
134			£if <u>you</u> came <u>here</u> and I had food for myself
135			but now when you are here we <u>both</u> will die
135			so it's better that just <u>you</u> will [die ((laughs))

137 Ps [((very loud laughter))

Asta initiates a turn in order to start a new proposal and uses Finnish: she seems eager to speak, but the teacher's instructional obligation is to interrupt and prompt her to use the target language (line 131). Her reminder of the fact (or a repair initiator) is brisk, but it ends with a reassuring note. Asta apparently has some difficulties in formulating her idea in English (line 132): she hesitates and mixes Finnish with English, but soon manages to express her proposal clearly finishing with laughter, and is rewarded by a strong laughing response from the audience. The teacher's repair initiator reminds the pupil about the right procedure, and seems very unlikely outside the classroom. It prompts the pupil in a positive way, but the teacher's didactic finger seems to be up in a 'disjunctive' way in her repair. The activity requires the use of English, not just the presentation of one's ideas (i.e. activity-oriented language function).

In sum, repair occurs very rarely during the activity, and though the teacher is involved in all of them in her institutional role, she mostly treats the trouble-sources by using conversational repair that is common in non-institutional settings. Repair is one form of the speakers' alignment and collaboration. Another kind of alignment is the topic of the next section, viz. how the pupils propose suggestions or respond to them collaboratively and collectively.

6.5 Pupils' collaborative participation

The earlier sections of this chapter have looked into the ways in which the teacher leads the negotiation with the help of follow-up questions and challenging yes/no-questions and negotiates for understanding by using formulations, partial repeat and repair. This section is going to focus on the pupils' participation seen as collaborative action during the negotiation. The pupils are studied as individual members of a school class, i.e. an association or a collectivity (Lerner 1993: 214), whose participation as a group or a team is made visible at some points during the activity. The problem solving game as a classroom activity presents opportunities for different kinds of participation by individual pupils as well as conjoined participation as a group. Mostly it is the individual participants who make proposals and take turns during the game, but the pupils also propose and respond to the teacher's questions together or treat a given proposal as the whole group's idea. The group also participates in concert as an ensemble by giving a choral response to the teacher's question and by producing laughing responses throughout the activity. In this way, there are three types of collaborative

action visible in the interaction taken by individual pupils, several participants and the whole group.

The pupils' collaborative participation in the problem solving game is discussed in the following way: Firstly, the pupils' initiations for proposals are studied as collaborative contributions in the drama activity. Secondly, I will look into the ways in which the pupils occasionally act as a team by joining in each other's initiations, by responding together or by taking someone else's turn. The last item of study deals with the group's ensemble participation in the form of shared laughter.

6.5.1 Pupils' proposals

As is seen in the examples of the previous sections of the analysis, there are two turn taking systems used in the initiations of the pupils' proposals, i.e. the one in which the teacher nominates a pupil (five cases) and the other in which the pupils self-initiate proposals without the allocation of turns (five cases). Those proposals which involve the nomination of turns are mostly also elicited by the teacher (four cases). Besides these broad differences in turn taking, the proposals themselves vary in their design. This section will show examples of each type of proposal and the analysis will focus on the form of the proposals and the character and form of the prior turns after which they are initiated, i.e. the context in which they are made. Before the study of the examples of the pupils' proposals, I will briefly discuss collaborative action in the classroom and interaction in general.

Carrying out the problem solving game requires co-operation between the participants in the same way as any classroom activity. The teacher thus expects the pupils to learn the rules of the game by observing the way in which she starts dealing with their proposals as well as to follow the teacher's lead and help her to build the activity cooperatively, i.e. the rules are not specifically taught, but presumed as is the case in classroom interaction in general (Levinson 1992: 89-91). Moreover, the turn-by-turn negotiation between teacher and pupils requires collaboration in different structures of discourse in the same way as any conversation. As Linell (1998: 74) explains: the discourse is shaped through the collaboration of the interactants as regards participation, interaction, content and negotiation of meaning. Thus, topics are typically joint constructions, since more than one person are needed to establish something as a topic. Similarly, their development and closing are managed collaboratively.

All in all, speakers engaged in mutual talk (viz. in different communicative projects) can be considered "partners in concerted activities". When we see participants in drama making proposals, and thus creating topics to be developed together, they collaborate with their teacher and classmates to make the problem solving work.

The pupils' initiation to the problem solving activity happens through the teacher's model rather than detailed explanation. So when the teacher leads the group into the drama activity, she does not specifically explain the procedure, which is to have the pupils making suggestions and the teacher non-accepting them one by one. Instead, the teacher first states her role as the porcupine and asks the pupils in pairs to think of ways in which the little squirrel could solve the problem. After this initial phase, the teacher begins in the role of the porcupine:

(35)

1	T	I'm the huge porcupine now and I'm sitting in the doorway (.)
2		ok so what is little squirrel going to do about me
3		because I've just told him that I haven't got a problem
4		he has got one
5		(1.0) ((gazes around the circle))
6		ºwhat could little squirrel doº (.)
7		ºhave you any suggestionsº

If we consider the teacher's model above, two important clues seem to be offered to the pupils: first, the teacher speaks in role and second, the pupils are now supposed to answer the teacher's eliciting question and make the proposal, which they have also had a chance to plan in pairs. When the pupil has made the proposal, the teacher's responsive move works as a model for the pupils, who will soon learn that each idea will be negotiated about between teacher and pupils until the most promising proposal is found. The procedure that is taken is thus learned through the interaction that is evolving. In fact, this type of interactional pattern for this activity is not self-evident, as the teacher could well have used another way of carrying out the game, e.g. by receiving and writing down pupils' proposals, which then could have been voted for or discussed at the end of the collecting phase.

Next, I will look at the pupils' proposals which are introduced in the following order: first, the proposals which the pupils make after the teacher's elicitation questions; second, the proposals for which the teacher nominates a pupil who bids to speak one way or another; third, the proposals initiated by the pupils without the teacher's nomination.

In this problem solving game, the teacher receives ten proposals from the pupils, nine of which she non-accepts, until she finds the tenth suggestion a promising solution, which then becomes accepted together. The teacher elicits proposals four times by using an almost identical conditional question asking what the little squirrel could or would do to get the porcupine out of his house. She asks the questions in her institutional role. The eliciting questions seem to affect the form or the scope of the proposals at least in some cases. The first proposal, as a response to the teacher's elicitation in the example above (lines 6-7), also seems to take the form of the teacher's question into account. The teacher nominates the speaker, which shows that there is an orientation towards the usual classroom practice of getting the floor through bidding to answer (the actual bidding to speak is not seen on the tape):

(36)

8	T		Ella
9	Ella	→	ok I would say to you that I know I have a ↑problem
10			and the problem is you (.) because you have those (.) quills
11			and if you are willing to (.) take off those quills
12			a:ll those quills we can live together

Ella uses a reporting clause in the conditional 'ok I would say to you' (line 9), which matches the conditional in the teacher's wh-question: '°what could little squirrel do°' (Example 1, line 6). Then Ella continues speaking in role addressing her talk to the porcupine as the little squirrel, and also creates a convincing dramatic scene through prosody by stressing the key words. By adopting the squirrel's role, she displays her willingness to join in the drama, i.e. to 'submit herself' to the drama context (Bolton 1992).

In the second proposal sequence, the teacher's elicitation question also guides the form of the pupil's response, i.e. the pupil's proposal is designed to match the conditional in the teacher's question. (Teacher: 'what else (.) could little squirrel try to do'(line 23); Esa: 'the squirrel could give porcupine some food' (line 26)) Moreover, the sentence structure of the proposal corresponds to the structure of the eliciting question. The proposal is addressed to the teacher and not to the teacher's role figure, porcupine. In this case, the pupil has also bid to make his proposal, and the whole sequence and is analysed in detail in section 6.4.3.3 (Example 32).

The two other elicitation questions which the teacher asks get different types of responses, i.e. proposals which are formed differently. Both elicited proposals, however, seem to take the teacher's eliciting question into account, at least to some extent. The teacher elicits the eighth proposal, nominates a pupil whose hand is lifted by the pupil next to her, and receives a laughingly produced plan, which suggests the use of a knife. (Teacher: 'what would you do

then if you were those little squirrels' (line 114); Tea: 'ok this l(h)ittle sq(h)uirrel (.) have to has a ↑kn(h)ife bec(h)ause (.) (line 119)) The beginning of Tea's longer proposal shows how the teacher's 'little squirrel' is recycled in her response in a precise way. The eighth proposal is discussed in Section 6.4.1 (Example 18).

Further, the teacher elicits the tenth proposal in the activity by animating the last part of her questioning turn while she pictures the porcupine: '<!he is just sitting in the doorway being very big!>' (line 141). As a response, a pupil initiates a one-word exclamation '£tickling' (line143). This proposal can be understood in connection with the teacher's turn, and it seems that the teacher's dramatization of the well-fed porcupine in the doorway has inspired the idea of using tickling as a solution. This is the winning idea in the tenth proposal sequence.

In the second type of initiation of proposals, a pupil bids for a chance to make a suggestion. The sixth and ninth proposal sequences are started with the teacher's nomination. In both cases, it is the same pupil who attracts the teacher's attention so as to be able to express her idea (not seen on tape). This occurs either after joint participation or some talk by several pupils and thus appears to be a practical means of getting the floor. The following example shows how the sixth proposal is introduced by Asta:

(37)

85	Ps	[(xx)
86	T	[Asta
87	Asta →	they should (.) do agreement (.) >you know<
88	T	>what kind of agreement<
89	Asta	yes but everybodys who is squirrel's friend↑ (.) would take ((gestures))
90		that porcupine for three days and would give him a bed and food
91		and he would go £around that la[n(h)d ((laughs and draws a circle in the air))
92	Ps	[((laughter))

The teacher nominates Asta (line 86), who initiates her proposal at a very general level adding a conversational '>you know<' to her turn (line 87). The teacher's latching follow-up question directs Asta to introduce her plan. Asta's proposal is elaborated with a recontextualized detail from the drama story (three days, bed and food), and it finishes in a coherent way (not shown here). It seems that Asta has had a comprehensive plan in store and by bidding to speak she makes sure that she is able to deliver it. The whole proposal sequence is studied in Section 6.4.1 (Examples 15 and 16). The second time when the same pupil makes a proposal happens in a similar way: Asta bids for a chance to speak and again produces a comprehensive, elaborated plan for getting rid of the porcupine.

Finally, on four occasions, the pupils initiate their proposals without the teacher's allocation of turns, but choosing the moment that seems right for it, and thus orienting to the turn taking rules of everyday talk. The common feature in three of these cases is that they seem to be connected to the previous topic, i.e. the prior proposal or the teacher's turn has occasioned them. As an example of this type of initiation, the following excerpt shows a proposal which suggests that the squirrel could teach the porcupine to build a house. The suggestion follows the teacher's response to the previous proposal which suggests that she should sit on the branch:

(38)

72	T		**[outside?**
73	Ella		>ye[s<
74	Ps		[((la[ughter))
75	Anu		[but may[be
76	T		[actually I'm feeling rather comfortable here (.)
77	Anu	→	but maybe but maybe the squirrel could (.) <u>teach</u> porcupine
78			to build own house in the [(x) ((gazes at the teacher))

Anu's first effort to initiate her proposal (line 75) is not successful, since the teacher does not hear her or is focusing on giving her non-accepting response to the proposal about the branch (line 76). After the teacher's turn, Anu restarts and produces a tentatively proposed solution to the problem, i.e. the squirrel could teach the porcupine to build a house for himself so that she would not have to stay outside (lines 77-78). The way in which she self-selects and continues the previous topic shows an orientation to the turn-taking system of ordinary talk.

The last example of a pupil-initiated proposal differs from the previously discussed initiations in an interesting way. The fourth proposal sequence begins with a presequence, a preliminary inquiry about the conditions for making a suggestion. As Nofsinger (1991:56) puts it, "presequences establish information relevant to how workable the projected action will be", in this case, how workable Ella's proposal would be. Ella self-selects her request in line 65 (i.e. the first pair part of the adjacency pair of the presequence) while there is some quiet talk after the negotiation of the previous proposal:

(39)

64	Ps		((quiet talk, 4 sec.))
65	Ella	→	so is it a big tree where that squirrel is living ((gazes at the teacher))
66	T		it's huge
67	Ella		so I think there's mitä on oksa ((gazes at the teacher))
68	Olli		(xx[x)

69 T [a branch
70 Ella → branch so I think there is another branch too (.) so that's where the (1.0) err (.)
71 porcupine can sleep and maybe that squirrel [(x)
72 T [**outside**

In line 65, Ella checks information about the drama reality, i.e. whether the tree where the squirrel lives is big. Her yes/no-question seems to expect a positive response, and the teacher's response 'huge' aligns with Ella's question (line 66) (i.e. the second pair part of the adjacency pair). Thus, Ella is building her proposal on the drama context and turns to the teacher, who is the knowledgeable person in the game, to make sure of the conditions. However, Ella's proposal is not initiated until lines 70-71, after a repair sequence (lines 67-70). She presents her idea repeating the earlier phrase 'I think', which shows her orientation to the practices of ordinary talk. ('I think' is a way of expressing a speaker's stance, i.e. it frames a statement before it is made (Kärkkäinen 2002: 94).) The teacher's dramatised opposing turn in line 72 interrupts Ella's turn.

In sum, in these instances when a pupil bids for to make a proposal, there is an orientation to institutional turn taking visible in interaction. In the first two proposal sequences, bidding to speak occurs after the teacher's eliciting question, which may have projected this form of institutional orientation. In the other cases, however, bidding to speak seems to be a necessary means of getting the floor in a multi-party event, since there has been some simultaneous talk going on, as shown in Example 37. On these occasions, pupils also seem to make more carefully formulated proposals. However, there is another orientation visible in the initiations of proposals, i.e. pupils initiate their ideas without asking for the floor and use the turn taking system of ordinary talk instead. The previous proposal or the wider drama context may have helped with the initiation of these proposals, as seen in Examples 38 and 39. So the construction and initiation of topics seems to have taken place through the collaboration of the participants in drama.

6.5.2 Pupils' conjoined participation

This section describes and analyses the ways in which the pupils in the problem solving activity participate jointly when making a proposal, responding to the teacher or joining in the negotiation. The pupils' joint participation resembles collaboration as a team, i.e. two or more people take an aligning action in a conversation. I will start by briefly introducing the concept of the 'teaming up' of two or more speakers in interaction and by discussing the

characteristics of the pupils' conjoined participation in the problem solving game. This is followed by the analysis of the different types of cases in which the pupils act together.

According to Kangasharju (1996: 291-293), there are situations that favour the formation of interactional teams, i.e. two or more participants aligning in the interaction (Lerner 1987 as quoted by Kangasharju 1996). They are situations in which participants are divided into opposing sides (e.g. situations involving disagreement or competition) or situations in which participants explain or tell a story collaboratively. Interactants in a multi-party event can be members of a pre-established association or a collectivity, such as a football team, or there may be only two sides in a multi-party situation, since one side is treated as a collectivity, such as a school class or a press conference. These different associations are potentially available to the interactants, but they do not have to be made interactionally relevant by the participants in a conversation. Instead, the participants who act as a team make it visible to the other participants by acting as an association. Lerner's term 'interactional team' particularly refers to associations which emerge spontaneously in interaction. Acting as a team can also bring 'team talk' to conversation, such as continuing, completing or repairing the talk of other team members or taking a turn on behalf of another member.

The pupils in the drama activity are thus members of a pre-established association as a school class, but in the problem solving game, they are also seen as another kind of pre-established group, as they now represent the squirrel's view and take his side which is opposite to the teacher's side. This kind of game may turn into a multi-party event in which interactional teams are formed and joint action is taken, but it is not an automation, i.e. it is up to the participants how they will manage the activity locally. In the problem solving activity of my data, such collaborative action between the pupils takes place at certain points.

The pupils start to participate conjointly in the mid-part of the activity after two proposal sequences. It seems that the participants have gradually become acquainted with the negotiation practice that is being followed and feel confident enough to digress from the conventional turn taking system in classrooms. During the drama activity, several types of collaboration can be detected: firstly, pupils join in and support a suggestion that is made by one pupil, or a pupil continues another pupil's proposal. Secondly, pupils produce responses in pairs or as a group to the teacher's questions. Thirdly, a pupil joins in the interaction with a comment. In these cases, a pupil or pupils have understood the activity as a game in which the

teacher plays on one side and the group together on the other side. Accordingly, the teacher's comments or enquiries are sometimes seen as being addressed to the whole group and not to individual participants, which gives everybody a right to participate at particular points during the negotiation.

The first example concerns a jointly made proposal in which several pupils join in and support the proposal. This co-participation occurs in the third proposal sequence which begins after a small lapse in interaction. Simo, lying on the floor in a relaxed way, makes a proposal about an umbrella (part of it not audible on the tape). It is possible that it is the proposal that Simo and his partner have already discussed during the preparation phase in pairs, and now more pupils nearby join in and repeat the word 'umbrella'. On the other hand, the group may also have wanted to make sure that Simo's rather quietly uttered turn is heard. The teacher correctly understands that the porcupine should be given an umbrella and be sent off into the rain.

(40)

35	T	[remember the <u>rain</u>	
36		(2.0)	
37	Simo	(xx) umbre[lla	
38	Ps →	[um[brella	
39	Pia	[that's your pro[blem	
40	T	[an £umbr↑[ella	
41	Ps		[((lau[ghter))

Simo’s new proposal about the use of an umbrella (not all audible on tape) is supported or made heard by several pupils nearby (lines 37-38). It responds to the teacher’s turn: since it is raining, an umbrella might solve the problem. The jointly made proposal instigates lively but orderly action: the evolving turns are all short and there is plenty of partial overlapping of turns (not all shown here). (Pia's 'that's your problem' seems a belated response to the teacher's closing turn in the prior sequence (line 39)). Thus, the pupils who supported Simo's suggestion about the umbrella interpreted the game as a joint activity played as a team. Whether the pupils had an idea ready in mind or they helped Arto to get his proposal heard points at the same thing, viz. collaboration between participants.

This is the only time when a suggestion is made jointly by several pupils. It is perhaps surprising, since the pupils planned their ideas in pairs before the game and they could have expressed their ideas together at least occasionally. In this case, the support is clearly wider

than just the back up from the work partner. The interactional pattern between teacher and pupils allows conjointly made suggestions and this time the group takes this opportunity. Its role seems to be to support the pupils' side of the game and increase the fun of playing the game together, of which the group's laughter is a proof. The conjointly made proposal may also have an important function as a creator of more conjoined participation which is visible in this particular proposal sequence, i.e. the pupils produce conjoined responses three times in this long sequence about the topic of the squirrel's umbrella. The two other cases involving joint responses are examined later in this section.

In the next example, a single pupil joins in another pupil's suggestion by adding a new item and thus elaborating the original idea. First, Ella suggests the use of a ship in order to get rid of the porcupine (the beginning of the turn is unfortunately not audible on the tape):

(41)

100	T	it's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally	
101	Ella →		[(xx) act(h)ually a ship
102	Ps		[((some excited talk))
103	T	(£) a ship	
104	Ella	yes=	
105	T	=£who's going to build the ship	
106	Ella	£the ↑squirrel	
107	Ps	((laughter))	
108	Anu →	and all (1.0) her (.) or his friends (1.0)	
109	Ella →	they are going to do you a ↑ni:ce ship with (1.0) a:(h)ll the	
110		f(h)o[od you c(h)an eat then >bye b(h)ye s(h)ee yo[u<	
111	Ps	[((some laughter))	

The teacher responds to Ella's proposal first with a partial repeat (line 103), and after Ella's response, asks a follow-up question (line 105). Ella utters her response, '£the ↑squirrel' smiling (line 106), perhaps meaning that the squirrel will be only too eager to help the porcupine to go). After the group's appreciative laughter, Anu, sitting beside Ella, initiates a continuation. 'with all (1.0) her (.) or his friends' (line 108). Anu's continuing turn adds a new ingredient to the proposal and thus resembles 'team talk' between the members of an interactional team (Kangasharju 1996: 292). With her turn Anu thus displays the co-authorship of the proposal.

In all three drama lessons, Anu has been working as Ella's partner and their co-participation here seems very natural, viz. Anu's conjoining turn aligns with Ella's turn as affiliative support. Ella and Anu may also have considered this proposal together in the preparation

phase, and the idea of the squirrel and his friends may have been part of the original plan. In that case, this is not a spontaneously produced ‘team talk’, but a mutually planned idea that is presented as a joint action. After Anu’s turn, there is a brief lapse in talk, after which Ella takes the floor and acts out a humorous summary that closes the jointly made proposal: 'they are going to do you a ↑ni:ce ship with (1.0) a:(h)ll the f(h)ood you c(h)an eat then bye b(h)ye s(h)ee you' (lines 109-110). The animated turn is addressed to the porcupine. The audience sees the humour in Ella's turn, and participates with a laughing response. This is the end of the conjointly constructed suggestion, which is proposed together by two participants in collaboration. Ella’s closing turn is made in a tempting manner: through laughter and in an animated voice. It also includes a recontextualised item from a previous proposal (there would be food for the porcupine to eat) as well as dramatised good-byes uttered in a mocking way.

The next three examples deal with another kind of joint action that the pupils take when they respond to the teacher's yes/no-questions and formulation, which are thus interpreted as questioning turns to the whole group. In the first example, the sequence starts with Anu's proposal which suggests that the squirrel could teach the porcupine to build his own house (lines 77-78). The teacher's response to the proposal overlaps partly with the end of Anu's turn:

(42)

78	Anu	but maybe but maybe the squirrel could (.) teach porcupine	
79		to build own house in the [(x)	
80	T		[but] could they do it (.) while it's raining
81	Anu	y[es	
82	Ps →	[yes	
83	T	do you think so	
84	Ella	[(x(h)x)	
85	Ps →	[(xxx)	

The teacher's opposing turn in the form of a yes/no-question to Anu’s proposal questions the plausability of the idea of teaching the porcupine to build a house (line 80). Anu produces a short affirmative answer which is accompanied by several agreeing voices joining in almost simultaneously (lines 81-82). The responses are dispreferred answers from the teacher’s point of view, since the teacher’s doubtful yes/no-question has expressed the porcupine’s stance that opposes all efforts to make him leave the house. The group responds to the question according to their role as the squirrel and gives a positive answer, which thus favours their cause, and here the pupils have acted as a team and supported Anu's proposal. The teacher's yes/no-question with its limited choice for an answer makes it an apt instigator of a joint action. On

the other hand, the question may have suggested a brief negotiation concerning the circumstances for the squirrel and the porcupine, but was responded in a different way. In line 83, the episode begins to close, and the teacher adds another doubtful yes/no-question seeking for the group's confirmation on the matter one more time. Like her previous question, the teacher's enquiry gets several simultaneous responses (one louder than the others), which unfortunately are not audible on the tape (lines 84-85). Thus, the pupils' participation as a team is made relevant in the interaction twice in the short passage. The choral responses which pupils may give to the teacher's questions in ordinary lessons differ from these joint responses, since choral responses in the classroom tend to produce the obvious joint answer, i.e. the talk may be designed to make a choral response by the class relevant (Lerner 1993: 219). In the case of problem solving, the teacher does not design her turn to get a particular response from the group, but may expect any opposing turn in the game instead.

The next two examples also show how the teacher's formulation gets responses from two pupils. The responses display an orientation to acting as a team, and the teacher's turn is thus interpreted as addressed to the whole group. Both the responses occur in the third proposal sequence, which has developed in a lively manner after a conjointly made suggestion about the use of an umbrella. The extract begins with the teacher's turn, in which she questions the suggestion about the umbrella (line 47):

(43)
47 T ok so you are telling me to go away with a little [umbrella and some food
48 Ps [((some laughter and talk))
49 Olli º£that's righ[tº
50 Ella → [ye(h)s (x(h)x) ((laughs loudly))
51 T [>but I guess that I would take the quills with me
52 would it be a good idea to leave all the quills [in the k squirrel's house<

The teacher's comment inspires a laughing response as well as an agreement 'º£that's rightº' from Olli followed by Ella's laughingly uttered affirmative in line 50 (not all audible on tape), which slightly overlaps with the prior turn. Thus, Ella agrees with Olli's opinion and offers both her support and view on the matter. Though this could seem like a simple agreement with the prior speaker, Ella's agreeing turn appears as a display of an alignment with Olli, because it is directed to the teacher as the primary recipient (see Kangasharju 1996: 294). It also seems to show Ella's overall orientation to the drama activity as a multi-party event where participation rules are not so constrained. After these two confirming responses, the teacher starts another line in her argument and takes up the topic of quills (line 51-52).

Later on in this proposal sequence, the same pupils again respond to the teacher's yes/no-question together, but now it is not a matter of similar teaming up. The teacher's enquiry occurs in the last exchange of turns in the negotiation of the third proposal, and it asks the pupils to consider whether the porcupine would go after all, i.e. to judge themselves if their proposal would work:

(44)
59 T but °do you think that the porcupine would go° (.)
60 Ella £no I don't think [so
61 Olli → [£°ye:s°
62 Ps ((laughter))
63 T I mean-

Again the teacher's yes/no-question displays her doubt on the feasibility of the proposal that has been negotiated about (line 59). It expresses the teacher's epistemic stance on the matter and from her point of view the right answer is negative. Ella's response '£no I don't think so' sounds thoughtful, and it agrees with the teacher's stance (a preferred response in line 60)). Olli, however, gives a smiling, elongated '°£ye:s°', which overlaps with the end of Ella's turn. The opposite responses and Olli's pleasant tone may have caused the group's laughing response. The teacher's repair 'I mean' sounds hesitant and may be caused by the opposite responses (line 63). Ella's and Olli's opposing turns seem to show that the participants may also orient to the drama activity as a multi-party event in which the expression of divergent opinions is quite alright for members of the team.

In sum, teaming up during the problem solving game is not very common, but the cases discussed above show that pupils do not speak only during their assigned turns and participate one person at a time. Instead, it seems natural for pupils to participate in the negotiation collaboratively, or join in an initiated response. The occasional, humorous remarks also prove that pupils see fun being part and parcel of a drama activity. Thus, pupils orient to the problem solving activity as a multi-party event in which the teacher's turns are at times addressed to the whole group, which makes the pupils' conjoined participation relevant in interaction. The following section examines another kind of collaborative action, i.e. shared laughter as ensemble participation.

6.5.3 Ensemble participation through laughter

In the problem solving game, the group is thus seen to participate conjointly at times, and on one occasion, the pupils produce a choral response (discussed in Section 6.4.2, Example 2). But as has been noted in the analysed passages, there is another kind of ensemble participation that is visible all through the activity in the form of the group's laughing responses. It has an important role in the running of the game as a supportive and encouraging factor in the interaction, besides being an expression of emotion and the instigator of fun. In the following, I will first briefly discuss the study of laughter in interaction, and then focus on the different kinds of instances in which pupils respond and participate with shared laughter.

Within conversation analysis, laughing is considered a socially organized activity that is methodically produced, i.e. it is not out of speakers' control and there are rules about when and where laughing is allowed. Laughter has traditionally been associated with jokes and humour, but it is seen to have many more interactional meanings. Laughter is also a great interactional resource and it is believed to be a guarantee of a successful interaction making interaction work. (Haakana 1999: 5-25) As Sacks (1992: 745-746) points out, laughing does not follow the same rules as speaking: its placing is crucial, since it is tied to the previous utterance and cannot be postponed. Laughing does not obey the 'one party at a time'-rule, since often several people laugh together. Laughing has a reason: you laugh at something at a point in a conversation and it is not hindered by speaker-turns.

Laughter in the problem solving activity has a significant role in the ways mentioned above, e.g. it often follows or coincides with a witty remark or an enactment as a natural part of the interaction. Thus, it seems to function as a reward after a good shot in the game, in the same way as applause is used by the audience at a performance. Furthermore, laughing responses with this group are collaborative in character: they are produced together, or at least by several participants, and seem to be targeted at the same thing in a supportive way. It is noticeable that in this drama activity, participants' laughter does not appear as a means of alignment between the members of the pupils' side only, which may be the function of laughter at a multi-party event between two opposing sides (see Kangasharju 1996: 317), but the group's laughing responses seem to reward humorous or witty contributions indiscriminately whether they are made by the teacher or the pupils. 'Shared laughter', however, refers here to the pupils' laughing responses, because the teacher does not join in the actual bursts of laughter. This seems quite natural in the institutional setting, i.e. the teacher acts in her professional role, and by keeping a positive, but not an overly amused stance, she

seems to treat the drama play seriously as a valid learning context and the pupils as a seriously-taken drama group. Haakana (1999: 280) observes a similar feature in doctors' laughing practices, in which doctors pursue professional cautiousness and neutrality by not laughing as much or as often as their patients. Moreover, the teacher is the initiator of almost half of the 'laughables', so part of their humorous impact could have been lost if the teacher had cued them as funny, i.e. marked them as humorous with laughter. Finally, the video recorder did not manage to capture the teacher's face from the front (from the side at the most), so her possible laughter could not be shown unfortunately. However, the teacher's voice was clearly heard at all times, and no distinct laughter, except at the end of the game, could be detected.

In the following, I will look into the audience laughter in the problem solving activity considering the context in which the laughter occurs and examine what makes the group laugh, i.e. who or what initiates the pupils' laughing responses. When answering this question, I will use a straightforward 'pragmatic criterion', suggested by Adelswärd (1989: 113), which states that "the person who first introduces something to laugh at – a laughable – issues the invitation". However, according to Haakana (1999: 56), it may not be easy to pinpoint the initiator of laughter, since interactants construct a laughing event as a joint achievement. Still, laughter may be specifically 'invited' by the co-speaker's own laughter at the turn-final position or his laughter may be inserted within the utterance (Jefferson 1979 as quoted by Haakana (1999: 56). In addition, materials that are culturally recognized as humorous may occasion laughter, or similarly, ways in which speakers contextualize their utterances with other cues besides laughter, such as smile, gestures or lexical choice, may create laughing responses from co-speakers. (Haakana 1999: 56)

There are nineteen laughing events during the activity, and the laughter occurs after the teacher's turn (8 times), individual pupils' initiations (11 times) or is instigated by two pupils acting conjointly. Making use of drama roles through enactment or dramatisation, initiating flippant, clever, playful, interested or appreciative turns, or introducing topics involving violence or death instigate shared laughter in the activity. Interaction involving fun and laughter appears in situations which can be loosely grouped into moments when opposition between the two parties is playfully highlighted, when the teacher gives pupils positive, surprised or interested evaluation or when the participants' institutional roles are put aside for a while, and when participants make a humorous turn relevant at some point in interaction.

Sometimes in these situations, the speaker's laughter also seems to invite a laughing response. Seven examples of instances that occasion laughter will be discussed in this section, some of which involve two or three successive laughing responses. However, only one example of the same type, such as the teacher's interested or appreciative (partial) repeats, is included, as they appear to have a similar basic function, i.e. to highlight the proposal in a particular way.

The first two excerpts show how the teacher's enacted or dramatised turns bring up the opposition or contradicting goals between the porcupine and the squirrel, which the group represents with their ideas. The second example also includes the teacher's responses which express approval and appreciation instigating laughter. In the first case, the porcupine's opposing stance becomes visible when the teacher formulates the pupils' jointly made suggestion in the following way:

(45)

47	T	→	ok so you are telling me to go away with a little [umbrella and some food
78	Ps		[((some laughter and talk))
79	Olli		ºthat's righ[tº
80	Ella		[y(h)es (x(h) x) ((laughs loudly))

The teacher speaks in role and her formulation is uttered in a matter-of-fact way rather than with emphasized or exaggerated resentment. The formulation summarises the two prior proposals (i.e. food, umbrella) as if to point out that this prospect does not please the porcupine. The laughter which it issues begins during the turn; it is not loud but clearly amused. The teacher's turn also gets two partly overlapping confirmations, the latter of which is uttered laughingly and finishes with a burst of laughter. This does not invite further laughter, probably, since the teacher initiates a new turn (not shown here).

The second example is a passage at the end of the activity, in which the group responds to the teacher's turns with laughter three times. First, the teacher highlights the opposition between 'the good squirrel' and 'the bad porcupine' in her teacher's role, i.e. she elicits a new proposal and adds a dramatised description about the porcupine refusing to leave the squirrel's home. Her dramatised statement becomes a laughable, which first instigates laughter and then a proposal which the teacher assesses appreciatively:

(46)

138	T		ok yes but (1.0) err (.) how would little squirrel make the porcupine
139			go out of his house
140			>I mean< (.) he wouldn't go ((emphatically))
141		→	<!<u>he is just sitting in the doorway being very [big!</u>

142 Ps [((some laughter))
143 Ella £tickling
144 T → ↑tickling
145 Ps ((laughter))
146 T → ↑that's↑ clever by the way
147 Ps ((laughter))

Here the teacher both non-accepts the prior proposal and elicits a new proposal (lines 138-139). Then she adds a dramatised characterisation of the situation almost as an afterthought, in which line 140 works as a preface to the actual dramatised description of the big porcupine sitting in the doorway (line 141). This line is uttered at a low pitch emphatically and slowly, and it adds playfulness to the prior elicitation in the same turn. The group treats the teacher's turn as humorous, and their laughing response partly overlaps with the teacher's turn (line 142). The teacher's dramatised prompt may well equal to telling a joke, which should be followed by laughter as an expected response (see Haakana 1999: 22).

As a response to the elicitation question, Ella makes a one-word suggestion (line 143), uttered in a bright smiley voice. The teacher repeats it in delighted and surprised tones, and the same tone seems to be echoed in the group's laughing response (line 145), which sounds a cheerful burst of laughter. The higher pitch which the teacher uses for the first word marks line 146 as an appreciative assessment, and it is followed by another, subdued laughing response (line 147). In these two instances, the teacher's appreciative repeat and assessment appear to build rapport among the participants in the same way as it would with usual English classroom tasks. Though the proposal is made by one pupil, the whole group's involvement as a team is visible in their laughing responses: they act as the joint recipients of the teacher's positive assessment. This incident resembles earlier cases in which the teacher responds to the pupil's proposal by using a partial repeat which expresses surprise or interest, and which instigates shared laughter.

The next example draws attention to the difference between the participants' institutional roles and drama roles. The passage occurs at the end of the activity after the proposal about tickling has been jointly approved. In the brief passage, teacher and pupils co-act and interact in a rather exceptional way compared with their usual classroom roles: the drama requires that tickling should be tried out on the porcupine in order to see whether it will work. Ella, whose proposal is in question, duly asks if she may tickle the teacher. Her turn is swift, produced with laugh particles, which appear to work as an invitation to laughter:

(47)
164 Ella →c(h)an I t(h)ickle you ((laughs))
165 Ps ((laughter))
166 Ty(h)es (.) but don't do it very hard >because I'm porcupine
167 and you will be little squirrel then<
168 Ella £I (will be)↑so little (xx) ((moves to the teacher and tickles her))
169 Ps [((very loud laughter))
170 T → [((shrieks, laughs and leans forward)) ok] th(h)ank you it [s(h)urely worked (1.0)
171 Ps [((some laughter))

After the group's laughter, the teacher responds to Ella's request with an affirmative (line 166) and continues to remind Ella of their roles as porcupine and squirrel, which specifically seems to emphasise the imaginary context where the tickling is to take place. Ella follows the cue and repeats the idea of a small squirrel jokingly, in a smiling animated voice. She walks in small steps to the teacher on the other side of the circle while talking, and thus assumes and enacts her role as the squirrel for this instant. She tickles the teacher who shrieks briefly and leans forward a little, which is accompanied by a loud laughing response. Some laughter still overlaps with the teacher's turn thanking Ella for the demonstration (line 170), which she does in her teacher's role. In this case, the act of tickling and Ella's and the teacher's enacted, smiling and laughing turns (line 168, 170) seem to have invited the laughter.

However, there may be other instigators for the loud burst of laughter and the group's earlier laughter in this situation, too. When Ella asked for a permission to tickle, the actual thought of tickling a teacher may have seemed unusual or even daring. Though it is part of drama pedagogical goals to decrease some of the constraints of an ordinary classroom context and allow teacher and pupils to meet on more equal terms, tickling in an institutional setting is not considered an appropriate thing to do. Laughter is sensitive to the nature of the activity, and the group may have felt slightly embarrassed or shy, at least initially, because the usual rules of behaviour were now altered in the drama context. In addition, Ella's first turn in this passage (line 164) may, at least in theory, have involved some embarrassment due to the institutionally unexceptional matter, i.e. in other institutional contexts laughter or smiling is found to occur when interactants talk about personally or culturally delicate matters (Haakana 1999, Sandlund 2004). Thus, laughter may serve an 'embarrassment-resistant function', and can also invite laughter (Sandlund 2004: 192). Tickling a teacher may well be considered a delicate matter in the classroom context, and Ella's laughter may thus also involve some embarrassment. However, feelings of discomfort are not something that you can pinpoint in her enactment, which treats the tickling phase as a suitable and humorous ending to the

problem solving. It should also be noted, that the teacher was a young teacher whom the group already knew well, which may have lowered the institutional barrier between the participants. So if the group felt a moment of embarrassment, it is likely to have been a passing feeling. However, it is natural that the difference between the two available contexts, i.e. those of classroom and drama, is present and visible in the interaction, which may also create humour and laughter.

The excerpt below has a pupil's humorous response to the teacher, which serves as an opposing turn and an instigator of fun. Pia recycles a phrase, rather a punch line, from the drama story, or from an earlier proposal sequence in which it was also recycled. In a usual classroom context, the response could well have sounded impertinent, whereas in a drama context, it serves its purpose as an expression of opposition effectively, but its 'cultural delicacy' may also be noticed by the participants:

(48)

96 T!oh (.) but <u>how</u> am I going to <u>tra</u>vel in that rainy forest
97 when it's raining so heavi[ly
98 Pia → [º£it's your proble[mº
99 Ps [((laughter))
100 T[it's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally
101 Ps [((some excited talk)

In lines 96-97, the teacher is responding to a prior proposal. Now Pia joins in the interaction with a comment ('º£it's your problemº') in line 97. The group's laughter partly overlaps with her turn (line 99), and the pupils may be laughing at the repetition of the punch line of the story, its playful, flippant tone uttered in a rather quiet and smiling voice, or the fact that its recipient is a teacher albeit in role. The teacher responds emphatically in a louder voice against the background of some excited talk. The passage shows how opposition is built between squirrel and porcupine, and some of the fun may have been caused by the cultural difference between the contexts of traditional lessons and the drama activities.

The last three excerpts deal with situations in which pupils' proposals occasion shared laughter, or when a playfully uttered response instigates a laughing response, shown in the first example. The teacher is asking her challenging yes/no-question which expresses doubt on the suggested idea. First, it gets Ella's agreeing response, which is followed (partly overlapping) another opposite view from Olli:

(49)

59 T ºbut do you think that the porcupine would goº (.)
60 Ella £no I don't think [so
61 Olli → [º£ye:sº
62 Ps ((laughter))

There may be several factors which instigate shared laughter: the opposite views presented may have caused the group's laughter, but this may not be the only reason for it: Olli utters his one-word affirmative lengthening the vowel and speaking softly and smiling sympathetically. In addition, the fact that boys do not talk much, but adopt the role of the audience in the activity, as in other drama activities with this group, may also have an influence on the audience reaction. Being rare participants, boys' contribution may well be particularly appreciated.

The extract below shows how a clever and funny idea, proposed in an engaging way instigates laughter:

(50)
89 Asta yes but everybody who is squirrel's friend↑ (.) would take ((gestures with hands))
90 that porcupine for three days and would give him a bed and food
91 → and he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs, draws a circle in the air))
92 Ps [((laughter))
93 Asta so nobody's food would end >eiku<
94 T º↑yeah that's right↑º
95 Asta yes and everybody would survive (.)

Asta is producing the gist of her lengthy and coherent proposal, gesticulating and complementing her talk with embodied action by drawing a circle in the air to describe how the porcupine could go '£around the la(h)nd' (line 91). At this point, Asta starts smiling, and cued by this, the group gives their laughing response. Their laughter (in line 92) coincides with Asta's 'la(h)nd', and this is a typical place for the group's laughter in this activity: laughing begins during the turn that instigates laughter. This happens in 2/3 of all the cases and seems to indicate that the participants follow the talk keenly and respond with laughter immediately when there is a reason for it. The laughter here appears encouraging and does not hinder the speaker's turn either: Asta continues her turn and finishes it in line 95, though the laughing response, even if it is supportive, may have caused the slight confusion in line 93.

A reference to the use of violence as a solution to the problem also causes laughter, perhaps because it is understood to be an unacceptable thing in the school environment and elsewhere, i.e. one type of delicate matter. In the following extract, Tea introduces a proposal which

involves violence, and her turn also shows that she is aware of the questionable nature of her idea:

(51)

119	Tea	→	ok this l(h)ittle sq(h)uirrel (1.0) err have to has a ↑k(h)nife
120	Tea		bec(h)ause [(.) bec(h)ause yeah (x) when he have to has a ↑k(h)nife
121	Ps		[((laughter))
122	Tea		and then (.) [an(h)d h(h)e
123	T	→	[what would you do with a [↑knife?
124	Ps		[((loud [laughter))
125	Tea		[his kn(h)ife
126			an(h)d s(h)aid to the p(h)orcupine that y(h)ou **have** to go (2.0)
127	T		°ok° ((tentatively))

Tea smiles broadly and looks jokingly doubtful when she utters her turn. At the same time, she also looks at the teacher and the audience as if to see their reaction to her proposal, which displays that she understands it to be an unacceptable solution. Part of it seems to be 'mock-concern' displayed in an engaging way. Tea's pose and turn-internal laughter in line 119 provide a context for audience laughter and invite a laughing response. The group's laughter in line 121, overlapping with some of her talk, seems to disrupt the turn's progress: it begins after the mentioning of the knife, which is uttered emphatically. Tea continues by repeating her words, and as if to help Tea to sort out her thoughts, the teacher initiates a question in line 123 asking what the knife would be for. Before she has uttered the word 'knife', the group gives a loud laughing response (line 124). The teacher's voice has a playfully warning tone, as if she was introducing a serious mode because of the 'culturally delicate' topic, and she stresses the word 'knife' in the same way as Tea. The instigator of laughter here appears to be the collision between the institutional and the non-institutional: violence is certainly not recommended as a solution or allowed in the school environment any more than anywhere else. Tea responds to the teacher's question (lines 125-126): her answer coincides with the end of the teacher's questions and the audience laughter, and it concludes her proposal. After a pause, the teacher produces a tentative ok-receipt, which acknowledges the idea, but neither approves or disapproves. This may mean be a question of delicacy, and a sign of the teacher's difficulty to deal with a proposal which is unacceptable, but which is not presented quite seriously.

In sum, a choral laughing response by several participants can be caused by various things or even combinations of 'laughables'. It appears to follow both teacher's and pupils' turns mostly as a sign of approval or amusement. It may be invited by the speaker and by no means

seems to be aimless or uncontrolled. Turns that instigate laughter are enacted, dramatised, humorous, witty or clever, and their function in the game is to highlight opposition, evaluate, express interest, but also to generate fun. There also appear to be other matters that make the group laugh, such as culturally delicate matters or when the institutional and the non-institutional are seen side by side. With some other pupils and another teacher, the interaction, i.e. the local management of the activity, would naturally take another form and expression. These participants in drama specifically orient to the drama activity as a playful game, which makes laughter relevant to the situation. So the teacher occasionally responds to the pupils' proposals or turns in a humorous way rather than with a grammatical question, and the pupils may use a humorous tone or a witty remark in their defensive responses deliberately.

Thus, the creation of fun and play appears as an interactional achievement by both the sides of teacher and pupils, which duly results in shared laughter. However, the laughter is audience laughter, and the fun is not pursued any further, as may happen in a different multiparty setting, viz. a college seminar, where enjoyment and lightheartedness may be pursued and created e.g. through speakers' dramatisations or mock emotions at particular moments in talk (Sandlund 2004). On the other hand, in another institutional setting, i.e. in doctor-patient interaction, laughing together sequences are usually brief and the talk moves away briskly after the jointly produced laughter (Haakana 1999: 112). In the drama activity, teacher and pupils do not laugh together, but the moments of shared laughter are also brief. Audience laughter in the drama activity tends to occur in its slot in an orderly way, after which, often overlapping with laughter, the next turn is initiated. The proposal–question–negotiation-pattern of the problem solving activity appears to have such a crucial influence on participation that no digression from this occurs, though the length of the negotiation sequences varies. Van Lier (1988: 166) calls listening responses, such as uhuh', lubricators in talk. Laughter clearly lubricates the interaction in the problem solving game: it makes the atmosphere positive and appreciative without disturbing the flow of talk and the running of the activity.

7 COLLECTIVE QUESTIONING IN THE WHOLE GROUP ROLE PLAY

In Chapter 7, the object of study is the questioning in a pupil-centred activity in which both teacher and pupils participate in role. My aim is to describe and analyse the way in which the participants organise their talk in the questioning phase of the multiparty event in the imaginary context. In this activity, a whole group role play is used as a drama convention to run the parliament of animals, in which two pupils in the roles of the squirrel and the porcupine are questioned one at a time by the rest of the group in their animal roles. Thus, these two participants will become the primary recipients of talk at certain points during the activity. The teacher has an organising role chairing the meeting as the king of the forest, who also takes part in the questioning to some extent. The structure of this activity type allows pupils to negotiate through questioning, offers them chances of collaboration while questioning collectively and an opportunity to appear in role. This makes the interactional pattern different from that in the more teacher-centred problem solving game which precedes this activity in the drama lesson. While in the problem solving game teacher and pupils are seen as the opposing parties in the negotiation, the opposition in the whole group role play is created between the two animal characters on trial and the rest of the group as members of parliament, including the teacher. The questioning of the two animals involves enquiries of the past events, and these questions often appear as reproaches or accusations made towards the accused party.

For the analysis and description of talk-in-interaction, I will also draw upon the concept of participation framework. When teacher and pupils participate in role, they do not have to express their own views and feelings, i.e. they are not necessarily the ‘principals’ of their talk, but appear as ‘authors’ speaking as representatives of their role characters. Goodwin (1990) distinguishes several speaker entities in children’s play and storytelling, which can also be applied to describing participation roles in a fictional drama context. The focus of analysis in this chapter is, however, mainly on the organisation of questioning between participants and on the way in which the participants orient to it as a playful activity. (Speaker roles and the concept of participation framework are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.2.)

The first section in this chapter gives some background information about the characteristics of the whole group role play as a drama convention and outlines the whole group role play in the drama pretext ‘The Rains’ of the present study. The second section shows how the teacher

introduces this activity to the group. In the third section, I will describe and analyse how the participants author the event, i.e. organize their talk in role in the questioning phase. First, the focus is on those instances when two people interact face-to-face, which means that only one participant does the questioning. Second, the section looks into the questioning that takes place collectively by more than one participant at a time usually about the same topic. The third part of the section discusses questioning passages in which the teacher has a role by allocating turns and organising the action. The fourth section looks at the elements of play, fun and laughter which participants generate through enacting and developing the drama in the role play.

In the whole group role play, participants create the drama context by using the available contextual resources, such as the previous events in the drama lesson, their roles and their action, i.e. how they question, defend themselves or chair the procedures. The use of fictional roles and participation roles will be discussed side by side. With the analysis, I hope to show what opportunities for interaction are available for the group when they carry out the proceedings and questioning in the parliament of animals, and what interactional tools are employed in this make-believe context.

7.1 Parliament of animals as a whole group role play

A whole group role play is a drama convention in which both teacher and pupils adopt roles. Unlike pupils' drama roles, the teacher's role is close to her usual one in class, in which she is able to make the drama develop from within the imaginary context. While she negotiates in role, she still negotiates as teacher who can give room to the pupils to 'make sense for themselves' of the learning material in the drama context. From the beginning, the teacher-in-role has a chance to invite the group to join her, and leading the group into the drama-time in role is also an effective way to help the participants to recognize their imagined roles, show that the new class dynamics have been created and can set an example for appropriate language and tone. (Neelands 1984: 46-48.) Moreover, pupils who adopt roles do not always have to characterise their role figures, but the participants in role have to answer the question 'Who am I?' in the drama. Participants may also be given a 'collective role' at the start of a drama. (Owens and Barber 1997: 10, 28). Being in the cover of a role also makes it easier for pupils to express attitudes and views which they otherwise might not have courage to express so easily (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 32).

The whole group role play in 'The Rains' (i.e. a drama pretext in Owens and Barber 1997) is a continuation to the problem solving activity in which the participants in drama find a way for the squirrel to get rid of the rude porcupine, whom the squirrel has rescued from the river and who now uses the squirrel's hospitality excessively refusing to leave his house. As a result of the solution to the problem provided by the group, the squirrel tickles the porcupine who falls into the river. The tickling of the porcupine is further acted out, which is followed by a vote about the destiny of the porcupine: the porcupine does not die but survives in the whirling water. The whole group role play in the form of the parliament of animals follows these events. It is summoned by the king of the forest, acted out by the teacher, who happens to see how the squirrel tickles the porcupine and how the porcupine falls into the river. One of the pupils takes the role of the squirrel and the other participants start questioning him. Soon the king's search party carries the rescued porcupine to the meeting and is also questioned by the group. The pupils have their animal roles, which they chose at the beginning of the drama lesson, and they are advised to use them. The teacher appears in the managing role as the king: first, she leads the group into the whole group role play; second, she begins the questioning of both the pupils in animal roles, third, she joins in questioning with the other participants, and fourth, she directs the different stages during the hearing of the two animals and also allocates speakers' turns when they ask for a floor at some points of the activity. After the questioning, the participants decide which of the animals is guilty, negotiate about an acceptable punishment and, in turn, find something to say to any of the three main characters in the drama, i.e. the king, the squirrel or the porcupine. Next, I will illustrate the way in which the teacher leads the pupils into the whole group role play and discuss her managing role in this introductory phase of the activity.

7.2 Entering the whole group role play

The teacher leads the group into the whole group role play, i.e. the parliament of animals, through different stages, in which the scene is set, roles nominated, dramatic tension created, and finally specific instructions on participation are given. The introduction to the drama is not managed solely by the teacher, but it is achieved through interaction between teacher and pupils, during which the teacher alternates between her institutional teacher's role, the narrator's role and the role as the king of the forest. In this section, I will describe and analyse the different phases in the group's entering the activity.

The group is seated in the circle after they have finished the problem solving activity: the squirrel has tickled the porcupine who has fallen into the river, and the pupils have voted that the porcupine will not die in the fall. The teacher starts the introduction of the activity with practical arrangements in her teacher's role:

(1)

1	T	and now we will rewind our drama (1.0) back to the point
2		where the little squirrel is tickling the porcupine (2.0)
3		and we need a squirrel who would be squirrel
4		(3.0)
5	Ella	>I c(h)an b(h)e<=
6	T	=>ok you can be squirrel<
7	Ps	((smile))
8	Ella	I al(h)ways can b(h)e
9	T	>you c(h)an always be squirrel<
10		and then just as little squirrel was tickling porcupine and porcupine
11		was falling down this tree (1.0) the king of the forest
12		>which animal is the king of the forest<
13	Ella	li[on
14	Ps	[lion
15	T	ok I'll [(xx) forest (x) at this moment

The teacher addresses the group in her institutional role and takes the group to the starting point of the activity (lines 1-2). In the same turn, she proceeds to create the drama context and offers the squirrel's role to the group. After a pause, Ella volunteers producing her turn quickly, laughing at the same time: '>I c(h)an b(h)e<' (line 5).The teacher accepts Ella's offer and includes an embedded repair in it by adding the missing part to Ella's sentence. Ella initiates another similar turn, in which she comments on her willingness to participate in drama: 'I al(h)ways can b(h)e' (line 8). Similarly, the teacher's laughingly uttered turn corrects the word order of Ella's turn while accepting it (line 9). This kind of embedded repair is a conversational repair used in meaning-and-fluency contexts (Seedhouse 2004: 149). Participants' smiles create a playful atmosphere: Ella's interest in acting has become known to everyone during the drama lessons.

The teacher now continues as a storyteller (lines 10-11) and takes the narration to the point when the squirrel tickles the porcupine. At mid-sentence, she addresses the group in her teacher's role (line 12) and requests the pupils to name the king of the forest. She receives almost simultaneous responses from Ella and a few other pupils (choral response in line 14). (Before joining in Ella's 'lion', some of the pupils bid to answer by lifting their hands, displaying thus an institutional orientation, but the teacher does not notice the bidding.) In line

15, the teacher's acceptance of the answer, beginning with an ok-receipt (the end of the turn is not unfortunately audible), finishes the exchange of turns between teacher and pupils. This exchange has an institutional character of a classroom activity, i.e. the teacher leads the group into a new drama context by appointing role characters together with the pupils.

In the next phase of the introduction, the drama context is established through the teacher's dramatisation of her role figure. As it happens with this group, the pupil in the squirrel's role decides to join in. (The drama pretext, viz. the 'script' for the drama, leaves this open, and it is up to the pupil in role to decide whether to speak or not at this point.) Ella in her squirrel's role moves to sit inside the circle, and the teacher first continues her narration (line 18-19) and then switches to her drama role (line 20):

(2)
18 T so the king of the forest was just walking round the corner and
19 <he saw what happened> (4.0)
20 → <↑I saw you do that little squirrel>
21 <is that a way to treat our fellow [creatures in this kingdom> (.) **no**
22 Ps [((laughter))
23 Ella !can I say something! (.) ((looks down and speaks timidly))
24 T you will **have** to say some[thing
25 Ps [((laugh[ter))
26 Ella [>ok ok I will< (1.0)

With a noticeable pause (line 19), the teacher marks the point where she changes her footing from narration to acting in role. Reciting the lines from the drama pretext, she animates the king's words speaking slowly and majestically and asks in a rhetorical way about the morality of the squirrel's deed (line 20-21). This is followed by the audience laughter at the point where the teacher could be approaching a turn transition point in her turn, and where the king's anger at the squirrel has already become apparent. After the emphatic and loud '**no**' (line 21), Ella animates the squirrel's words to the king asking for a permission to speak. The teacher acts out the king's menacing-sounding command (line 24), which is followed by the laughing response from the pupils, who treat it as a humorous turn. Ella animates the squirrel's timid and hasty agreement (line 26).

The passage above shows how the introduction to the whole group role play is built turn by turn between the participants. In this drama lesson, Ella in role decides to join in and initiate a preliminary action to defend herself. She sees a slot which allows her to speak for herself and adjusts her talk and action to suit her request, i.e. she animates the squirrel's words by

speaking timidly and shifting herself unsurely on the floor (line 23). The teacher does not hurry to go on, but follows the suit and adopts the king's serious tone in her response (line 24). As the drama context is open to changes, the introductory phase is allowed to take its course, and as usual, participants adjust their action accordingly.

Next, the introduction continues with a passage in which the squirrel gives the account of the porcupine's visit. Ella in role uses the facts from the story, but presents the events from the squirrel's point of view. The teacher joins in with the king's questions. Both the speakers animate their role figures while they find their way step by step in the dialogue:

(3)

27	Ella	<I gave him food three days and three nights > ((points)) and I thought that that
28		was the custom of our country so I did the right thing= ((gazes at the teacher))
29	T	=!that's the right thing ((menacingly)) but what happened then! (1.0)
30	Ella	err err he wouldn't leave ((quietly) he just he just that that say
31		that he would stay and eat all my food ((plaintively)) and
32		and make me sleep on the floor and he would sleep on the bed
33		and I couldn't have any food that I had made the bed (xx).
34	T	what's wrong with sleeping on the floor
35		you could do it for a while if you have a guest
36	Ella	yeah for a while but (1.0) he was going to be so cruel with me ((reaches for word
37		list)) (.) and (1.0) he had those quills ((gazes at teacher)) and they were er hurting
38		me and I have these bruises all [over me because he was so rude ((shows hands)
39	Ps	[((some laughter))
40	T	oh ↑I see I'm beginning to get the(1.0)picture of what happened but anyway

The opposition between the two sides is created conjointly: the squirrel explains her side of the story, and the king expresses doubt with comments and questions. Ella in the squirrel's role recounts the events as they were told in the African story earlier in the drama lesson. The exact words from the story, such as 'the custom of our country' (line 28) are now recontextualised and animated as the squirrel's words. 'so I did the right thing' (line 28), however, expresses the squirrel's sentiments which Ella adds to the story. The teacher builds her opposition on the prior turns in both her prompting questions (lines 29, 34-35). To characterise the squirrel as a responsible creature, Ella's uses slow speech, stresses key words and gazes at the teacher, whereas the teacher animates her role character through a serious tone of voice. The talk which is built turn-by-turn between the two parties both revises the past events and provides a model for participation in the whole group role play.

At the final phase of introducing the parliament of animals, the teacher mainly appears in her instructional role and gives clear, specific instructions about the group's participation in the activity. She addresses the group as a whole and Ella in the role of the squirrel. A short narrative sentence (lines 41-42) links the previous scene (between the king and the squirrel) to the teacher's instructions:

(4)

41 T so the king of the forest the ruler decided anyway that the squirrel would
42 → appear (2.0) before the parliament of animals and now you will make up the
43 parliament of animals remember those roles that you have right? (2.0)
44 Ps ((some laughter))
45 Tand we will be here we will be the parliament of animals and you will be little
46 squirrel (.) and you will have to defend yourself for what you did (2.0)
47 and every one of you is allowed to ask him questions and [then we'll have to (.)
48 Ella [her
49 T>oh her this time you have been he (.) this far< but from now on I gue(h)ss
50 you will be she and then we will have to make up our minds
51 what are we going to do what we are going to do about this little squirrel (1.0)
52 o↑k so I will begin I'm the king of the forest (1.0)

The teacher begins in her narrator's role telling about the king's decision (line 41), which takes the group back to the main topic of the activity. Then the teacher changes her footing, and in the teacher's role informs the group about the coming activity (lines 42-43). She also instructs Ella directing her words to her through gaze (lines 45-46). During her further instructions, Ella does an other-correction, in which she corrects the teacher's use of pronoun (line 48): the group will ask 'her' questions and not 'him', which was the case in the original story. The teacher further confirms this in line 49, displaying her new understanding in her turn by an oh-token (i.e. after an other-initiated repair an 'oh'-receipt expresses the speaker's new understanding (Heritage 1984 as quoted by Houtkoop 1987: 79)). After stating once more the purpose of the parliament (lines 50-51), the teacher shows with a decision marker 'ok so' (van Lier 1988: 175) that the whole group role play is about to begin, which finishes the introduction of the activity to the group.

Before the pupils have a chance to start questioning the squirrel, the parliament is opened by the king, and the squirrel is asked to give an account of the incident. The teacher begins by animating her role character speaking slowly and majestically:

(5)

53 <!most honoured parliament of animals (1.0)
54 I bring before you the squirrel (.) whose dishonourable deed
55 I witnessed only one hour ago (2.0) he was tickling porcupi[ne!>

56 Ps [((laughter))
57 T and that porcupine fell out that tree and (2.0)
58 fell into the water and you know >what the rain is like<
59 ok so first I think that little squirrel will give a brief account of what happened
60 and then we will ask her questions about what happened
61 and why he did so and then we will have to decide
62 what we are going to do about this little squirrel (1.0) ºok pleaseº
63 Ella ok I have to say that I'm innocent I didn't do anything wrong
64 because that porcupine came to me three days ago (.)
65 so I have given him food and place to sleep for three days and three nights
66 and >after that I said to the porcupine that you now you can go
67 because I have done eve(h)rything I could and want to do to you
68 and (.) then the porcupine said that I have some kind of problem
69 I don't know what he was talking about and I don't care
70 but the main thing is that the porcupine was sturbing my life
71 and making (it) uncomfortable and boring and all those things
72 so I wanted to him to go and he wouldn't go, so I just ↑little bit
73 tickled him and he (1.0) falled (.) ºit wasn't my faultº

The teacher recites the opening words from the drama pretext (line 53), and then continues by matching the events of this particular drama to the opening procedures, i.e. this group has decided that the squirrel tickles the porcupine who then falls into the river. In line 55, the formal formulation of talk is humorously linked with the amusing act of tickling, which instigates a laughing response from the group. In lines 57-58, the teacher finishes the king's recount of what he saw the squirrel do, which ends with a remark to the audience ('you know >what the rain is like<'). With her additional remark, the teacher thus creates the context in which the group is now part of in their fictive roles. Then the teacher seems to shift back to her instructional role, reminding the group of the coming proceedings and referring to the squirrel using a third person (lines 59-62), but especially in the way in which she begins with a teacher-like decision marker ('ok so'), which here appears as an activity switch (Van Lier 1988: 175). Overtly she is still in the king's role, but the talk seems to be orientated to giving a teacher's instructions to make the activity run smoothly. Ella acknowledges the teacher's request to hear the squirrel's account with a similar 'ok'-token, and gives an elaborated report in role in the squirrel's defence (lines 63-73). She retains the recurring expressions in the story, i.e. 'three days and three nights', as well as picks the main events from the story, but gives a subjective description of the situation using such adjectives as 'uncomfortable', 'boring, or 'innocent'. Ella acts out the part by moving her fingers and often looking down at the floor and occasionally at the group in the circle. Ella's account in role includes the recontextualised facts about the incident, but they are now presented from the squirrel's point of view.

In sum, the teacher engages the group in the whole group role play through various stages: first, by casting the main roles in her teacher's role, setting the scene by speaking as the king in role and listening to the squirrel's enacted account and finally by giving specific instructions about the procedure in the parliament of animals in her teacher's institutional role. The teacher also links the different phases together with narration, and thus her third participation role is that of a narrator. The teacher's roles have a function in the interaction, she moves between these roles smoothly and the pupils do not seem to have any difficulty in following the different roles in the developing stages of the introduction. The proof is in the pupils' interpretation of the teacher's talk, as a result of 'a proof procedure' which "obliges its participants to display to each other, in a turn's talk, their understanding of each other's talk" (Sacks et al 1974: 728). Thus, the preparation phase is not a hurried, short stretch of talk before the proper questioning with the whole group. While participating in the preparation phases, the pupils have got a good idea about how the questioning can be carried out, how participants can animate their characters and what the main points of the squirrel's problem are in her view. The preparation for the group activity has also helped to establish the drama context for the questioning, i.e. the discourse and setting the scene for the parliament are contextual resources that have been made available for the group.

7.3 Questioning in the parliament of animals

The parliament of animals as a fictional multi-party event has a special goal that affects the interactional pattern of the activity: two animals one after the other are questioned by the king and other animals of the forest, which creates a situation of opposition. Thus, some participation roles have set positions, i.e. the two pupils in their animal roles act either as current speakers or as addressees, and cannot take other listener roles while they are questioned. The positions of the other participants, the teacher included, are more varied, and they can act as current speakers, but are also free to adopt listener roles whenever they like. Thus, participation roles for most pupils in the whole group role play are flexible, and participants can move between their listener role and the role of the current speaker during the questioning. There are also two speech exchange systems available for participants, i.e. turns are taken either through self-selection and turn allocation. Further, several participants may join in and question collectively, but a single questioner may also hold the floor even for a longer stretch of talk, i.e. questioning is done in a dyad. While questioning, pupils can draw upon different kinds of contextual resources which are available for them in that situation in

order to interact coherently and logically. The co-speakers' prior talk and the knowledge about the characters and the previous events in the drama as well as the African story serve as essential contextual resources for the group, besides the understanding about the type and purpose of the activity.

This section looks into the ways in which participants organise the questioning passages by using questions to reproach and accuse the two drama characters, and the way in which these playful reproaches are responded through different kinds of defensive strategies. The group's use of participation roles and contextual resources will also be observed. First, I will discuss two separate questioning sequences in which only one pupil questions the pupil in role (i.e. the squirrel) individually in a dyad. Next, the analysis will examine the questioning in the parliament of animals, which the participants in drama, i.e. teacher and pupils, carry out collectively by asking questions one at a time about the same topic or by participating in the negotiation in some other way. The third section will show how the teacher manages the activity in her double role as a teacher and the king of the forest by directing action at different stages of the activity.

7.3.1 Questioning in dyads

The noticeable characteristic of the questioning passages between two pupils is the participants' way of using questioning and reasoning tactics effectively and managing the floor through the careful timing of their initiations of turns, which is particularly seen in the latching or overlapping of the speakers' turns. Maintaining eye-contact between the co-interactants is also visible in the first questioning sequence, in particular.

The first questioning sequence in a dyad occurs at the beginning of the questioning phase after Ella in the role of the squirrel has finished her account of the past events, followed by a short question-answer sequence. Asta initiates a question, which leads to a long sequence of 21 turns almost entirely between these two participants. Asta has a clear agenda for her questioning: her questions point out that by getting rid of the porcupine, the squirrel has violated the animal code of helping other animals, i.e. the question is 'performing social control' (Günthner 1996: 277). The two girls sit opposite each other, and their placing on the floor helps their interaction and their maintaining the eye contact throughout the sequence:

(6)
86 Asta → why couldn't he stay with you he did he-
87 Ella have you ever seen a porcupine
88 Asta £ye:s ((nods))
89 Ella do you know what he has in his back (.) they are quills
90 !and they are [sticking you!
91 Asta [yes-
92 Ella when you are slee(h)ping and it [hurts ((laughs some))

The 'why'-construction in Asta's opening question uses a typical format employed in reproaches, which expresses the speaker's moralizing stance about an issue which she considers inappropriate (Günthner 1996: 272). In this case, the 'why'-question implies that the squirrel should have let the porcupine stay in her home. Though Asta's turn is uttered without any special emphasis or signs of affect (found typical in reproaches of this kind, according to Günthner (1996), Ella orients to it as a reproachful turn, i.e. she treats it as criticism about her conduct, and not as a real question. She interrupts Asta's turn countering her with a question about the porcupine (line 87). Asta's elongated and emphatic affirmative answer (line 88) expresses some doubt about the nature of the enquiry. Ella's question is rhetorical, for which she also provides the answer after a brief pause, i.e. the porcupine has sticking quills on his back (lines 89 -90). The answer to Asta's question comes in line 92: the porcupine's quills are painful and disturb sleeping, and that is why the porcupine cannot stay in the squirrel's house. As her defensive strategy, Ella has introduced a 'question-answer insertion sequence' (Nofsinger 1991: 62) in the question-answer adjacency pair which Asta has initiated. In line 91, Asta has tried to get the situation under control by butting in with a turn-initiator ('yes -'), which is targeted at the turn transition point of Ella's turn, but which she has stopped abruptly seeing that Ella is going to continue. In the passage, Ella has animated her role figure by using emphatic tones and sobbing, which is mingled with some suppressed laughter. When Ella utters the last word 'hurts' (line 92), Asta is ready to initiate her response:

(7)
93 Asta [b(h)ut] ((slaps &laughs)) (.) ok if you food was end
94 → (1.0) so you have to be !so nice that you will (1.0) give him a home!=
95 Ella =it wouldn't be-
96 Asta !she's an animal too[we] have to stay to↑g(h)ether! ((raises her fist))
97 Ella [yea-]
98 but he i(h)s v(h)ery hungry a(h)nimal and and he would've (.) eaten all my food
99 and we couldn't survive both of us
100 Asta yes [but]
101 Sara [I'm sorry] ab(h)out that
102 Ella yeah? ((nods))

Asta's 'but' informs of a new topic or a disagreement. Then she recognises the overlap with Ella's turn (shown in Excerpt 1a), stops, slaps her knee, laughs briefly and starts again when Ella has finished. Asta begins by suggesting appropriate behaviour, which she presents in the form of an appeal, i.e. the squirrel should be kind and give home to the porcupine (lines 93-94). Ella tries to intervene (line 95), but Asta continues and reaches the climax of her appeal in line 96 ('=!she's an animal too [we] have to stay to↑g(h)ether!'). In her long turn, Asta uses prosody, such as animated voice and emphasis on the key words ('home', 'too'). She gestures and maintains eye contact with Ella and utters her words partly laughingly, partly in earnest. In the study of why-formatted reproaches, prosodic cues, such as accentuated words which mark the speaker's affect, help the recipient interpret a reproach as what it is (Günthner 1996: 281). In a laughing manner, Ella begins to counter-attack Asta's appeal (no doubt involving reproach), which expresses an opposite view to the porcupine (line 98): 'but he i(h)s v(h)ery hungry a(h)nimal'. The rest of Ella's turn recycles facts from the story, i.e. there was not enough food for both the animals to survive (lines 98-99). Asta's counter-argument (line 100) starts with an affirmative as an acknowledgement followed by a contradictory conjunction 'but'.

During Asta's turn (lines 93-94), Ella, by leaving the floor to Asta, has oriented to the 'one party speaks at a time'-norm (which was also done by Asta earlier in line 93). At the next transition relevance place of Asta's turn, Ella initiates a new turn ('yea-') (line 97), which she again cuts short when she notices that Asta has not finished. The two girls have maintained the floor so far, but now a 'third party' is trying to join in the questioning, which is her right as the member of the parliament: Sara's 'I'm sorry ab(h)out that' (line 101) is uttered in an ordinary tone of voice, but with a tinge of laughter, which may have been invited by Ella's laughingly animated turn. Sara's turn can be interpreted as a sign of support to Ella rather than as an expression of irony. Ella turns her gaze to Sara while she acknowledges her turn (line 102). Her 'yeah?' uttered with a slight rising intonation sounds somewhat unsure as if wondering what it means. She may be seeing Sara as Asta's supporter, because the girls are sitting beside each other and are former working partners in the drama. However, it is noticeable that the questioning passage between Asta and Ella has been so structured that there has not been a chance for anyone to join in earlier. Further, Sara has had to interrupt Asta's turn to be able to squeeze in the talk between the two opponents.

In the last section of this questioning in a dyad, Asta employs one more approach which somewhat resembles court room tactics. A study about a cross-examination shows how descriptions about a scene of crime can be used to draw some inferences from them and to accuse the witness and show a deficiency of action on his part. Such accusations are seen as first pair parts of an adjacency pair which makes the second pair part 'conditionally relevant', i.e. a denial, acceptance or modifier is expected to follow (Drew 1978: 1-5) Asta picks up the topic of food from Ella's response, which has stated that if the porcupine had stayed, it would have eaten all the food:

(8)
103 Asta→ !he hadn't ate <u>yet</u> all the food (.) had he?
104 Ps [((smiles, some quiet laughter))
105 Ella [no
106 Asta >so [(xx)] would have<
107 Ella [>(xx)< yes=
108 Asta→ =>you can't be sure<=
109 Ella =yes I can because **all** he did on those three days he just ate
110 and slept **on my** bed not in the floor (1.0)
111 Asta yes but [he was (x) ((shakes her head a little))
112 Ella [yes and he was sticking me with his quills (2.0) so I think it was unfair
113 (7.0) ((Ella looks around for more questions))

Asta animates her role character by uttering her questioning statement in a worried but determined way. She also stresses the word 'yet' meaningfully and uses a question tag with a remarkably clear rising intonation (line 103). By highlighting this key word, Asta's turn becomes an accusation against the squirrel's conduct, i.e. since there still was food, the squirrel could have let the porcupine stay. The group's smiles and the quiet laughter seems to appreciate Asta's questioning tactics. Ella's response in line 105 accepts the accusation which is hidden in Asta's turn. The next question-answer pair in lines 106-107 is short, the turns overlap and they are uttered hurriedly in an animated and rather loud voice. In line 108, Asta questions Ella's view (or action) ('=<you can't be sure<='), to which Ella produces a disagreement. The beginning of her turn heightens the opposition with Asta's turn by repeating some of its structure: 'yes I can' (line 109). This resembles children's disagreements, in which opposition may also be displayed in a similar way so that 'yes' at the beginning of a response to a negative statement signals polarity, and highlights opposition (Goodwin M.H. 1990: 145). Ella continues her turn enacting the role of the squirrel by putting a special emphasis on the key words (line 109-110), and thus implying that she was a victim of gross maltreatment. In her turn, she recontextualises expressions from the drama story to support her argument, such as 'three days' and sleeping '**on my** bed' (lines 109-110). This

may also show Ella's orientation to follow the plot of the original drama story in order to sustain the make believe-frame in the questioning phase, i.e. give credibility to the role play.

In her closing comments, Ella also recounts the events from the drama story: she interrupts Asta's turn (line 111) and finishes the description of the events with the porcupine ('he was sticking me with his quills' in line 112) adding her personal opinion after a noticeable pause ('so I think it was unfair'). This ends the first questioning passage, since Asta does not continue. Ella looks a little surprised, and during the long lapse in talk and the silence that follows, she gazes round inviting or expecting more questions from the group.

The first round of questioning has come to a successful end, and both parties have defended their differing viewpoints by using various interactive tactics. Except for one try to break into the talk between the two speakers, the participants were able to keep the floor to themselves. This was managed mainly through the timing of the initiations of both the speakers so that no pauses were left at the transition relevance places of their opponent's turns. The chance to speak was often secured by latching the initiation with the previous turn, starting the turns during the other speaker's talk, which caused overlapping of turns, and by interrupting the co-speaker's talk. On the other hand, orientation to the normative turn taking rule ('one party speaks at a time') was also visible at the beginning of the sequence. With some resemblance to courtroom questioning or similarities with children's arguments, this context of questioning involved opposition which was familiar to pupils from fictional or social contexts. This may have helped the participants carry out their agendas and develop the topic coherently as well as follow the co-speaker's turns, i.e. both the action and the sentence structure.

The turns which interrogated the squirrel came out as reproaches which expressed the questioner's moralising stance. These reproachful questions and arguments received suitable defending responses which together created an exchange between two opposing views. In courtroom questioning (Drew 1992) and news interviews (Clayman and Heritage 2002), the talk is designed for the overhearing audience, to which the talk between Ella and Asta also seemed to be oriented. The group adopted the role of the audience that did not intervene, but followed the talk keenly, sometimes smiling, and thus treated the questioning as designed for them. Both the girls maintained their fictional participation roles: they acted as authors and animators of their role figures, who thus were the principals of their talk. The enactment was

in line with the talk of the concerned ant (Asta) and the defensive but hurt squirrel (Ella), whose occasional laughter emphasised the fun rather than the awkwardness of acting out a role. Further, though the girls oriented to the questioning with humour, there was also a touch of sincerity connected with the topic of helping other animals. The previous events in the drama story worked as the main contextual resource for the participants, but the general knowledge about arguments and opposition may have been used as a means of interaction in the first questioning passage.

The second questioning sequence between two participants, Anu and Ella, gets started after a considerable lapse in talk. Ella is sitting inside the circle sideways with Anu. When Ella enacts her role as the squirrel, she does not change her position on the floor, but glances at Anu over her shoulder and thus seeks to have eye contact with her. The same strategy of managing the floor which was visible in the first questioning sequence is also used here as almost all the turns are latched or overlap with the prior turns:

(9)

114	Anu	→did you try to communication with the porcupine=
115	Ella	=yeah and all he said wrrr wrr[r
116	Anu	[(oh) ((gazes up))
117	Ps	[((some laughter))
118	Ella	((laughs)) and (.) oh he did say that I have a problem and and he doesn't want
119		to go out and all that stuff and [(x)
120	Anu	[maybe you have a problem
121	Ella	may(h)be: [(x) ((points with a forefinger))
122	Anu →	[y(h)ou d(h)on't think that the porcupine is (1.0) also animal
123	Ella	>yes I know< and I feel very sorry for him because he died hm but [((laughs))
124	Ps	[((laughter))
125	Ella	but I have to think also (1.0) myself and how I'm going to survive
126		so (.) what have you: (.) done if I would be the one who fell down ((gazes))
127	Anu	(x)
128	Ella	you didn't [(x)
129	Ps	[((some talk and quiet laughter))

Anu's yes/no-question ('did you try to communication with the porcupine=') asks Ella to affirm or negate this matter. It is a question without any undertones and easy to respond to promptly (line 115). Though a simple 'yes' would have been an adequate response, Ella elaborates and uses reported speech by animating the porcupine's words ('=yeah and all he said wrrr wrr[r'). Anu lifts her gaze in an amused way and acknowledges the answer with an 'oh'-token as a 'sequence-closing third' as a receipt for the information which has been requested for (Schegloff 2007: 118-119). Ella's animation also invites the group's laughing response, in which Ella herself briefly joins. Then she recycles facts from the drama story

repeating the phrase about the squirrel having a problem (line 118). Ella's elaboration (lines 118-119) seems to be made on the spur of the moment or she may want to create that impression: the 'oh' at the beginning may be seen as one type of 'change-of-state token marking a change in the speaker's recollection or recognition (Heritage 1998: 292), which here signals that Ella remembers something to recount to the others as news or present as her defence. She also stresses the key words ('oh', 'did' in line 118). Anu's response in line 120 overlaps and probably interrupts Ella's turn. She reuses the phrase from Ella's turn thoughtfully and meaningfully ('maybe you have a problem'). By reusing the porcupine's words, Anu's turn rather aligns with the porcupine's view, as well as points out the problematic situation that the squirrel is in now. In line 121, Ella agrees briefly, in meaningful tones, laughing slightly ('may(h)be: [(x)'), as if appreciating Anu's turn.

Anu's next questioning turn begins in a laughing manner before Ella has quite finished her response (line 122). It is in the form of a negative statement that involves a presupposition about the squirrel's morals. The stress on the word 'think' in Anu's question seems to emphasise her doubt: [y(h)ou d(h)ont think that the porcupine is (.) also animal'. (This topic has already been touched by Asta in the previous questioning sequence and now Anu recycles it.) Anu's turn involves an accusation, which Ella this time rather acknowledges and accepts herself, and so her acceptance makes the second pair-part to an accusation (Drew 1978: 5). Ella's initial '>yes I know<' (line 123) may mean that she sees Anu's point, which is that the squirrel may seem a heartless animal, as she has not let the porcupine stay with her. Ella continues portraying her character as a repenting squirrel (line 123), but finishes her turn abruptly after the mention of the porcupine's death, laughs and bends down on the floor to lean her head on her hand. The group's laughing response coincides with Ella's laughter. In lines 125-126, Ella, finishes her turn with a defensive counter-move: she looks at Anu over her shoulder and asks a hypothetical question ('so (1.0) what have you: done if I would be the one who fell down'). The next exchange of turns is unfortunately partly inaudible (lines 127-128), during which, Anu looks surprised, smiles and mouths inaudibly, which seems to suggest that the question is difficult to answer.

The second questioning passage in a dyad displays similar interactional features to those in the first one-to-one questioning exchange. Thus, there are no lapses between turns or long pauses in either of the speakers' turns, but some overlapping and latching of turns occur. The two questioning turns use both the drama story and the topic of the previous questioning

sequence as material and receive coherent and comprehensive responses. In this passage, the questioning turns also express doubt on the squirrel's conduct and partly come out as accusations. Both the speakers make use of the vocabulary and structure in their co-speaker's turns, which seems to highlight the opposing positions. Midway the sequence, both girls also seem to treat their talk as an enjoyable game, which is visible in their laughter, and which the group also joins in. Ella enacts her role figure with bodily gestures, sidelong glances and a way of sitting creating an image of the squirrel who is the victim of the porcupine's rude behaviour.

In sum, the most noticeable feature in the two questioning sequences in dyads is how the speakers' turns partially overlap, which seems to emphasize the urgent and active nature of the interrogation. This means that the interactants have occasionally competed in getting the floor. However, even where the co-speaker's turns are interrupted, i.e. cut short or talked over, the participants do not seem to regard this as a violation of their turn taking rights, i.e. the questioning is thus done in cooperation between the speakers (Nofsinger 1992: 101). Further, the general frame of the activity allows both the parties to have definite roles and separate agendas to carry out. This helps both the questioners and the defendant have clear goals which they pursue by matching their responses and initiations to the prior turns. Instead of mainly finding out facts, the questioners also imply and suggest things or do moralising through reproachful turns or accusations. The moves that the participants take are also based on the co-speaker's action, and part of the co-speaker's prior turn may be reused in the next turn to support one's own agenda. As regards participation roles, the three participants involved in the two questioning passages act as authors and animators of their characters' attitudes and ideas. They may also be the originators (or principals) of some of the opinions themselves, and so express their own views on the squirrel's conduct. The participants in their opposing roles have had an opportunity to carry out the talk in similar ways as is done in disputes in other social contexts getting or keeping the floor by paying attention to their co-speaker's turns.

7.3.2 Collective questioning by teacher and pupils

This section discusses the questioning sequences in which several participants take part by initiating questions to the two pupils in the roles of the accused animals. These sequences usually deal with the same topic and both teacher and pupils are involved in the questioning.

Some of the questions are self-selections by participants while in other instances pupils bid for a permission to question by raising their hands, i.e. there are two speech exchange systems used in the activity. The teacher both allocates participants' turns and joins in with her questions in the questioning sequences, and in this capacity she can be considered one of the participants with a special status as the king of the forest. In addition to this, the teacher has a managing role, in which she directs and organises the proceedings of the parliament and begins the questioning sessions of both the animals. The teacher's managing role will be discussed in Section 7.3.3.

The first passage in which questioning is done collectively involves three questioners dealing with the same topic, i.e. whether the squirrel used violence when the porcupine fell into the river. It occurs midway through the activity when the squirrel has been questioned for a while, and after the teacher in role has informed about the next events: the search party has been sent to look for the porcupine. As the organisation of the search party between three pupils takes some time, and since there is a long lapse in the activity, the teacher activates the class by eliciting more questions:

(10)
153 Thas anyone got any questions or problems (.) Ol[li
154 Ps [((some laughter))
155 Olli → are you sure that you (.) £only tickled that porcupine
156 Ella yes that was only thing I ever did
157 Olli → did you use any guns or [s(h)ometh(h)ing ((laughs))
158 Ps [((loud [laughter))
159 Ella [**no**]
160 Anu? (xxx)
161 Ella no no no the only thing I have is a fork and that w(h)asn't v(h)ery (.) wise
162 Anu °you [didn't even (x)°
163 T → [↑did you use a fork?
164 Ella !no no I didn't all I did think! [about it (x)
165 Anu [(you didn't even think about it)
166 Ella (x) these fingers ((waves her forefingers)) nothing else these are my these
167 are [my these are my
168 Anu→ [didn't you even think about it [(xx) use of guns or (x)
169 Ella [no no] no no never ((shows her fingers))
170 T>Simo have you got a question?<

Olli bids to speak and the teacher nominates him as the next speaker. In line 155, he introduces the topic of tickling, smiling a little, and his yes/no-question expresses doubt that the squirrel has given a truthful account about it ('are you sure that you (.) £only tickled that porcupine£'). Ella's affirmative 'yes' would have been an adequate answer, but she elaborates

to make her assertion stronger (‘that was only thing I ever did’) in line 156. Olli continues with another yes/no question asking about the use of guns (line 157). The loud laughing response from the group partly overlaps with the question (line 158). This may be caused by the incongruence between guns and tickling or guns and squirrels, but the topic of violence or Olli’s laughingly uttered question may also have invited laughter. In line 160, Ella initiates her curt ‘no’ during the group’s laughter.

Ella elaborates her earlier negation (line 161) explaining that she only had a fork in a laughing manner. Two questioners initiate turns almost simultaneously: in line 162, Anu begins a negative statement in a rather quiet voice (‘ºyou didn’t evenº (x)’). This is unnoticed by the teacher whose initiation (line 163) now interrupts Anu’s turn. The teacher picks up the topic of fork from Ella’s prior turn for her question (’↑did you use a fork?’), which gives an impression of the chairperson’s intervention in order to ascertain a particular fact. In line 164, Ella negates it emphatically and begins to elaborate (‘all I did think !about it (x)’), with which she seems to admit that she did think about it. Again Anu tries to find a slot in the talk for her questioning turn, and her initiation coincides with Ella’s talk: ‘you didn’t even think about it’ (line 165), which seems to pass Ella’s turn in which she admitted thinking about it. Instead, Anu pursues the question which gets heard later in line 168. However, Ella still does not catch Anu’s words, but continues her turn explaining that she only used her fingers (lines 166-167). To illustrate this, she waves her hands and fingers thus enacting her character. In line 168, Anu finally manages to get her question heard by interrupting Ella’s turn. She formulates her negative statement into a form of a negative interrogative (‘didn’t you even think about it (xx) use of guns or (x)’). This form of questioning in news interviews may involve a proposition which, on the basis of the preceding talk and emerging facts, evaluates the interviewee’s conduct critically and challenges the interviewee to rebut the proposition (Heritage 2002: 1439). Ella immediately produces her rebuttal to the made proposition at the first transition relevance place of Anu’s turn before Anu has finished (line 169). The teacher nominates the next speaker, but he does not continue the same topic any more.

This questioning passage displays participants’ questioning strategies as somewhat similar to interrogation tactics in the courtroom, viz. the questioners pay careful attention to the defendant’s responses in order to find a flaw or discrepancy in them and build their next moves on those particular points. Thus, yes/no-questions and negative questioning statements are used to focus on a specific point and only ask for affirmation or negation on that detail,

which is doubtful and needs to be checked. The questioners enquire whether the squirrel used any violence when tickling, and there is an opportunity for participants to join in the questioning, i.e. there seems to be more 'room for interaction' than in the previous activity. The latter part of the questioning is done in a dyad, and in this passage the participants' turns overlap considerable, which resembles the turn-taking in the questioning between two pupils seen in Section 7.3.1.

In the second questioning sequence, the squirrel is mainly questioned by one pupil who gets support from the group members. The squirrel also receives one supportive comment. Tea raises her hand to question and the teacher notices it while speaking and announces her as the next speaker in a playful way using Tea's role name 'honeybee', i.e. the nomination is done in the drama frame. Tea takes up the topic that Olli has started in line 155:

(11)

179	T	(x) su(h)rprise Tea (.) the honeybee has a question
180	Tea→	£yes you said that you tickled him only just by your fingers (x) nails
181	Ella	ye(h)s b(h)ut (x)
182	Tea	yes but l(h)ook at y(h)our n(h)ails
183	Ella	what about them w(h)ell then (2.0) I [j(h)ust- ((looks at her nails))
184	Ps	[((some talk and laughter))
185	T →	I guess they could be considered weapons=
186	Ps →	=yes
187	Ella	I don't think so >because I use these fingers and there are no nails in these
188		fingers (.) they are (x)< [((shows her fingers))
189	Pia →	[oh sure
190	Tea	yes after that (.) you [have to (.) it-
191	Ella?	[(xxx)
192		!no [(x) surface it's so smooth!=
193	Pia →	[yeah
194	Iris →	=I'm on her side we don't have sc(h)isors to c(h)ut the nails (1.0) so ((laughs))
195	T	>yes but you can always (2.0) bite them<

Tea uses reported speech asking the squirrel to confirm that she only used her fingers for tickling the porcupine (line 180). She utters her questioning statement through smiles, and Ella responds to it (her response is unfortunately inaudible). Tea's next turn is a directive which points out a discrepancy in the squirrel's testimony ('yes but l(h)ook at y(h)our n(h)ails). This is a 'topic glide' from an earlier questioning sequence (Extract 10) concerning whether the squirrel only used her fingers for tickling (Linell 1998: 189). Here Tea adds a new detail from the physical drama context referring to the squirrel's nails. Ella denies Tea's accusation with a challenging wh-question (>what about them<), looks at her nails and tries to continue her turn through laughter (line 183). Wh-questions may have a challenging function

in environments which involve disagreement and express the questioner's stance implying that the presented claim has no basis (Koshik 2003: 68).

Ella's turn thus joins in the make-believe frame which Tea has now taken to concern the actual physical environment. The group responds to the exchange with laughter (line 184). The teacher continues the authoring of the make believe context: she gives the king's statement about the matter (line 185). It is based on the prior evidence ('I guess that they could be considered weapons'), and her statement elicits a collaborative confirmation from several pupils (choral response) (line 186). Ella defends herself by disagreeing with this idea ('I don't think so') and elaborates by explaining that she only used 'these fingers' without any nails (line 187-188). She also illustrates this by showing her fingers while speaking. She is interrupted by Pia's comment which is uttered in a disbelieving voice. Her 'oh sure' is meant ironically and it treats Ella's turn as highly untrue (line 189). Tea initiates a turn, Ella joins in playfully and their turns overlap (lines 190-191, not all audible). Ella's animation in line 192 is a recontextualisation from a chapter in the sixth form text book ('!(x) surface it's so smooth!'). In line 194, Iris announces her support to the squirrel and authors her turn as a fellow animal in a laughing manner, i.e. these two animals do not have scissors to cut the nails with. The teacher, however, authors the king's counter-argument by pointing out a weakness in the claim (>'yes but you can always (2.0) bite them<') in line 195, which also finishes this questioning sequence.

In this sequence, the questioners playfully end up demonstrating their opposition or support to the accused squirrel and thus appear as two interactional teams for a moment, in which "participants explicitly act as an association making this association visible to the other participants" (Kangasharju 1996: 292). Tea points out that such nails as the squirrel has may have been used as weapons in tickling. Her turn invites the group to enter a make believe frame, or pretence, in which the co-participants accept the proposition as a fact and treat it as if it was real. Accordingly, Ella first authors the squirrel's denial to Tea's claim, but the teacher's turn agrees with Tea and also gets general support from others. Similarly, Pia as the next questioner expresses her disbelief, and there is thus firm opposition against the squirrel. The squirrel's side now gets support from Iris who joins in with a defending turn, as a sign of solidarity and a deliberate counter-action towards the opposing party.

In the last questioning sequence of the activity, several participants question the porcupine together. According to the African drama story, the porcupine misbehaves as he comes to stay at the squirrel's house during the rainy season and refuses to leave. Now the porcupine's life and her lack of a house become the topics of questioning. The story, however, does not provide any information about the porcupine's past life, unlike in the squirrel's case, and this means that Mari in the role of the porcupine cannot draw on the story to be able to answer the questions. Instead she has to author the answers to the questions about the porcupine's life herself. Prior to Extract 12, the teacher herself has questioned the porcupine (discussed in Extract 15, Section 7.3.3), and now she elicits more questions from the group in the last part of her turn:

(12)

232	T	so that they wouldn't fall off (.) ºohº (2.0) <u>now</u> (1.0) we have brought these
233		creatures in front of us (2.0) would anyone (.) like to ask porcupine anything
234	Asta→	>ok< where is your (.) own home
235	Mari	£I don't have a home?
236	Girl→	why don't [you
237	Ella	[why ↑no:t↓
238	Mari	£I don't <u>need</u> a home
239	T	Pia (xx[x) (Pia waves the turn to someone else)
240	Ella →	[>!are you too lazy to ↑build one<
241	Mari	**no** (.)
242	Ella?	(wrr)

The teacher opens the floor for questioning, and in line 232, Asta introduces a new topic prefacing her enquiry with a quick ok-token as a decision-marker ('>ok< where is your (.) own home'), to which Mari authors a smiling response ('£I don't have a home?') in line 235. Two pupils initiate questions almost simultaneously asking for the reason for this (lines 236-237). Mari produces another similar smiling answer in the same form as her previous turn ('£I don't <u>need</u> a home') in line 238. The teacher nominates Pia as the next speaker. She, however, gives up her turn and Ella initiates a quick yes/no-question (line 240). It makes a proposition on the basis of the porcupine's prior turns, i.e. if he does not have a home or need one, this may be due to laziness. Mari negates the proposition promptly ('**no**') in line 241.

The sequence continues with reproaches which three successive questioners make. They each criticise the porcupine for not living like an animal should. For the moment, the talk becomes a 'reproach activity' while the questioners express their "moral indignation" on his behaviour (Günthner 1996: 273):

(13)

243 T so (.) Tea (.) do you have a question?
244 Tea → £yes why don't you (1.0) build your own house
245 [(1.0) when the others build their house
246 Ella [(lazy)
247 Mari I don't know how (2.0)
248 Ps ((some belated laughter))
249 Pia → why don't you ask (.) somebody (.) to help you
250 Mari I don't have anybody to ask ((smiles))
251 T → what did you do during the (2.0) dry season then (1.0)
252 Ella→ ◦ate and sleep◦
253 Mari £I walked around and (2.0) ºall kind of stuffº (2.0)
254 Ps ((some belated laughter))
255 Anu→ someb(h)ody is l(h)ying now
256 Ella → so is here someone who would like to ↑take ↑with him
257 and [give him some foo:d and some be:d and [(x) ((acts out disbelief))
258 Ps [((some laughter))
259 T [ok thank you if this is every-
260 thing that we've got to say we should now make a decision about what to do
261 in this matter (.) ((turn continues))

Tea acknowledges the teacher's turn and produces a why-formatted question, used for reproaches (Günthner 1996: 272), which asks why the porcupine does not build a house like everybody else (lines 244-245). The comparison which she makes with other animals distinguishes the question from 'real' why-questions and makes it recognisable as a reproach. The question is uttered in a smiley voice, which softens the criticism. Mari's response is brief, and it resembles her earlier answers in this sequence ('I don't know how') in line 247, now followed by the group's soft laughter after a pause (line 248). Pia self-selects and asks another why-question which is based on Mari's response, i.e. why does the porcupine not ask someone to help her to build a house if she does not know how to do it (line 249). The question is a follow-up question to the porcupine whose answer has not yet given a satisfactory account of his conduct (line 245), and thus Pia's question also involves a moralising tone. Mari's new response resembles her earlier answers: 'I don't have anybody who to ask' (line 250). The king's enquiry (wh-question) that the teacher authors next produces a topic glide and asks what the porcupine did during the dry season (line 251). The question sounds authoritative, based on the evidence that has been acquired during the interrogation, and a slight stress on the word 'then' implies the speaker's moralising stance in the matter: so what did the porcupine do if he did not build a house or make friends. The teacher's question is the third reproach made to the porcupine.

However, Ella portraying the frustrated squirrel steals the next turn and presents her view on the porcupine's life in a humorous and critical manner: since eating and sleeping was exactly what the porcupine had been doing in the squirrel's house, what else would she be doing anywhere else. Next, Mari authors her version in a smiley voice ('£I walked around and (2.0) ºall kind of stuffº') in line 253. Again this is followed by the group's laughter that is produced after a slight pause. In line 255, Anu self-selects a turn in which she casts a humorously expressed doubt on the porcupine's words in a laughing manner ('someb(h)ody is l(h)ying now'). Mari points her finger at Ella, to whom she seems to direct Anu's turn playfully. Ella also self-selects a turn in which she authors the squirrel's request to the animals asking whether someone could take the porcupine home and give food and a bed (lines 256-257). She animates her role figure through a meaningful tone of voice and elongated, stressed words ('foo:d, be:d), and gets the group's laughing response. The question does not appear to be genuine, but implies the squirrel's disbelieving attitude: on the basis of the information which the parliament has received, it is unlikely that anyone would like to give home to the porcupine. This remains the last turn in the sequence, as the teacher has to start the next phase in the activity which involves decision making in the parliament.

The participants in this questioning passage author the porcupine's past history together mostly through the chain of question-answer adjacency pairs. Most of the questions are wh-questions which resemble each other in form. These questions are well suited to their function, which is to find out facts about the porcupine's life. They are open questions which leave it up to the recipient to provide as comprehensive answers as possible. Mari as the porcupine responds with the minimum amount of information without elaborating or thus offering explanations unless specifically requested by why-questions. Why-questions, on the other hand, have a different function in the questioning: they are used as reproaches or moralising evaluations of what is being found out the porcupine. Thus, the previous talk and the participants' knowledge about the situation are relied on in these reproach activities (Günthner 1996: 277). Mari's enactment of the character is seen to follow the characterisation of the porcupine in the African story, that is, the porcupine used the squirrel's hospitality but did not say much during its stay. The questions and answers in the passage make a logical chain, and as a rule, each answer to the prior question provides an idea or premise to the next question. The alternating question-answer pairs give an impression of a dialogue between only two speakers instead of six or seven interactants, who collectively build the turn-by-turn questioning.

In sum, in the three sequences in which participants question the squirrel and the porcupine collectively, the opposition between the two sides (the questioners and the defendants) is built in different ways and questioning techniques. The types of questions that are used and their functions vary (i.e. from statements or yes/no-questions to wh-questions, and from information-seeking questions to reproaches), and they also affect the design of the sequences. The common characteristics in all these multi-party questioning sequences is the way in which the speakers' turns are mostly built on the topic of prior turns and often take the sentence structures into account. The teacher's participation involves allocating turns as well as questioning with pupils. Her higher status as the king of the forest is also visible in a particular type of questioning turns based on previously given evidence, which the teacher asks during the questioning.

7.3.3 Teacher's managing role in the activity

After leading the group into the drama, the teacher manages the different stages of the questioning phase within the drama activity acting at the same time in role as the king of the forest. The two participant roles, i.e. the institutional organising role and the fictional role, both have an authoritative status. Besides allocating turns and joining in the questioning at times, she thus decides when it is time to move from one stage of questioning to another and elicit the necessary action. Moreover, she may also take over the questioning for a moment. In this section, I will look into the way in which the teacher questions the squirrel and the porcupine at the points when there is a change in action and the teacher is in charge for a while.

The squirrel has been questioned in a dyad for the second time, and she has built her opposition by claiming that she has been treated unfairly by the parliament. At this juncture, the teacher joins in with a comment. It may be an assurance of a fair treatment (unfortunately only part of it is audible). This leads to a long passage of talk between the king and the squirrel, authored by the teacher and Ella. The teacher begins it with questions to the squirrel and continues by introducing the next phase in the drama:

(14)

130	T	[(x) accusing porcupine
131	Ella	no I don't think you would ((in a hurt voice))
132		you just (.) !want be mean to me (.) like that porcupine! (2.0)
133	T →	well did the porcupine offend you (2.0) or say [she is sorry

134 Ella [hmm no
135 T→ >by the way how did he come to your house< (.)
136 Ella err (.) he just (.) came because I yelled to him he was I think he was drowning (.)
137 and I yelled to him that !↑hey: I'm over here!
138 and !then he came and ate and slept and ate and slept and slept and ate! (1.0)
139 Ps ((smiles))
140 Ella and I didn't hear thank you (3.0)
141 and I don't know why even if I (x) saved his life then ((quietly as if to herself))
142 T → ↑oh (1.0) ºactually porcupine has not been found yetº I have sent a search party
143 to look for him two brave soldiers but they aren't back yet and I think that they
144 will be here rather soon so (2.0) I think that we should wait for them first to be
145 able to make up our mind I think it's important(1.0)to pro[ve
146 Ella [prove that I'm innocent
147 T→ no I mean it's important to(1.0) know whether porcupine is dead or not (1.0) ºokº
148 Ps ((20 sec., subdued laughter, whispering, cautious whistling while
149 three pupils get ready for the roles of Porcupine and two searchers))
150 T ok will that be all that you've got to say?
151 Boy (xx)

In lines 131-132, Ella's expresses the squirrel's hurt feelings in her turn, with which she responds to the teacher. The turn seems accusatory and is followed by a noticeable pause in talk. Since the previous questioning sequence has clearly finished, the teacher seems to initiate the next question in order to move on, or to continue the topic which Ella has brought up as a wrongly treated party. (The filler 'err' seems to indicate some uncertainty about how to continue.) The teacher's enquiry in line 133 ('well did the porcupine offend you (2.0) or say she is sorry') is an easy question, to which the participants know the real answer from the African story. Ella's overlapping response ('hmm no') is animated as an answer of the reluctant squirrel (line 134). However, the teacher moves on (>by the way<) to elicit more information from the drama story and the past events by asking how the porcupine came to the squirrel's house (line 135). This incident has not so far been recounted, and it is also an easy question to deal with. Ella gives a detailed squirrel's account of the event in lines 136-141: she animates the squirrel's words and puts special emphasis on the porcupine's animated words (!↑hey: I'm over here!) and by showing through her use of voice how tiresome the porcupine was. The group responds with a smile during her turn. After what seems like Ella's closing comment in line 140, there is a long lapse in talk and Ella adds a concluding remark as if to herself (lines 140-141).

The teacher now begins to inform the group about the next phase in the drama (lines 142-145). The 'oh'-particle at the beginning does not sound surprised at what she has heard, but she seems oriented rather to the next topic. Oh- particles may also express "changes of state

of orientation or awareness", which seems to be the case here too (Jefferson 1978 as quoted by Heritage 1998: 291). The teacher informs about the search party that has been sent to look for the porcupine and that the parliament should wait for their return. However, when the teacher comes to the point where she states the reasons for the future plan, Ella intervenes with her defensive action (line 146). Ella's initiation is audience-oriented and it proposes that the parliament should be able to prove that she is innocent. (Her 'prove' partially overlaps with the teacher's 'prove', and it looks like a collaborative completion. However, Ella is advancing her own agenda, and the purpose of the turn may not be collaborative but argumentative.) The teacher acknowledges Ella's candidate solution in a matter-of-fact way, and produces an other-repair in line 147 ('no I mean it's important (1.0) to know whether porcupine is dead or not (1.0) ºokº'). This sequence is followed by a phase during which the search party gets organised, and there is a lengthy lapse in general action.

The next time the teacher is in charge of the questioning occurs when the search party has brought the porcupine in front of the parliament before the pupils. As in the squirrel's case, the king questions the porcupine first before the animals start their questioning:

(15)

210 T[↑ok now we have been listening to little squirrel
211 → what is your opinion porcupine (1.0) how can you ex[plain
212 Mari [h(h)e is g(h)uilty ((points
213 Ps ((laughter)) at Tarja))
214 T → of what what happened (.)[(x)
215 Mari [he] almost killed me (1.0)
216 T → then what was the reason for that (.)
217 Mari I d(h)on't k(h)now (.) I was a nice c(h)ustom[er
218 Ps [((some laughter))
219 T→ how did you behave?
220 Mari £I (2.0) mm I slept and (1.0) I ate and (1.0) I =
221 T → =did you eat a lot?
222 Mari £no
223 Ella !oh n(h)o!=
224 Anu =why y(h)ou are s(h)o fat
225 Ps ((loud laughter))
226 Mari £it's my (2.0) yes [((waves her left arm))
227 [((loud laughter))
228 T → >what is the reason for you being so fat<
229 Mari I must be fat because my (2.0) ((looks at the wordlist)) mm because those
230 quills n(h)eed so(h)me (.) f(h)at [(x) ((lifts up her arms and laughs))
231 Ps [((loud laughter))
232 Tso that they wouldn't fall off (.) ºohº (2.0) now (1.0) we have brought there
233 creatures in front of us (2.0) would anyone (.) like to ask porcupine anything

The teacher leads Mari through the porcupine's first questioning sequence by using a string of questions which take Mari from one response to the next one. After Mari has given her laughingly uttered response to the teacher's request to explain, accusing the squirrel (line 212), the teacher initiates a follow-up question inquiring what had happened. Mari's prompt response ('[he] almost killed me') is again followed by another question: 'then what was the reason for that' (line 216). 'Then' at the beginning particularly seems to involve criticism against the porcupine's behaviour: if the squirrel tried to kill him, then there may be some reason for that. Mari's response also treats the turn as a reproach as she produces a humorously untrue evasive answer through laughter: ('I d(h)on't k(h)now (.) I was a nice c(h)ustomer'). The teacher follows Mari's response and picks up the topic for her next question: 'how did you behave?' (line 219), to which Mari gives a smiley explanation, which is interspersed with pauses (line 220). Similarly, the teacher's next follow-up question ('=did you eat a lot?') receives Mari's denial served with a smile (line 222). So far the teacher and Mari have managed the floor together exchanging their turns in an orderly way. Mari has portrayed her role character in a playful manner displaying it as a careless creature through her answers to the teacher's questions.

At this point, a third party joins in the talk, i.e. Ella self-selects a turn after the porcupine has denied having eaten a lot. Her animated comment (!'oh n(h)o!'), which is produced through laughter (line 223), expresses the squirrel's view on the matter and implies that the porcupine is lying. Anu joins in quickly (224): she initiates a humorous turn which accuses the porcupine of being fat, the humour arising from the fact that Mari is a slim girl. Since Mari has some difficulties in coming up with a suitable response, the teacher rephrases Anu's question quickly, which here seems to have an assisting function. Now Mari manages to initiate a carefully designed turn (line 229-230), and gives the reason for her being so fat. The teacher adds a brief explanation which gives plausability to the porcupine's words (line 232), and then opens the floor for questioning in her managing role.

In sum, the teacher directs the different stages in the questioning phases of the whole group role play in her drama role which has a similar high status as her institutional role in the classroom. When she takes over the questioning in the directing capacity, her enquiries deal with the central events in the drama, and, as questions which ask about facts that are known to the pupils, they are thus easy to answer. But bringing up the past events may also be the teacher's way to elicit information for the benefit of the group to help their participation as

well as highlighting particular familiar points which can then be used in questioning. The question-answer adjacency pairs that are formed between the teacher and the two pupils in turn most often come as a chain in which the next question is based on the prior answer. The teacher does not animate her role character especially, but rather expresses the authority of the king of the forest through her talk while questioning or managing the different stages. After the questioning phase, the parliament makes a decision about the punishment, i.e. who to punish and how. The decision in this drama with this group was not unanimous, but as the teacher concluded, both of the animals had done something wrong. At the final stage of the drama lesson, the pupils are asked to think up something to say to any of the three main characters, the king, the squirrel or the porcupine. This brief reflection of the past events brings the drama lesson to a close and collects the pupils' impressions about the characters or events which they created and worked with.

7.4 Creating mutual fun and enjoyment through role play

As was seen in the preceding problem solving activity (Chapter 6), jointly created playfulness through interaction and laughter was a noticeable and significant feature in the activity. The focus of the section dealing with shared laughter was on the 'laughables', i.e. humorously treated items that generated laughing audience responses at particular places in interaction. Fun and playfulness in the whole group role play is viewed from another perspective in this section: here the focus is on the way in which participants create playfulness through their role play. The roles that are available in this activity for all participants are understood as a medium to create fun, laughter and a light-hearted atmosphere. Through enactments and dramatic action, participants in role make the imaginary context visible to the other participants, and also show that they are playing the drama game. By reciprocating the action and responding to the enactments through laughter, the audience also displays the same orientation to the activity. Moreover, the group's questioning occasionally takes the characteristics of the two role figures into account, and consequently generates shared laughter and fun. In other words, drama roles offer an opportunity to create playfulness in the local context of classroom drama, in which it is up to the participants to take this opportunity or not. The playful context is not stable and pre-created, but created by choice in talk-in-interaction.

The approach to playfulness taken in this section has been inspired and influenced by a recent dissertation studying how everyday emotions are socially organised in talk-in-interaction and utilised by other interactants in an institutional environment. Sandlund's research (2004) investigates 'enjoyment' that is pursued at different phases or times in graduate school seminars, and which is carried on by the other interactants for a while within the otherwise institutional talk, and which the participants thus make relevant in their talk and actions. Similarly, the description and analysis of playful interaction in the whole group role play will focus on those instances where the participants enact, account, question, argue or make a point in a humorous and playful way, and which generates fun and laughter for a while or is carried on for a longer stretch of talk. Thus, 'creating fun' in this case, unlike in Sandlund's research on emotions mentioned above, also covers brief moments of mutually experienced fun which is here observed and looked into. The interactional pattern of questioning in this activity sets a demand for orderly question-answer sequences, and playfulness is expressed in the process of questioning and answering and not as digressions from the pattern.

The following two sections will look at the ways in which the participants in drama create fun and playfulness through their roles or by making use of the role play context when questioning in the whole group role play. In Section 7.3.1, the pupils in the central roles use role enactments or reported speech to create fun and shared laughter. Often the group's laughing responses are invited by the speakers' own turn-internal or turn-final laughter. In Section 7.3.2, amusement and fun are instigated and generated by the group members as questioners through the use of the make believe or a culturally delicate topic. Thus, the participants in drama are also seen to make use of the roles that are available in order to create fun and amusement, and an overall orientation to treat the drama lesson as a playful activity is visible in this activity.

7.4.1 Creating fun through role enactments

The examples in this section show how the two pupils in the roles of the squirrel and the porcupine characterise their role figures through enactment when being questioned or by describing past events through reported speech. The first excerpt shows how Ella animates her role character at the beginning of the questioning phase. It begins with Pia's enquiry about the squirrel's tickling: Ella has just explained that she only tickled the porcupine a little and the porcupine had fallen (not shown here), and Pia asks about the squirrel's intentions:

(16)

77	Pia	didn't you want that he would fall falled ((gestures trying to find the word))
78	Ella	no: I [just] w(h)ant him to go out of my home to the next >what was it<
79	Pia	[ºfallingº
80	Ella	branch=
81	T	=ºbranchº
82		(3.0)
83	Ella	→ !I didn't mean it to fall ((sobs))[(.) I'm so s(h)ad! ((gazes at the teacher sadly))
84	Asta	[ok
85	Ps	((some laughter))

Ella's ('no:') includes laugh particles when she rebuts Pia's question in a defensive way (line 78). After a search for a forgotten word, which the teacher offers (line 81), Ella finishes her response after a pause in line 83. She produces her turn in an animated voice, sobbing, and looking at the teacher (the king of the forest) sadly, but bends her head down to display that she is also doing it for fun, i.e. her response finishes as a 'mock remorse'. (Asta initiates an ok-marker at the first turn transition place (line 84), but leaves it at that, since Ella continues her turn.) Ella's enactment instigates a laughing response from the group, and it is placed after she has finished her turn. The fact that Ella likes to act in the drama lessons and characterises her role figure well for everyone's amusement may have caused the audience laughter, and indeed, the laughing response can be seen as the expected rewarding response to Ella's enactment. Moreover, the laughter here may also be partly due to the humorously depicted remorse which is seen and heard at the latter part of the turn (line 83). Mock emotions can be found as a resource for fun when conversationalists enact an emotional state to pursue light-heartedness, e.g. a mock remorse to a teasingly presented rebuke (Sandlund 2004: 260-266), and Ella's turn also displays a tinge of similar playful pretence, which duly occasions and invites laughter.

In the second example, Ella first uses reported speech and enacts her role as the squirrel, which receives a laughing response:

(17)

114	Anu	did you try to communication with the porcupine=
115	Ella	→ =yeah and all he said !wrrr wrr[r!
116	Anu	[(oh) ((gazes up))
116	Ps	[((some laughter))
117	Ella	((laughs)) and (.) oh he did say that I have a problem and and he doesn't
118		want to go out and all that stuff and [(x)
119	Anu	[maybe you have a problem
120	Ella	may(h)be: [(x)

As a response to Anu's enquiry, Ella, in line 115, starts to recount the past events through indirect reported speech ('=yeah and all he said') and changes it into direct reported speech ('!wrrr wrrr!). In the African story, the porcupine used to grunt at the squirrel instead of talking to her, and now Ella uses this information and illustrates the porcupine's action. In instances where reported speech is used to express a dramatic mood as part of storytelling, as shown in studies quoted in Sandlund (2004: 231), the speaker's own assessment or standpoint is also conveyed in a reported account. Similarly, Ella here expresses the squirrel's attitude, i.e. the porcupine is portrayed as morose and uncommunicative, as she quotes what the porcupine has said (or may have sounded like) by using an unfriendly tone in the quotation. Prosody and intonation are essential ways to direct reported speech when 'the teller lends his or her voice to the speaker being quoted' (Sandlund 2004: 231), and here Ella includes an angry tone in her brief quote, which brings an instant laughing response from the group and Anu's response which seems disbelieving (line 116). Ella herself laughs briefly and continues her turn using now indirect reported speech adding, as if an afterthought, some more facts to her account (lines118-119).

The role character's stance can also be humorously expressed through irony or 'mock emotion', as seen in the next extract, in which Ella in the squirrel's role questions the credibility of the porcupine's answers. This passage occurs at the end of the questioning of the porcupine, who has just claimed that she walked round during the dry season:

(18)

255 Anu someb(h)ody is l(h)ying now
256 Ella → !so is here someone who would like to take with him and
257 [give him some foo:d and some be:d (x)!
258 Ps [((some laughter))

Anu's turn expresses disbelief in a laughing manner (line 255) and is followed by Ella's initiation, which she addresses to or targets at the assembly (lines 256-257). She chooses to use 'mock belief' which both expresses her mistrust in the porcupine's preceding answers and challenges the others to think for themselves. The turn is uttered in mockingly patient and exaggerated tones, which marks it to be taken as an ironic, opposing comment, and the turn duly occasions a laughing response from the group (line 258). The 'mock emotions' displayed in the drama lesson bear similarities to expressions of feigned emotions in other situations described in Sandlund (2004). The playful pretence displayed in 'mock emotions' is usually easily perceived and captured by co-interactants and used as material for 'interactional games

with each other' Further, 'mock emotions' are found to do also 'serious' interactional work, i.e. give information, besides achieving lightheartedness. (Sandlund 2004: 266-267.) The playfulness in Ella's turn also appears as an added humorous effect on the actual function of the turn, which is to express mistrust and opposition to the porcupine.

The next excerpt exemplifies how participants can highlight and make use of different roles available in the whole group role play. Here Ella creates fun by referring to an animal role in the parliament of animals after she is questioned by Simo. When Simo starts his enquiry in a laughing manner, his turn also receives the group's laughing response (lines 171-172). This seems typical of boys' participation which tends to be rewarded by laughter (also noted in Section 6.5.3, Chapter 6):

(19)

170	T	>Simo have you got a question?<
171	Simo	yes I h(h)ave [(xxx)
172	Ps	[((laught[er))
173	Simo	[do you have [any friends
174	Ella	[ºn(h)ice to m(h)eet youº
175	→	↑friends (.) oh yes I have (.) one (4.0) ºhe's a (2.0) he's <u>she</u>'s a
176		where is itº ((looks at her wordlist)) now ladybird
177	Ps	((some laughter))

In line 173, Simo asks whether the squirrel has any friends, while Ella's laughing, quieter greeting coincides with it, which seems to be her belated response to Simo's earlier turn (line 171). After a brief expression of surprise ('↑friends'), Ella, muttering quietly, begins to look up a word in the word list to be able to name one of the animals as her friend. When the right word is found and uttered, the group also expresses their amusement in laughter (line 177). The pupil in the role of a ladybird is sitting near Ella, and she has not taken part in the actual questioning in the activity. Ella's choice seems like a friendly gesture to encourage her classmate and perhaps make her feel more part of the drama. The animal names on the whole are not used much in the activity, which may be due to the fact that managing the questioning and answering requires all the participants' concentration. Since the names are not written on name tags or anywhere else, they are not so easy to keep in mind either. Ella's use of the role name here may have also reminded the teacher of the pupils' roles as she in her next turn nominates the next pupil by using her role name: '<u>Tea</u>: (.) the honeybee has a question'

The last excerpt shows how Mari in the other central role as the porcupine enacts her role figure and defends her side of the argument in ways which create fun and amusement, i.e. she

portrays the porcupine as a decent visitor, accuses the squirrel for the event and mostly produces her turns through smile or laughter. Mari is given (or suggested) the role of the porcupine by the teacher midway through the parliament of animals, and since she has not participated in the questioning so far, taking a role is a new experience for her. In the first example, Mari is questioned by the teacher after a lively passage involving laughter while the porcupine is brought in. The same lightheartedness is visible when the questioning begins:

(20)
209 T ok now we have been listening to little squirrel what is your opinion
210 porcupine how can you [explain
211 Mari → [h(h)e is g(h)uilty ((pointing at Ella))
212 Ps ((laughter))
213 T of what what happened [(x)
214 Mari [£he] almost killed me (1.0)
215 T then what was the reason for that (.)
216 Mari → I d(h)on't k(h)now I was a nice c(h)ustom[er
217 Ps [((some laughter))

Mari launches a playful accusation against the squirrel when she is asked for an explanation for the past events. She produces it laughingly pointing at Ella, which cues the accusing action as a humorous turn inviting laughter and duly instigates the group's laughing response. Part of Mari's laughter may be due to the novelty of appearing in role, or acting a role of a rude character at that, and so may also have a similar 'embarrassment-resistant function' which laughter can have in talk when interactants deal with personally or culturally delicate matters (Haakana 1999, Sandlund 2004). However, while speaking, Mari looks at Ella and focuses on enacting her role by defending herself and accusing the squirrel, and her laughter may also indicate her understanding of the role play as a non-serious activity. Mari's turn in line 216 is also produced through laughter, as a response of the reckless porcupine who does not see that he has done anything wrong ('I d(h)on't k(h)now I was a nice c(h)ustomer'). It is a good, rather shyly but playfully expressed answer, and some of Mari's own laughter may be caused by her humorously untrue portrayal, which also occasions and invites the group's laughter. The laughter, as seen in research, also in itself tends to work as an invitation to audience laughter (Haakana 1999, Sandlund 2004, Adelsvärd 1989). Later on in the questioning (discussed in Section 7.3.2), Mari also portrays a helpless porcupine by making up the past for the animal, which the drama story does not provide for. Her portrayal creates a humorous effect and instigates appreciative laughing responses by the other participants.

In sum, drama roles make it possible to play and have fun together, and as seen in the examples above and also in the preceding chapters, they can be made use of in several ways to create enjoyment. The pupils in the roles of squirrel and porcupine enact their characters and match their answers with the questions which are asked, and the animated turns in both enactments are seen to arouse amusement and fun. Ella uses reported speech, portrayal of her role figure and mock emotions as her dramatic devices, i.e. she follows the events of the story, but gives colour with direct reported speech and enacts the feelings of the remorseful squirrel. She also refers to another animal role in her talk. Similarly, Mari's responses are in line with the events of the African story while she portrays the porcupine as a selfish creature. But she also makes up answers to the questions which do not deal with events in the story, and both kinds of turns tend to create shared fun and amusement. The inserted laughing particles and smiling in the produced turns also seem to occasion and invite laughter. Most of the shared fun is instigated by the turns of the main characters, but there are one or two cases when questioning turns are made in a playful make-believe frame.

7.4.2 Pursuing fun through questioning

The questions which are addressed to either of the two animals make use of the make-believe quality of the imaginary context. Most of the questioning deals with the topics in the story, or the background and the past events, but there are two cases in which the questioners pick up an item which they criticise as a stated fact, i.e. they build their turn on the make-believe. In the first excerpt, Tea points out that the squirrel has nails which may be used as weapons:

(21)

179	T	((h)x) s(h)urprise Tea: (.) the honeybee has a question
180	Tea	£yes you said that you tickled him only just by your fingers
181	Ella	(xxx)
182	Tea →	yes but l(h)ook at y(h)our n(h)ails
183	Ella	what about them ((looks at her nails)) w(h)ell then (.) I j(h)ust-
18	Ps	((some talk and laughter))
185	T	I guess they could be considered weapons=
186	Ps	=yes

Tea initiates a question (line 180) which takes up the use of fingers which has been dealt with earlier in the activity. Tea smiles through her talk, and it seems that she has planned her next move beforehand: in line 182, she creates an 'as if'-reality through pretence, and treats Ella as if she was the squirrel. Her laughingly presented question 'yes but l(h)look at y(h)our n(h)ails' gets Ella's response which sounds a little surprised and partly mixed with laughter, which is

joined in by several participants. (Unfortunately Ella is not seen or heard on tape all the time, but she studies her nails carefully at some point of this questioning.) When the teacher produces a candidate understanding of how the previous question could be understood (line 185), the group gives a choral response to it.

The second excerpt describes a similar case, in which the real situation becomes an 'as if'-reality through Anu's question. This creates an even more humorous situation, since there is a greater clash between these two realities, and the question itself occasions a loud laughing response:

(22)

220	T	did you eat a lot?
221	Mari	£no£
222	Ella	!oh n(h)o!=
223	Anu →	=why y(h)ou are s(h)o <u>fat</u>
224	Ps	((loud laughter))
225	Mari	£it's my (1.0) ((waves her left arm)) yes
226	Ps	((loud laughter))
227	T	>what is the reason for you being so fat<
228	Mari	I must be fat because my (1.0) ((looks down at the wordlist)) mm b(h)ecause
229		th(h)ose q(h)uills n(h)eed some [fat ((lifts up her arm laughing))
230	Ps	[((loud laughter))

In line 224, Anu initiates a laughingly asked question to Mari after the topic of eating has been introduced by the teacher and responded to and commented on. Anu's turn creates loudly expressed amusement, apparently because Mari as a slim, tall girl is the opposite of the well-fed porcupine. Anu's own laughter may also have worked as an invitation for the others to join in laughing. Mari has some difficulties in finding the right word or answer, and she waves her arm in an effort to finish her turn. The group responds with loud laughter which is not unsympathetic, and Mari also joins in. The teacher's reformulation of the question (line 227) helps Mari to produce a good response after finding the word in the wordlist, and she finishes it through laughter. This is again responded with the group's loud laughter partly overlapping with the end of the turn. Mari's lifting her arm signals that she still finds her answer difficult or even inadequate, but she laughs at the same time and thus "exhibits willingness to be laughed at" , which also seems to be acknowledged by a loud audience laughter as in the case described in Sandlund (2004: 283-284).

There are two other questioning turns which generate amusement among the participants, but the fun is not connected directly to fictional roles, but may deal with the topic of violence.

However, these two examples show how drama roles and make-believe reality can be employed in the questioning in ways which are not so predictable and which create new challenges for suitable answers. This kind of pretence bears some resemblance to children's play where something is stated as a fact which should be reciprocated by the co-player. It also clearly shows that the questioners as well as the central characters want to play the game and display their willingness to enter the drama frame.

8 DISCUSSION

This study has aimed at looking into the interaction of two drama activities in a foreign language classroom, and particularly into the way in which the participants, i.e. teacher and pupils, organise their talk in a fictional drama context. Both the activities have different goals which have affected the turn taking and interaction system employed by the participants, but both involve and draw on play, roles and pretence which are present in the drama contexts. In Chapter 6, the problem solving activity is seen to consist of proposal sequences in which pupils' proposals to the teacher in role are negotiated mostly through question-answer adjacency pairs between teacher and pupils. The whole group role play in Chapter 7 presents another kind of interactional pattern, also constructed by question-answer adjacency pairs, in which the participants question two pupils in the parliament of animals. The detailed study of the turn-by turn interaction with the conversation analytical method has attempted to show (i) how the participants organise their talk in the two drama activities and what kind of institutional or non-institutional orientation they show in their participation; (ii) what kind of access the pupils have to talk; (iii) what kind of sequences are constructed in the activities; and (iv) what the role of the fictional context has in the interaction between teacher and pupils.

This chapter discusses the findings of the present study in the following order: First, I will explicate the typical interactional features of the two drama activities separately, and then give a brief summary of those features that appear as common defining characteristics in the fictional learning contexts of study. This includes features concerning the organisation of talk, participants' orientation and access to it as well as the role of the fictional make-believe context. Second, the findings of the present study are viewed in the light of drama pedagogy, i.e. what drama pedagogical aims may have been reached or approached in the process. Third, the findings and observations of the two drama contexts are discussed from the point of view of foreign language learning, i.e. what opportunities or affordances they seem to offer. This is done through van Lier's ecological approach within Vygotsky's sociocultural framework. As a final conclusion, the chapter ends with considerations about the use of drama in education in a foreign language classroom and discusses the limitations of the present study and possible areas for further research.

8.1 Findings

The two drama activities under scrutiny in this research are structured in different ways, and this requires different types of participation from teacher and pupils, which also influences pupils' access to talk. Despite the differences in interaction, the activities have a common, unifying factor, because they both are fictional drama contexts which are also part of a bigger drama context of the drama pretext 'The Rains'. In this section, I will sum up the typical interactional features and participants' institutional and non-institutional orientations through the findings of the two activities, first separately and then as a brief summary of the defining characteristics in these two drama activities.

8.1.1 Problem solving activity

The overall sequence organisation in the problem solving activity appears orderly and rather teacher-centred, that is, the teacher manages the interaction by producing at least half of the turns that are taken. Moreover, she has the power to decide whether to accept or non-accept the proposed idea. However, the CA analysis of the proposal sequences reveals that the interactional pattern for problem solving offers different opportunities for participants to vary the way in which they propose and negotiate. Thus, the rules for participation turn out to be less rigid and more flexible than in a traditional teacher-centred classroom context, which is made visible in the interaction in the following way: First, since no specific rule about taking the floor is given, participants themselves can choose either to bid to get the floor or self-select, and both ways of initiating proposals are used. The analysis shows that particularly after the teacher's elicitation questions, pupils orient to participation in an institutional and traditional way by bidding to speak, but all in all, self-selection and allocation of turns occur in equal proportions in the problem solving game. Second, the pupils make conjoined participation as an interactional team relevant a few times during the game, e.g. by initiating a proposal or responding to the teacher together. Third, the audience laughter is often used as a reward to the pupils' or the teacher's amusing or witty turns, as expressions of approval or enjoyment, or culturally delicate matters. Laughter is an important form of ensemble participation, which defines the character of the activity as a playful game. The group's laughing responses are thus a sign of affect and a general feeling of friendly atmosphere.

In both the activities of this research, questions have a central structuring role. In the problem solving activity, the teacher manages the interaction with her questions and other means of negotiation when dealing with the pupils' proposals. Each type of questioning turn has a function and a goal which the pupils also have to analyse and act accordingly, e.g. by recognising a challenging enquiry to be able to defend their side of the game. The problem solving activity thus involves versatile participation skills which are visible in the interaction. First, regarding the use of questions, the teacher uses wh-questions as follow-up enquiries to find out more about the proposal which is made. However, the function of yes/no-questions is mostly different, i.e. they challenge the suggested ideas and show that there is something problematic about them. Both these questions are usually asked in the teacher's institutional role, and their overall function is to create more talk in order to carry out the negotiation. Second, the teacher may also non-accept and oppose the proposed ideas with formulations which express the porcupine's stance and they are made in role. She also seems to use her role when responding to the proposals with partial repeats or formulations, which express the speaker's emotions, such as surprise and interest. Such responses are signs of the teacher's non-institutional orientation to the activity. Similarly, the few corrections used in the activity are unobtrusive conversational repairs. The alternation between the teacher's two roles resembles the way in which the teacher in class may change from instruction to administrative duties and "talk the institution of the L2 classroom in and out of being" (see Seedhouse 2004: 199-201). In the problem solving activity, the teacher talks the drama context 'in and out of being', by using the role character, i.e. talking and acting in a drama frame.

As to the character of the problem solving game, the two opposing sides between teacher and pupils are created in order to play the game, and therefore it is not surprising that the negotiations about the given suggestions turn out to be friendly and often humorous, and the talk between the two parties is playfully opposing. At some points, there is an orientation by two or more pupils to act as a team, but this kind of conjoined participation, e.g. responding together or joining in the negotiation, tends to add to the relaxed and playful atmosphere in the game rather than emphasize the strengthening opposition or a competitive spirit. Thus, one of the functions of pupils' conjoined participation seems to be creating fun and playfulness in the negotiation, besides offering support to the pupils' arguments.

In sum, the participants in the problem solving game display both institutional and non-institutional orientation to the activity. The teacher manages the talk through elicitation

questions and allocates turns when pupils bid to speak, which are typical characteristics in an institutional classroom setting. However, there are plenty of non-institutional features in the participants' interaction: The drama game shows the teacher's varying use of surprised or challenging responses to the pupils' proposals or defending turns. Further, the pupils occasionally act as a team with joint responses or initiations. Moreover, in the interaction of the fictional context, which also involves the opposition of the two sides, playfulness and laughter are made the natural ingredients of talk, which mark or reward witty and apt proposals and responses as humorous. Thus, teacher and pupils also treat the activity as a game which gives them a chance to have fun together.

8.1.2 Whole group role play

The whole group role play allows pupils to have more responsibility and power than the problem solving game in the running of the activity through their participation as questioning animals and in the two main roles of the accused animals. The teacher in her institutional role acts as the organiser of the successive phases and as a co-questioner in the parliament of animals, but the analysis of the drama context shows how pupils manage the interaction between themselves for a considerable part of the activity. Though the interactional pattern of this drama context mostly consists of question-answer adjacency pairs, the questioning phase with this particular group displays noticeable variety in the question-answer sequences which are built. First, two methods for turn-allocation, i.e. the teacher's turn allocation and pupils' self selection, are used. This seems to express participants' institutional and non-institutional orientation to the activity. Second, questioning sequences are managed between two pupils in a dyad as well as collectively by several participants, so that one participant introduces a topic and the others join in. Third, topics are developed on the basis of the produced responses, and the sequences thus resemble chains in which question-answer adjacency pairs are logically tied together. The topical coherence in a question-answer sequence in which several participants do the questioning thus resembles the coherence of a sequence between only two interactants.

As regards the participants' use of roles and enactment, they are made use of at certain points in the activity. At the introduction phase, the teacher leads the pupils into the drama partly speaking as the king of the forest, at times together with a pupil in role, which provides a model for participation. The two girls in the roles of the squirrel and the porcupine enact their

role figures mainly following the characterisation of the animals in the African story. On the other hand, the questioning pupils seldom make their animal figures apparent in their talk or refer to them. Instead, the questions are seen to express different emotions and attitudes which oppose or question the way in which the two animals have behaved in the past, and thus these questions often work as reproaches and accusations. The questioning passages are built in a variety of ways: In the two dyads, the two pupils keep the floor through intensive, well-timed dialogue, in which questioning and responding turns latch or partly overlap. When the questioning is carried out collectively by more than one pupil at a time, the opposition is built on the initiated topics. Each question or statement continues the topic so that the responses are often used as building material for the next enquiry. The collective questioning creates a playful and humorous atmosphere which is expressed through laughter and shared amusement. These moments often involve the enactment of the two central animal figures with animated voice or bodily action, which also creates fun. Play and humour are also part of the interaction in the dyads, which the group follows as an interested audience without trying to join in.

In sum, the interaction in the whole group role play displays characteristics which are not typical in traditional classroom contexts, such as pupils' central participation roles and ample opportunities to take or keep the floor. However, sometimes pupils orient institutionally to the activity by bidding to speak, which may also be seen as a way to ask for a floor at a meeting, which the parliament of animals is. Further, pupils are able to decide the way of questioning in the parliament, whether to do it individually or jointly. When several pupils do the questioning, they continue each other's ideas and topics coherently, and the talk is occasionally managed without the teacher's participation. On the other hand, the teacher acts as one of the group and as a co-questioner besides managing the different stages of the activity. The questioning especially in dyads with overlapping and latching turns resembles talk in everyday social contexts, such as children's arguments or courtroom questioning. Play and fun are generally pursued by highlighting the opposition in questioning and through participants' enactments in role.

8.1.3 Common defining characteristics

In addition to the individual characteristic features of the two drama activities, there are a few common features which are typical of both of them. First, the two drama contexts work like

social contexts in which the participants act and interact. They are embedded in a bigger drama context in 'The Rains', which is first introduced and then built and developed together, and which can be used as a contextual resource in interaction. As in everyday social situations, pupils have a chance to decide their own level of participation, and they have their participation roles with the teacher also acting as one of the group. Second, the use of fictional roles allows the participants to express opinions under the cover of a role figure, besides enacting their role characters. In the problem solving game, the pupils do not have their roles, but their side represents the squirrel's viewpoint, and may be treated as one type of role. Third, since drama involves conflict as a natural ingredient, it engages the participants in solving dilemmas, considering options and making decisions in situations which ring true and worth considering within the drama frame. Finally, submitting to the make-believe reality of drama gives the participants an opportunity for play, fun and mutual enjoyment. These features define the social context for interaction in the two fictional contexts, and they may thus be considered the defining characteristics of the two drama activities of this study. Some aspects of these characteristics will now be briefly discussed.

When the group interacts to find a solution to the squirrel's problem and later questions the accused animals in the parliament of animals, they do not have to make up the situation or create topics themselves. The African story which the teacher tells to the pupils forms the basis for future action, i.e. it ends with a problem which the participants set out to solve. Thus, the drama which the group works on together continues the story and brings it to a satisfactory end. The events and the two characters in the story which are introduced to the group make the contextual resources which can be used in interaction. The pupils can take the circumstances in the story and the characterisation of the squirrel and the porcupine into account when they make proposals. The same context is also available for the teacher to use in her rejecting responses. Similarly, in the whole group role play, the pupils in the roles of the squirrel and the porcupine make use of the features of their fictional characters and the narrated events. The questioning is also largely built on the existing facts about the two animals and past events.

Besides the narrated story, there are other features in the drama lesson which participants can use as contextual resources for interaction. The animal roles which the pupils choose for themselves at the beginning of the lesson can be activated through enactments in the questioning passage in the parliament of animals. This is not much used with this group, but

the pupils' questions sometimes express or highlight the 'animal-view' in the matter. As the drama develops, participants will naturally use each other's or their own added material, talk or acting out, as contextual resources for further developments, in the same way as interaction-in-context is built between interactants.

There are also factors which seem essential in creating and maintaining the overall drama context: The physical setting of the drama lesson, in which the group with their teacher is seated in a circle on the floor, follows the cultural tradition of storytelling. The teacher's appreciative attitude towards the drama work and the pupils' contributions in particular seem to mark the session as a meaningful and interesting activity. Building the drama context thus starts at the beginning of the lesson and after the goal is reached, it is brought to an end within a drama frame. The analysis of the two drama activities shows that carrying out classroom drama needs collaborative work between individual participants, and that dramatic playing may lead to pupils' spontaneous collective action. With this group, participation in the fictional context also involves pursuing and creating fun and laughter, which can be seen as their interactional achievement. The defining characteristics in the drama context thus resemble typical features of a social context, in which the speakers are united not only by the words they exchange, but also by cultural, human, individual and collective bonds.

8.2 Findings viewed in the light of drama education

This section discusses the two drama activities from the point of drama education, considering its aims and learning goals and the way in which these goals appear to have been reached with this group in this research data. Drama goals and objectives are based on the principles of drama theories, which can be seen as institutional guidelines for drama practitioners. Some recent studies of institutional talk-in-interaction have been looking for a dialogue between conversation analysis and normative models or theories which some institutional settings involve. Peräkylä and Vehviläinen (2003: 727-732) call these models and theories 'stocks of interactional knowledge' (SIKs), and in their new approach, the different types of relations which SIKs and conversation analytical findings may have are focused on. Such relations include falsifying or correcting assumptions which are set by SIKs, providing a more detailed picture of the SIK-practices, increasing the understanding and expanding the description of the SIK-practices. My discussion in the following focuses on the relations between the drama objectives, i.e. the SIKs of classroom drama, and the findings of this research as they appear

through the CA analysis. When the analysed findings are seen in relation to the goals which have been set for the drama, it is likely to increase the understanding of classroom drama as a valid, working practice in a language class, i.e. drama may be shown to work.

There seem to be some general considerations and criteria which must be fulfilled to be able to carry out a successful drama lesson. Getting participants engaged in a fictional activity, i.e. submitting themselves to the drama reality (Bolton 1992), appears the most crucial factor in making drama work. Thus, the playful exercise must be treated as a worthwhile activity, and if pupils are given some information of the use of drama conventions, it may be easier to treat the drama as 'legitimate play' for all age groups. The teacher in the present data started the drama by taking up the use of conventions, emphasised confidentiality when necessary, and enhanced pupils' positive attitude towards the drama practice. Further, the teacher's role in a drama lesson is considered vital as a provider of 'scaffolding' in the working process (Bolton 1992; Neelands 1984). This is done will skilful questioning which challenges pupils' thinking. Naturally, it also gives participants a chance to practice their language skills. The teacher's challenging and probing questions in the problem solving activity in particular worked as 'scaffolding' tools in the interaction between teacher and pupils. Often language practice is regarded as the essential reason for doing classroom drama, and language is used as the central means with which the drama is carried out. In 'The Rains', making proposals, questioning, accusing and defending are the types of action which pupils have a chance to use and practice, which the participants in the present study can also be seen doing successfully.

Taking pleasure in the 'game of drama' is identified as the overall aim for the drama pretext 'The Rains' (see Owens & Barber 1997: 109-116). The drama which is based on an African story involves a fable context, animal roles and opposition between two contradictory stances. These components are well-suited for instigating a playful game between participants: imaginary stories have a natural connection with children's play and the two sides represented by the hospitable squirrel and the rude porcupine create a game-like setting which is culturally easy to relate to. The interaction in the two drama activities is built round questioning between two opposing sides, which also enhances the idea of a game. As the participants adopt roles of animals and not of ordinary human beings, there are even better chances for a playful activity.

The analysis of the two activities displays game-like qualities in the following way: First, both teacher and pupils build opposition in the problem solving activity, sometimes more sometimes less. The teacher asks pupils challenging questions about their proposals trying to pinpoint their potential drawbacks, e.g. 'But could they do it while it's raining?' The teacher's playful portraying of the selfish porcupine also seems to highlight the opposition. The pupils' side expresses the squirrel's point of view, which they sometimes present with humorously impertinent comments to the porcupine, such as 'It's your problem.' The pupils also act conjointly especially when producing short disagreeing turns, which emphasises playful opposition. In the whole group role play, teacher and pupils in their questioning use enquiries which humorously challenge the accused animals, who in turn are seen to defend their side successfully. The second game-like feature is fun and laughter, which participation in both the activities instigates among members of the group. The analysis of the interaction in the two activities provides plenty of evidence of the participants' (i.e. both teacher and pupils) mutual enjoyment and pleasure in trying to reach the goals of the activities. Thus, the 'game of drama' is constantly visible in the participants' defending their sides in a playful and purposeful way.

'The Rains' involves a number of goals which it aims to develop such as pupils' drama skills and knowledge, social skills, expressing assertiveness and learning about moral concepts which are connected with the topic of the drama (Owens & Barber 1997: 109) As regards the drama skills, some pupils follow the teacher's example and occasionally use dramatisation in their talk. For instance, in the whole group role play, the pupil in the role of the squirrel uses her voice and embodied action to characterise her role figure. However, the questioning of the animals is generally done without any special emphasis on enactment and bodily action. Second, the specific goals set for social skills include planning and presenting ideas, making agreement, relating knowledge to context and role behaviour. The pupils in this study are also seen to practice these skills in both activities. Pupils propose their own ideas to the teacher in the problem solving game having spent a while on planning them in pairs. Though two opposite sides interact to win support for their claims, both parties express some understanding for others in the negotiation, and an agreement is reached through vote. In the parliament of animals, the pupils' questions to the accused animals are presented coherently often taking the prior responses into account. As in the problem solving game, the events told in the African story are used as contextual resources, and especially the key items which the teacher has emphasized in her narration are recycled in interaction. This means that the

importance of those items has been understood correctly. Though pupils as members of the parliament do not generally display role behaviour of their animal figures, they may express the 'animal-side' in their questions. The two girls in the central roles as the accused animals, however, also characterise their role figure through animation.

Working with the themes and topics of 'The Rains' aims at increasing pupils' understanding in such moral concepts as fairness, justice and compassion or the experience of oppression and teach about African culture and traditions (Owens & Barber 1997: 109). The analysis of the pupils' talk displays how some questioning passages are exchanged with serious thought and argument, though they may have also involved laughter. So it seems conceivable that these moral issues were also given some thought if only passingly. If this lesson had been a start for a longer project, these and other areas in human life could have been worked on in more depth. Similarly, such personal learning areas as assertiveness and a personal way of handling difficulties could also be better practiced and learned in a longer period of time.

In sum, some of the central goals set for the drama lesson of my data seem to have been reached by the participants in this study. Though the pupils' negotiation and questioning was not done in their native tongue, it did not prevent the group from dealing with the topics and themes coherently when carrying out the activities, reaching their goals in the drama or creating fun in the process. The action turned out to be collaborative and at times collectively achieved, and the group 'played the game' in two meanings of the expression. The pupils seemed to understand the idea of dramatic playing by expressing the attitudes and stances of their characters in their talk, and sometimes dramatic expression was used in participation. The turn-by-turn analysis of the interaction of the two activities showed that the general objectives of classroom drama and the specific goals of 'The Rains', which formed the 'stock of interactional knowledge' for the drama lesson of the present study , could also be observed or reached by the participants.

8.3 Findings in the light of second language learning

This section is going to view the drama contexts as language learning environments and discuss what opportunities for learning they may offer on the basis of the findings of the present study. For this, I will use the 'ecological perspective' on language learning based on the notion of 'affordance'. In van Lier's suggestion for an ecological perspective within

Vygotsky's sociocultural framework, 'affordances' mean those opportunities for learning which the environment can offer to an active language learner (van Lier 2000: 253). I will first discuss affordances in the drama contexts in terms of equality and power, orientation to symmetry and joint construction of talk as well as contingent use of language and motivation. This is followed by a brief look at how learning is mediated in the two drama contexts of this research, i.e. which issues help in carrying out the activities.

When considering the affordances of a learning environment, two questions are seen relevant characteristics to language learning, i.e. an issue of symmetry which involves participants' joint construction of talk, and the issues of equality and inequality, including participants' power and access to talk (van Lier 2001). As was seen in the analysis of the two drama activities, teacher and pupils had more equal rights to participate than in a traditional teacher-centred lesson. In the problem solving activity the teacher managed the activity as the recipient of pupils' proposals, but the group's contribution was just as important for carrying it out, i.e. participants' rights and duties to participate were equally shared. In this respect, there was symmetry between the participants, though the two parties were not in an institutional sense equal, i.e. the teacher was in charge of the activity and had the power to decide when to stop the game and which proposal to accept. However, both teacher and pupils acted in the game in the same position as members of the drama group with their assigned participation roles, which were not similar to their institutional roles. As was seen in the analysis, participants showed orientation to both roles. Similarly, the whole group role play followed its own rules for interaction, which gave pupils more chances to speak as questioners in the parliament and also to have two central participation roles. In both the activities, participants displayed a collaborative and collective orientation to carrying out the activities. Their interaction showed features of conversational talk and appeared contingent, i.e. participants used contextual resources in talk, which was spontaneously produced, as well as linguistic and social resources to achieve mutual understanding (see van Lier 2001: 101). Such resources, which van Lier (2001) calls 'proactive', 'concurrent' and 'reactive' resources, were also used as devices by participants in the negotiation of both drama activities.

Both teacher and pupils used 'ok'-markers to ground their proposals, questions or responses occasionally, or as in the teacher's case, to indicate the beginning of a new phase in the activities. Other 'proactive' resources, such as 'by the way' or 'now', remained single cases. During the questioning in the parliament in particular, participants used and maintained eye

contact between the two parties. However, they did not ‘back channel’ each other’s turns in either of the activities, except for one case in the problem solving game after the first proposal was made: Otto sitting beside Ella who had proposed her idea, produced a smilingly uttered ‘uhhuh’. Neither were ‘empathy markers’, such as ‘Oh’ or ‘Really?’ used, which was understandable in activities with opposing parties. Among the most often used devices which created contingency in these two drama activities were summarising or rephrasing devices, such as ‘so’, which both teacher and pupils used in summing up their own or others’ ideas. Further, ‘oh’-receipts were mainly used to demonstrate the recipient’s understanding about some issue, mostly by the teacher when negotiating about proposals, but also employed by pupils as mock-surprised responses in the parliament, for instance. Repair, as a reactive resource in talk, was needed to clear up a problem at talk only a few times. In his argument, van Lier (2001: 102) observes that repair is only one means which language learners use to negotiate for meaning, not the only device, as it is generally understood. This was also seen in the negotiations of the two drama activities under study.

In the two drama contexts, the participation roles for the teacher and pupils are set, defined roles for and by this particular drama. The teacher’s role has a high status which does not differ from her traditional role as regards the power it involves. However, the teacher has to submit herself to the rules of the drama world, listen to the pupils’ suggestions, follow the decisions which are made and be willing to play as a member of the group. Thus, both teacher and pupils have rights and duties to make the drama work and reach the set goals, and pupils also have a choice as to the level of their participation. These shared rights and duties can also be thought to create a more symmetrical relationship between teacher and pupils. Symmetrical conditions (or an orientation towards symmetry) are seen to increase learners’ motivation to participate, as intrinsic motivation is connected to “the perception of being able to choose and of being somehow in control of one’s actions” (van Lier 2001: 97). It is the way in which contingent talk requires speakers to listen to each other that creates an “intrinsic motivation for listening” (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) as quoted by van Lier 2001: 102). As regards the motivated listening in the two drama activities, the participants as a group are found to listen to the continuing talk keenly. Through the ‘next-turn proof procedure’ of the turn-taking system (Sacks et al 1974: 728), it can be shown how pupils follow the talk and display their understanding (and appreciation) of it through participation in talk and shared laughter.

Motivation from Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective is connected with a need to carry out an action which has a specific goal. In both the drama activities, the action is goal-oriented, i.e. first, solutions are sought to solve the squirrel's problem, and next, the group is to find out through questioning which of the animals is to blame. However, when pupils participate in the drama activities, it is likely that they are not motivated by the same needs (see Lantolf 2000). Thus, a need to learn to speak English, a need to have fun or experience something new in the language class, a wish to express oneself through drama, or simply not to let anybody down in the drama lesson may also have motivated participants in the two drama activities. Different motives for participation may also have resulted in different types of drama work, but the study of interaction can only detect some general features about the group's activeness, or pinpoint single pupils' active and enthusiastic participation. The dissertation by Laakso (2004), states that classroom drama as a teaching method can be seen to boost motivation. Similarly, Pyörälä (2000) in her pro gradu research observes that classroom drama can give pupils new courage to use English, which could be considered a result of motivated action. Thus, if the game of drama is also a strong motivator for participation in a language class, the more engaging and inspiring, and thus more useful, the interaction in the drama activity may become. Further, when learners are engaged in contingent talk, they are also believed to focus on linguistic features (van Lier 2001: 102). This kind of interaction with a focus on meaning is also considered useful for second language acquisition within communicative language teaching and second language acquisition research which emphasises the role of interaction (e.g. Long 1996, Nunan 1989).

The interaction in the two drama activities, as in any goal-oriented activities, is mediated by "socially and culturally constructed forms of mediation" (Lantolf 2000: 8). In classroom drama, in which pupils act and interact in a fictional context, the make-believe reality, i.e. the drama itself, may be seen as a form of mediation. Submitting oneself to the drama reality, as if it were real, is like children's play, and under the cover of pretence, participants in drama or play can try out issues which they might not do in real situations. Acting in a drama context distances the topics from actual everyday events which can be dealt with in the cover of a role, and language is not used 'for real', which offers chances to take risks and have fun. With this particular research group, the interaction in the drama context and the use of roles involved this kind of risk taking and playfulness, which was sought together by initiating humorous turns, and which can be considered an interactional achievement. Thus, playfulness which the make-believe context made possible also had a mediating function for the group. In

much the same way, Sullivan's study of the use of play shows how the tradition of verbal play in Vietnamese culture mediated talk in an English class (Sullivan 2000). The research on the use of internet mediation (Lantolf 2000: 12), which lead to participants' creative and witty use of language and creating fun, also displays a similarity with the playful interaction mediated by drama in the way in which another forum for interaction may bring about change in learners' practices.

Further, the teacher's role in classroom drama is a mediating one. According to Bolton (1992: 136), the teacher in her dramatic role (teacher-in-role) has a chance to ask the right questions at the right moment and raise the level of pupils' potential for learning. By doing so, she creates a space for learning, i.e. in Vygotsky's concept, a 'zone of proximal development', in which "the input of an adult helps the learners to achieve beyond their previous capacity". The same conditions for learning are offered to pupils in a foreign language class, and the same benefits are thus available for language learners, too. In the problem solving game, the teacher manages the negotiation through questions by challenging and creating more talk, and her questions make the 'scaffolding' for the group. The whole group role play allows pupils to have a more dominating role, and they can manage much of the questioning on their own. In this way, the two activities are placed in such an order which supports the idea of scaffolding, i.e. it should help learners to become independent language users.

Finally, though in language classrooms the teacher's 'scaffolding' is usually connected with corrective work in the negotiation between teacher and pupils, it may also be viewed more broadly. Lantolf (2000: 17) suggests that a zone of proximal development could also be understood as "the collaborative construction of opportunities" (or affordances), i.e. "people working together are able to co-construct contexts in which expertise emerges as a feature of the group". Similarly, the group can be seen to co-construct the two drama contexts: The teacher manages the activities helping and engaging the group in the drama work. Some participants act as more active members of the group, others join in with laughter, and in this way the jointly built drama displays the collaborative action and achievement of this particular group. The way English is used to build these contexts by teacher and pupils alike are thus offered as affordances for learning.

9.4 Further considerations and limitations of the present study

The present study is going to end on a more practical note as this section will consider the findings and observations of the study from the pedagogical perspective. The beginnings of this research are situated in everyday classroom work, which made it possible to collect the data for the research. So its aim was to illustrate what kind of learning environment classroom drama would appear to be, and consider what potential benefits it might offer to language learners. However, the three drama lessons and the two analysed activities picked for the primary data can only give a select and limited picture of this learning environment. Thus, this section will also discuss the scope and limitations of the research as well as possible areas for further study.

Starting from the first observations of the three drama lessons, the would-be-data for the research seemed highly interesting, since the interaction displayed features which were not common in traditional plenary instruction or communicative language lessons. In some of the activities, participants passed and developed ideas smoothly between each other in a way which reminded of 'thought collectives'. Fleck's concept of a 'thought collective', which was discussed in Mazzarella (1995: 14-15), suggests that participants in conversation are able to construct thoughts which they are not likely to create alone or in any other context. This was also the first impression of the interaction in many of the drama activities of the data: participants' in drama were found to build their talk on someone else's idea in ways which might not have been done separately. In this respect, the running of the talk was clearly different from ordinary discussions in a language classroom, however successful. The later use of analytical tools also made this feature visible in the analysis itself, as the findings of the talk in the primary data have shown, and gave some concrete evidence to support the first impressions that classroom drama might offer language learners new kinds of opportunities for interaction. However, though participants in drama were found to continue other speakers' train of thought, team-like collaboration or conjoined action was not particularly common in these data. All in all, despite the positive expectations set for the present study, the actual analysis and description of the data have attempted to picture and analyse the interaction under study as truthfully and carefully as possible. Conversation analysis as a tool for research has the advantage of being able to display the analysis which the speakers make of each other's talk visible also to the analyst and other readers (Seedhouse 2004: 195).

In the light of the findings, pupils are shown to have more access to talk in both drama activities than in traditional teacher-centred lessons, i.e. the talk is more symmetrical between teacher and pupils. From the teacher's point of view, this is also a particularly important asset, since in the drama lesson, teacher and pupils are able to work side by side, share not just facts, but events and emotions and have fun together. The teacher does not have to act as the sole provider of talk, but can act as one of the group herself, co-author the situation with the pupils and enjoy the mutual experience. Working in drama may be able to offer what van Lier (2001: 104) calls 'quality interaction' between teacher and pupils, in which symmetry is sought for. The analysed drama activities show how the drama roles and contexts provide for a more symmetrical ground than usual, and which participants may also orient to in a non-institutional way at times. So the use of structured whole-lesson process drama is likely to involve many of the features, such as contingency, which recent approaches to second language learning speak for and recognise as affordances for active learners.

This leads to the question of the group's activity which is not equally shared between the participants in this data. Only about two thirds of the pupils contribute verbally to the two activities. Of these participants, girls are seen to be clearly more active than boys, and boys' turns also tend to be shorter than girls' contributions. The boys make only one third of the group, and as was briefly pointed out in Section 6.5.3, their turns are appreciated and rewarded with laughter. It may also be worth noting whether the activity of the same pupils varies or remains the same: Two or three of the most active pupils maintain the same level of activity in both the activities, but on the whole, more pupils join in the questioning in the parliament of animals than in the problem solving activity. Questioning another pupil may have been easier than making a proposal and getting involved in a negotiation about it with the teacher. Moreover, a pupil who has not spoken much in public in previous activities finds the courage to join in and accepts the role of the porcupine in the whole group role play. It seems plausible that if the group had tried out more drama , those pupils who now did not dare, feel comfortable or have enough skills to join in would have contributed verbally more often. However, talking is not the only form of participation, and the group is found to listen, follow the interaction and respond with laughter when there is a reason to do so.

When the data collected to be examined is small, as in this study, the development of pupils' skills cannot be observed or taken as a focus for research. To find out more about this kind of fictional learning environment and its effects on pupils' activity or development in different

areas of interaction, a longitudinal study of classroom drama in a language class would be needed. Further, other types of interaction in drama, such as reflection on the topics and themes of the drama, could be examined. In that case, the group could use the drama as a starting point for talk and employ the fictional context as a point of reference and comparison. Pupils' non-verbal participation, i.e. embodied action and expressions, would also be an interesting area to study in more detail, since they are an essential part of interaction. Unfortunately, one video camera and tape-recorder used in the present study were not always able to catch all participants' faces or action. However, some observations could be made, and the use of laughter as conjoined non-verbal action could be observed.

Finally, if a language teacher without any special drama studies approaches classroom drama from the philosophical perspective, it may seem intimidating with its fine educational pursuits and versatile learning areas, which seem to require infinite skill and dedication. However, the young teacher who held the drama lessons for these data had had no earlier experience in drama, but only observed the same lessons which were held with another group of pupils. She also learned about the drama conventions that she was going to need and studied the exercises and the pretexts carefully. As the study shows, the drama lessons were carried out successfully and all participants took the lessons seriously, i.e. played the game of drama. Classroom drama can thus be approached through practice and learn more about it step by step. The drama pretexts, such as given in Owens and Barber (1997), offer detailed guidance to drama practitioners in many fields. The pro gradu theses by Pyörälä (2000) and Huohvanainen (2001) focus on the practical side of classroom drama: the former looks into the use of drama in an English optional course and the latter consists of a material package for such a course. These studies also point out the opportunities which drama creates for spontaneous language use in meaningful situations and the courage which this type of practice gives to learners. The present study has only given a small picture, but hopefully a precise one, about the type of learning environment which classroom drama can offer to language learners. Many of the opportunities which seem to be available for participants in drama are found to be among the ones which the current approaches to second language learning consider most valuable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelswärd, V. 1989. Laughter and dialogue. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 12, 107–136.

Alanen, R. 2000. Vygotsky, Van Lier ja kielenoppiminen : sosiokulttuurinen viitekehys kielellisen tietoisuuden ja vieraan kielen oppimisen tutkimuksessa. In P. Kalaja and L. Nieminen (eds.), *Kielikoulussa - kieli koulussa*. AFinLA Yearbook 58. Jyväskylä: AFinLA, 95–120.

Alanen, R. 2002. Lev Vygotski: kieli ja ajattelu ihmisen kehityksessä. In H. Dufva and M. Lähteenmäki (eds.), *Kielentutkimuksen klassikoita*. Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen teoriaa ja käytäntöä 4. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 201–234.

Alasuutari P. 1999. *Laadullinen tutkimus*. 3rd revised edition. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Arminen, I. 2005. Institutional interaction; studies of talk at work. [online] (29 Feb 2008) http://www.uta.fi/~ilkka.arminen/doc/Arminen InstitutionalJuly25th05.pdf.

Bell, N. D. 2005. Exploring L2 language play as an aid to SLL: A case study of humour in NS-NNS interaction. *Applied Linguistics* 26 (2), 192–218.

Bolton, G. 1979. *Towards a theory of drama in education*. London: Longman.

Bolton, G. 1992. *New perspectives on classroom drama*. Herts: Simon & Schuster.

Broner, M. A. and E. E. Tarone 2001. Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (3), 363–379.

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

Clayman S. and J. Heritage 2002. *The news interview. Journalists and public figures on the air.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. 1997. Language play, language learning. *ELT Journal* 51 (3), 224–231.

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

Drew, P. 1978. Accusations: The occasioned use of members' knowledge of 'religious geography' in describing events. *Sociology* 12, 1–22.

Drew, P. 1992. Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: the case of trial for rape. In P. Drew. and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 470-520.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage. (eds.) 1992a. *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage 1992b. Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–65.

Drew, P. and M.-L. Sorjonen 1997. Institutional dialogue. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction. Discourse as social interaction*, vol. 2. London: Sage, 92–118.

Duranti, A. and C. Goodwin 1992. (eds.) *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, A. and D. Westgate 1994. *Investigating classroom talk*. London: Longman.

Firth, A. and J. Wagner 1997. On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal* 81 (3), 285–300.

Fleming, M. 1996. *Starting drama teaching*. London: Davin Fulton.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis. Ana essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodwin, C. and A. Duranti 1992. Rethinking context: an introduction. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–42.

Goodwin, M. H. 1990. *He-said-she-said: talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Günthner, S. 1996. The prosodic contextualization of moral work: an analysis of reproaches in 'why'-formats. In E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody on conversation. Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 271-302.

Haakana, M. 1999. *Laughing matters. A conversation analytical study of laughter in doctor-patient interaction*. University of Helsinki, Department of Finnish language.

Hakamäki, L. 2005. *Scaffolded assistance provided by an EFL teacher during whole-class interaction*. Jyväskylä studies in Humanities 32. Jyväskylä University.

Hakulinen, A. 1998 (1997). Vuorottelujäsennys. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 32–55.

Heikkinen, H. 2002. *Draaman maailmat oppimisalueina. Draamakasvatuksen vakava leikillisyys*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University.

Heikkinen, H. 2005. *Draamakasvatus – opetusta, taidetta, tutkimista!* Jyväskylä: Minerva.

Heritage, J. 1985. Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis vol. 3: discourse and dialogue*. London: Academic Press, 95-119.

Heritage, J. and A. L. Roth 1995. Grammar and institution: questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28 (1), 1–60.

Heritage, J. 1998. Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society* 27, 291–334.

Houtkoop, H. 1987. *An analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences*. Dordrecht/Providence, R.I.: Foris Publications.

Huohvanainen, T. 2001. *Process drama as a way of teaching oral skills: a material package*. Pro gradu thesis. Jyväskylä University, Department of English.

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt 1998. *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Inha, P. 2007. *Prosessidraama vuorovaikutuksena*. Pro gradu thesis. Jyväskylä University, Teacher training college.

Jones, R. and J. Thornborrow 2004. Floors, talk and the organization of classroom activities. *Language and Society* 33 (3), 399–423.

Kangasharju, H. 1996. Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 291–319.

Karvonen, K. 2007. Puheenvuoro oppilaalle. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 119-138.

Kasper, G. 1997. "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3), 307–312

Kasper, G. 2004. Partipicant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 551–567.

Kleemola, S. 2007. Opettajan kysymykset oppitunnilla. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 61–89.

Koshik, I. 2002. A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1851–1877.

Koshik, I. 2003. Wh-questions used as challenges. *Discourse Studies* 5 (1), 51–77.

Koskela, H. and A. Piirainen-Marsh 2002. Harvey Sacks ja keskusteluntutkimuksen perinne. In H. Dufva and M. Lähteenmäki (eds.), *Kielentutkimuksen klassikoita*. Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen teoriaa ja käytäntöä 4. Jyväskylän yliopisto, 257–280.

Kristiansen, I.1999. *Tehokkaita oppimisstrategioita. Esimerkkinä kielet*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1993. Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal*, 47 (5), 12–21.

Kuuluvainen, J. 1994. Draama. Nyt. Draaman teoriaa 1990-luvun alun Englannissa. In J. Lehtonen and H. Tanttu-Knapp (eds.), *Draama. Nyt. Kirjoituksia ilmaisukasvatuksen alalta*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitos, 10–22.

Kärkkäinen, E. 2002. Asennoituminen keskustelun osanottajien yhteistoimintana. In A. Mauranen and L. Tiittula (eds.) *Kieli yhteiskunnassa – yhteiskunta kielessä*. AFinLA Yearbook 60. Jyväskylä: AFinLA, 85–100.

Kärkkäinen, E. 2005. Paikallinen kielellinen rutiini: I guess asennoitumisen jäsentäjänä. In L. Kuure, E. Kärkkäinen and M. Saarenkunnas (eds.), *Kieli ja sosiaalinen toiminta – Language and social action*. AFinLA Yearbook 63. Jyväskylä: AFinLA, 109–126.

Laakso, E. 2004. *Draamakokemusten äärellä. Prosessidraaman oppimispotentiaali opettajaksi opiskelevien kokemusten valossa*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University. Doctoral Dissertation

Lantolf, J. P. 2000 Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-26.

Lantolf, J. P. (ed.) 2000. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lehtimaja, I. 2007. *Viittaaminen ja tehtäväjaksojen siirtymäkohdat.* In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 139–155.

Lerner, G. 1993. Collectivities in action: establishing the relevance of conjoined participation on conversation. *Text* 13 (2), 213–245.

Levinson, S. 1992. Activity types and language. In P. Drew J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 66–100.

Linell, P. 1998. *Approaching dialogue: talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press, 414–468.

Margutti, P. 2004. *Classroom interaction in an Italian primary school: instructional sequences on pedagogic setting*. PhD Dissertation. University of York, Department of Sociology.

Mazeland, H. and M. Huiskes 2001. Dutch ‘but’ as a resumption marker. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Betjemans.

Mazzarella, M. 1995. *Täti ja krokotiili*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.

McHoul, A. 1978. The organisation of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society* 7, 183–213.

Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning lessons. Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

Mondada, L. and S. Pekarek Doehler 2004. Second Language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 501–518.

Morgan, N. and J. Saxton 1987. *Teaching drama. A mind of many wonders.* London: Stanley Thornes.

Mori, J. 2004. Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: a case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 536–550.

Neelands, J. 1984. *Making sense of drama. A guide to classroom practice*. Oxford: Heinemann educational books.

Neelands, J. 1990. *Structuring drama work. A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neelands, J. 1992. *Learning through imagined experience*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Nofsinger, R. E. 1991. *Everyday conversation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. 1993 (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. 2001. *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

O'Neill, C. and A. Lambert 1982. *Drama structures: A practical handbook for teachers*. London: Stanley Thornes.

Owens, A. and K. Barber 1997. *Drama works. Planning drama, creating practical structures, developing drama pretexts*. Carlisle: Carel Press Ltd.

Peräkylä, A. 1997. Institutionaalinen keskustelu. In L.Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 177–203.

Peräkylä, A. and S. Vehviläinen 2003. Conversational analysis and the professional stocks of interactional knowledge. *Discourse & Society* 14 (6), 727–750.

Pomerantz, A. and B. J. Fehr 1997. Conversational analysis: an approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction. Discourse as social interaction*, vol. 2. London: Sage, 64–91.

Poulisse, N. 1997. Some words in defence of the psycholinguistic approach: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal 81* (3), 324–328.

Pyörälä, E. 2000. English through drama. Pro gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English.

Raevaara, L. 1998 (1997). Vierusparit – esimerkkinä kysymys ja vastaus. In L.Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 75–92.

Raevaara, L., J. Ruusuvuori and M. Haakana 2001. Institutionaalinen vuorovaikutus ja sen tutkiminen. In J. Ruusuvuori, M. Haakana and L. Raevaara (eds.), *Institutionaalinen vuorovaikutus. Keskustelunanalyyttisia tutkimuksia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 11–38.

Ruuskanen, L. 2007. Suomenoppija vastauspolulla – opetussyklin toteutuminen suomi toisena kielenä –oppitunnilla. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 90–116.

Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on conversation* (Vols. 1–2). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Sahlström, F. 1999. *Up the hill backwards. On interactional constraints and affordances for equity-constitution in the classrooms of the Swedish comprehensive school*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Uppsala Studies in Education 85.

Sandlund, E. 2004. *Feeling by doing. The social organization of everyday emotions in academic talk-in-interaction*. Doctoral dissertation. Karlstad University, Department of English.

Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361–382.

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

Seedhouse, P. 1996. Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities, *ELT Journal* 50 (1), 16–24.

Seedhouse, P. 1997. The case of the missing ”no”: the relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning* 47 (3), 547–583.

Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of language classroom: a conversation analytic perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seppänen, E-L. 1997. Osallistumiskehikko. In L.Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 156–176.

Sorjonen, M-L. 1997. Korjausjäsennys. In L.Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 111–137.

Suihko, K. 1995. Pedagoginen draama sosiaalisten roolien oppimisen välineenä. In J. Lehtonen and J. Lintunen (eds.), *Draama. Elämys. Kokemus. Kirjoituksia ilmaisukasvatuksen alalta II*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitos, 139–150.

Sullivan, P. N. 2000. Playfulness as mediation in communicative language teaching in a Vietnamese classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115-131.

Tainio, L. 2007. Miten tutkia luokkahuoneen vuorovaikutusta keskustelunanalyysin keinoin? In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 15–58.

Thornborrow, J. 2001 Questions, control and the organization of talk in calls to a radio phone-in. *Discourse Studies* 3 (1), 119–143.

Thornborrow, J. 2002. *Power talk: language and interaction in institutional discourse*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Thorne, S. L. 2005. Epistemology, politics, and ethics in sociocultural theory. *The Modern Language Journal* 89 (3), 393–409.

Van Lier, L. 1988. *The classroom and the language learner.* New York: Longman.

Van Lier, L. 2000. From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 245–260.

Van Lier, L. 2001. Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. In C. Candlin and N. Mercer (eds.), *English language teaching in its social context. A reader.* London: Routledge, 90–107.

Vepsäläinen, M. 2007. Opettaja kysyy ja oppilas vastaa – vai toisinpäin? In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskustelunanalyysi.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 156-177.

Vygotsky, L. 1978. *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Edited by M. Cole, J. Steiner, S. Scribner and E. Souberman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Young, R. 2004. Series editor's foreword. In P. Seedhouse, *The interactional architecture of language classroom: a conversation analytic perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

APPENDIX 1

Transcription conventions

te[xt1] [text]2	overlapping utterances
text1= =text2	latching utterances
(1.0)	a pause, timed in seconds
(.)	a pause, shorter than 0.5 seconds
(x)	unintelligible item, probably one word only
(xx)	unintelligible items, approximately of phrase length
(xxx)	unintelligible items, beyond phrase length
(text)	uncertain transcription
((laughs))	transcriber's comments
CAPITALS	loud speech
°high circles°	soft speech
<u>text</u>	speaker emphasis
bold font	prominence
>fast<	fast speech
<slow>	slow speech
↑	rising intonation
↓↑	falling-rising intonation
cutoff s-	cutoff word or sentence
t(h)ext	laughing production of an utterance
£text	smiling production of an utterance
!	animated or emphatic tone
te:xt	lengthening of the preceding sound
→	mark features of special interest

APPENDIX 2

I Problem solving activity

(T = Teacher; P = pupil; Ps = Pupils)

1 T I'm the huge porcupine now and I'm sitting in the doorway (.)
2 ok so what is little squirrel going to do about me
3 because I've just told him that I haven't got a problem
4 he has got one
5 (1.0) ((gazes around the circle))
6 ºwhat could little squirrel doº (.)
7 ºhave you got any suggestionsº
8 Ella
9 Ella ok I would say to you that I know I have a ↑problem
10 and the problem is you (.) because you have those (.) quills
11 and if you are willing to (.) take off those quills
12 a:ll those quills we can live together
13 (1.0)
14 Olli £ºuhhu[hº
15 T [but how can a porcupine take off his quills
16 Ella I don't know
17 that's your pr £problem ((points at the teacher with her finger at 'your'))
18 now I don't have a prob[lem any more£ ((pointing at herself laughing))
19 Ps [((laugh[ter))
20 T [!remember I'm bigger than you (.)
21 Tthat is the basic problem (.)
22 but if we (1.0) think that porcupine can't take off its quills
23 what else (2.0) could little squirrel try to do
24 (4.0)
25 Esa
26 Esa £the squirrel could give porcupine some food
27 Tsome↑f[ood
28 Ps [((so[me laughter))
29 T [but he's been giving it to me all the time and what do you do then
30 Ps ((smiles, talk, 5 sec.))
31 Esa ºxxx) £mukaanº ((addresses the teacher))
32 Toh so that you would give me some food with me (.)
33 and then I would go away
34 Esa [ºy(h)esº
35 T[remember the rain
36 (2.0)
37 Simo (xx) umbre[lla
38 Ps [um[brella
39 Pia [that's your pro[blem
40 T [an £umbr↑[ella
41 Ps [((lau[ghter))
42 T [do squirrels have umbrellas?
43 Ps £ye[s
44 T [because I lost my umbrella when I was (1.5) I was there

45 >down at [the bottom of the river bank<
46 Ps [((quiet talk))
47 Tok so you are telling me to go away with a little [umbrella and some food
48 Ps [((some laughter and talk))
49 Olli º£that's righ[tº
50 Ella [y(h)es (x(h)x) ((laughs loudly))
51 T [>but I guess that I would take the quills with me
52 would it be a good idea to leave all the quills [in the k squirrel's house<
53 Ella [no]
54 Ella well if you leave the quills (.) you may be able to goes live somewhere else
55 Ps ((laug[hter, talk))
56 Toh (x) [see your point
57 Ella [you m(h)ay (have a ch(h)ance)
58 (2.0.)
59 Tºbut do you think that the porcupine would goº (.)
60 Ella £no I don't think [so
61 Olli [º£ye:sº
62 Ps ((laughter))
63 TI mean-
64 Ps ((quiet talk, 4 sec.))
65 Ella so is it a big tree where that squirrel is living ((gazes at the teacher))
66 Tit's huge
67 Ella so I think there's mitä on oksa ((gazes at the teacher))
68 Olli (xx[x)
69 T [a branch
70 Ella branch so I think there is another branch too (.) so that's where the (1.0) err (.)
71 porcupine can sleep and maybe that squirrel[(x)
72 T **[outside**?
73 Ella >ye[s<
74 Ps [((la[ughter))
75 Anu [but may[be
76 T [actually I'm feeling rather comfortable here (.)
77 Ps ((some laughter))
78 Anu but maybe but maybe the squirrel could (.) teach porcupine
79 to build own house in the [(x) ((gazes at the teacher))
80 T [but] could they do it (.) while it's raining
81 Anu y[es
82 Ps [yes
83 Tdo you think so
84 Ella [(x(h)x)
85 Ps [(xx)
86 T[Ansu
87 Asta they should (.) do agreement (.) >you know<
88 T >what kind of agreement<
89 Asta yes but everybodys who is squirrel's friend↑ (.)would take((gestures with hands))
90 that porcupine for three days and would give him a bed and food
91 and he would go £around that [la(h)nd ((laughs)) ((draws a circle in the air))
92 Ps [((laughter))
93 Asta so nobody's food would end >eiku<
94 T◦↑yeah that's right↑◦

95 Asta yes and everybody would survive (.)
96 T!oh (.)but how am I going to travel in that rainy forest
97 when it's raining so heavi[ly!
98 Pia [º£it's your proble[m
99 Ps [((laugh[ter))
100 T it's a problem to you (.) well actu[ally
101 Ps [((some excited talk))
102 Ella [(x) act(h)u(h)lly a ship
103 T (£)a ship
104 Ella yes=
105 T =£who's going to build the ship
106 Ella £the ↑squirrel
107 Ps ((laughter))
108 Anu and all (1.0) her (.) or his friends (1.0)
109 Ella they are going to do you a↑ni:ce ship with(1.0)a(h):ll the f(h)o[od you c(h)an eat
110 Ps [((some laughter))
111 Ella then >bye b(h)ye s(h)ee yo[u<
112 T [do] you really think that the porcupine would go
113 Ella now I (.) d don't th(h)ink he would go (.) b(h)ut I think (xx)=
114 T =but if he says that **I'm not going anywhere** (.)
115 what would you do then (.) if you were those little squirrels
116 Tea well [this
117 Ps [(xxx)
118 T [shut the door and (.) >Tea<
119 Tea ok this l(h)ittle sq(h)uirrel (1.0) err have to has a ↑↑k(n)ife
120 bec(h)ause [(.) bec(h)ause yeah (x) when he have to has ↑k(h)nife
121 Ps [((laughter
122 Tea and then (.) [an(h)d h(h)e
123 T → [what would he do with a [↑knife
124 Ps [((lou[d laughter))
125 Tea [(xx) and knife an(h)d s(h)aid
126 to the p(h)orcupine that y(h)ou **have** to go (2.0)
127 Tºokº ((tentatively))
128 Ps [(xxxx)
129 T [(x) Ansu
130 Asta täs pitäis niinku
131 T >ok say in English you know how to do it<=
132 Asta ((laughs unsurely))=err somehow (1.0) go (.) tai >sillee < ((gestures))
133 that porcupine's emotion feelings (.) that (.) that (.) squirrel should say that
134 £if you came here and I had food for myself
135 but now when you are here we both will die
136 so it's better that just you will [die ((laughs))
137 Ps [((very loud laughter))
138 T ok yes but (1.0) err (.) how would little squirrel make the porcupine
139 get ↑out of his house
140 >I mean< (.) he wouldn't go ((emphatically))
141 <!he is just sitting in the doorway being very [big!>
142 Ps [((laughter))
143 Ella £tickling
144 T ↑tickling

145 Ps ((laughter))
146 T ↑that's↑ clever by the way
147 Ps ((laughter))
148 T ºthat's clever I've never thought about thatº (1.0)
149 so when little squirrel would tickle (.) porcupine
150 it would fall out of the tree=
151 Ella =[y(h)es ((laughs))
152 Ps [((some talk))
153 T what do you think of this solution
154 (1.0)
155 Iris cruel
156 T ↑cruel?
157 Iris £but great
158 (2.0)
159 T but if we are thinking of porcupine's nature and character (1.0)
160 I'm a ↑little bit (x) shall we ↑try it?
161 Ella yes
162 Boy n[o
163 T [ok
164 Ella c(h)an I t(h)ickle you ((laughs))
165 Ps ((laughter))
166 T y(h)es but don't do it very hard >because I'm porcupine
167 and you will be little squirrel then<
168 Ella £I (will be) ↑so little (xx) ((moves to the teacher and tickles her))
169 Ps [((very loud laughter))
170 T [((shrieks and laughs, leans forward)) ok th(h)ank you it surely worked (1.0)
171 Ps ((some laughter))
172 T and so porcupine went sliding down the muddy bunk bank
173 and disappeared into the swirling waters

II Parliament of animals: whole group role play/teacher in role

1 T and now we will rewind our drama (1.0) back to the point where the little
2 squirrel is tickling the porcupine (2.0)
3 and we need a squirrel? who would be squirrel
4 (3.0)
5 Ella >I c(h)an b(h)e<=
6 T =>ok you can be squirrel<
7 Ps ((smile))
8 Ella I al(h)ways can b(h)e
9 T >you c(h)an always be squirrel< (1.0)
10 and then just as little squirrel was tickling porcupine and porcupine
11 was falling down this tree (1.0) the king of the forest
12 >which animal is the king of forest<
13 Ella li[on
14 Ps [lion
15 T ok I'll [(xx) forest (x) at this moment
16 P [((cough)) ((Tarja moves to sit inside the circle))
17 Ps [((talk))
18 T so the king of the forest was just walking round the corner and

<he saw what happened> (4.0)
<↑I saw you do that little squirrel>
<is that a way to treat our fellow [creatures in this kingdom> (.) **no**
Ps [((laughter))
Ella !can I say something! ((looks down and speaks timidly))
T you will **have** to say some[thing
Ps [((laugh[ter))
Ella [>ok ok I will> (1.0)
<I gave <u>him</u> food <u>three days</u> and thr<u>ee</u> n<u>igh</u>ts > ((points)) and I thought that
that was the custom of our country so I did the right thing= ((gazes at teacher))
T =!that's the right thing ((menacingly)) but what happened then (1.0)
Ella err err he wouldn't leave ((quietly) he just he just that that say
that he would stay and eat all my food ((plaintively)) and
and make me sleep on the floor and he would sleep on the bed
and I couldn't have any food that I had made the bed (xx).
T what's wrong with sleeping on the floor
you could do it for a while if you have a guest
Ella yeah for a while but (1.0)he was going to be so (cruel) with me ((looks up word))
(.) and (1.0) he had those <u>quills</u> ((gazes at teacher)) and they were err hurting
me and I have these bruises all [over me because he was so rude ((shows hands)
Ps [((some laughter))
T oh ↑I see I'm beginning to get the (1.0) picture of what happened but anyway
(3.0) so the king of the forest the ruler decided anyway that the squirrel would
appear (2.0) before the parliament of animals and now <u>you</u> will make up the
parliament of animals remember those roles that you have right? (2.0)
Ps ((some laughter))
Tand we will be here we will be the parliament of animals and you will be little
squirrel (.) and you will have to defend yourself for what you did (2.0)
and every one of you is allowed to ask him questions and [then we'll have to (.)
Ella [her
T >oh her this time you have been he (.) this far< but from now on I gue(h)ss
you will be she and then we will have to make up our minds
what are we going to do what we are going to do about this little squirrel (1.0)
o↑k <u>so</u> I will begin I'm the king of the forest (1.0)
<!most honoured parliament of animals (1.0)
I bring before you the squirrel (.) whose dishonourable deed
I witnessed only one hour ago (2.0) he was tickling porcupi[ne!>
Ps [((laughter))
T and that porcupine fell out that tree and (2.0)
fell into the water and you know >what the rain is like<
ok so first I think that little squirrel will give a brief account of what happened
and then we will ask her questions about what happened
and why he did so and then we will have to decide
what we are going to do about this little squirrel (1.0) °ok please°
Ella ok I have to say that I'm innocent I didn't do anything wrong
because (.) that porcupine came to me <u>three</u> days ago (.)
so I have given him food and place to sleep for <u>three</u> <u>days</u> and <u>three</u> <u>nights</u>
and after that I said to the porcupine that you now you can go
because I have done eve(h)rything I could and want to do to you
and (.) <u>then</u> the porcupine said that <u>I</u> have some kind of problem

69 I don’t know what he was talking about and I don’t <u>care</u>
70 but the main thing is that the porcupine was (1.0) sturbing my life
71 and making it uncomfortable and boring and all those things
72 so I wanted to him to go and he wouldn’t go so I just ↑<u>little bit</u>
73 tickled him and (1.0) he falled (.) ºit wasn’t my ↓faultº (3.0)
74 Tok so (2.0) [(xx)
75 P [((coughs))
76 (2.0)
77 Pia didn't you want that he would fall falled ((gestures trying to find the word))
78 Ella <u>no</u> I [just] w(h)ant him to go out of my home to the next >what was it<
79 Pia [ºfallingº]
80 Ella branch=
81 T =ºbranchº
82 (3.0)
83 Ella !I didn’t mean it to fall ((sobs)) [(.) I’m so s(h)ad! ((gazes at the teacher sadly))
84 Asta [ok
85 Ps ((some laughter))
86 Asta why couldn’t he stay with you he did he-
87 Ella have you ever seen porcupine
88 Asta £ye:s ((nods))
89 Tarja do you know what he has in his back (.) they are quills
90 Ella !and they are [<u>sticking</u> you!
91 Asta [yes-
92 Ella when you are <u>slee(h)ping</u> and it [hurts ((laughs some))
93 Asta [b(h)ut] ((slaps her knee)) <u>ok</u> if you food
94 was end (1.0) so you have to be (.)so nice that you will (1.0) give him a <u>home</u>=
95 Ella =it wouldn’t be-
96 Asta =!she’s an animal <u>too</u> [we]have to stay to↑g(h)ether ((a gesture with her fist))
97 [yes]
98 Ella but he i(h)s v(h)ery <u>hungry</u> a(h)nimal and and he would’ve (.) eaten all my food
99 and we couldn’t survive both of us
100 Asta yes [but]
101 Sara [I’m sorry] ab(h)out that
102 Ella yeah? ((nods))
103 Asta !he hadn’t ate <u>yet</u> all the food (.) had he?
104 Ps ((smiles, some laughter))
105 Ella [no
106 Asta <so [(xx)] would have<
107 Ella [(xx) yes=
108 Asta =>you can’t be sure<=
109 Ella =yes I can because **all** he did on those three days he just ate
110 and slept **on my** bed not in the floor (1.0)
111 Asta yes but [he was (x) ((shakes her head a little))
112 Ella [yes and he was sticking me with his quills (2.0) so I think it was unfair
113 ((Ella looks around for more questions, 7 sec.))
114 Anu did you try to communication with the porcupine=
115 Ella =yeah and all he said wrrr wrr[r
116 Anu [(oh) ((gazes up))
117 Ps [((some laughter))
118 Ella ((laughs))and <u>oh</u> he <u>did</u> say that I have a problem and and he doesn’t want

119 to go out and all that stuff and [(x).
120 Anu [maybe you <u>have</u> a problem
121 Ella may<u>(h)be:</u> [(x) ((points with a forefinger))
122 Anu [y(h)ou d(h)on't <u>think</u> that the porcupine s (1.0) also animal
123 Ella >yes I know< and I feel very sorry for him because he died <u>hm</u> but [((laughs))
124 Ps [((laughter))
125 Ella but I have to think also (1.0) myself and how I'm going to survive
126 so (.) what have you: (.) done if I would be the one who fell down
127 Anu (x)
128 Ella you didn't [(x)
129 Ps [((some talk and quiet laughter))
130 T [(x) accusing porcupine
131 Ella no I don't think you would ((in a hurt voice))
132 you just (.) !want be mean to me (.) like that porcupine! (2.0)
133 T well did the porcupine offend you (2.0) or say [she is sorry
134 Ella [hmm no
135 T >by the way how did he come to your house< (.)
136 Ella err (.) he just (.) came because I yelled to him he was I think he was drowning (.)
137 and I yelled to him that !↑<u>hey: I'm over here!</u>
138 and !then he came and ate and slept and ate and slept and slept and ate! (1.0)
139 Ps ((smiles))
140 Ella and I didn't hear thank you (3.0)
141 and I don't know why even if I (x) saved his life then ((quietly as if to herself))
142 T ↑oh (1.0) ºactually porcupine has not been found yetº I have sent a search party
143 to look for him two brave soldiers but they aren't back yet and I think that they
144 will be here rather soon so (2.0) I think that we should wait for them first to be
145 able to make up our mind I think it's important(1.0)to pro[ve
146 Ella [prove that I'm innocent
147 T no I mean it's important to(1.0) kn<u>o</u>w whether porcupine is dead or not (1.0) ºokº
148 Ps (20.0) ((subdued laughter, whispering, cautious whistling while
149 three pupils get ready for the roles of Porcupine and two searchers))
150 T ok will that be all that you've got to say?
151 Boy (xx)
152 Ps ((Subdued laughter))
153 T has anyone got any questions or problems (1.0) Ant[ti
154 Ps [((some laughter))
155 Olli are you sure that you (.) only tickled that porcupine
156 Ella yes that was only thing I ever did
157 Olli did you use any guns [or s(h)ometh(h)ing ((laughs))
158 Ps [((loud laug[hter))
159 Ella [**no**]
160 Anu (xxx)
161 Ella no no no the only thing I have is a <u>fork</u> and that w(h)asn't v(h)ery (.) wise
162 Anu ºyou [didn't evenº
163 T [↑did you use a fork?
164 Ella no no I didn't all I did think [about it (x)
165 Anu [you didn't even think about it
166 Ella (x) <u>these fingers</u> ((waves her forefingers)) nothing else these are my these
167 are [my these are my
168 Anu [didn't you even think about it [(x) use of guns or (x)

169 Ella [no no] no no never ((shows her fingers))
170 T >Arto have you got a question?<
171 Simo yes I h(h)ave [(xxx)
172 T [ok
173 Ps ((laught[er))
174 Simo [do you have [any friends
175 Ella [ºn(h)ice to m(h)eet youº
176 ↑friends (.) oh yes I have (.) one (4.0) he's a (2.0) he's she's a where is it
177 ((looks at her wordlist)) now ladybird
178 Ps ((some laughter))
179 T (x) s(h)urprise Tea (.) the honeybee has a question
180 Tea £yes you said that you tickled him only just by your fingers (x) nails
181 Ella ye(h)s b(h)ut (x)
182 Tea yes but l(h)ook at y(h)our n(h)ails
183 Ella what about them w(h)ell then (2.0) I j(h)ust[- ((looks at her nails))
184 Ps [((some talk and laughter))
185 T I guess that they could be considered weapons=
186 Ps =yes
187 Ella I don't think so >because I use these fingers and there are no nails in these
188 fingers (.) they are (x)=[((shows her fingers))
189 Pia =oh sure
190 Tea yes after that (.) you [have (to) (.) it-
191 P [(xxx)
192 Ella no [(x) surface it's s(h)o smooth=
193 Pia [yeah
194 Iris =I'm on her side we don't have sc(h)issors to c(h)ut the nails (1.0) so ((laughs))
195 T >yes but you can always (2.0) bite them<
196 T ok ↑now I can see my search party and they are carrying porcupine with them
197 now we are going to see (.) whether (1.0) ºhe is dead or notº
198 Ps ((laughter, some talk))
199 T **you can leave him there** (1.0) ↑**porcupine**
200 Boy £(we) found her
201 Ps [(laughter, loud talk))
202 T [(xx) are you feeling well **is there anyone who knows** anything about nursing
203 (1.0) dying porcupines=
204 Mari =my ankle is hurt
205 Asta I'm an ant
206 Ps ((laughter))
207 Olli Iiro, Iiro Lahtinen
208 Mari I'm gonna get with you
209 Ps [((some laughter, talk))
210 T [↑ok now we have been listening to little squirrel
211 what is your opinion porcupine (1.0) how can you ex[plain
212 Mari [h(h)e is g(h)uilty ((points
213 Ps ((laughter)) at Tarja))
214 T of what what happened (.)[(x)
215 Mari [he] almost killed me (1.0)
216 T then what was the reason for that (.)
217 Mari I d(h)on't k(h)now (.) I was a nice c(h)ustom[er
218 Ps [((some laughter))

219	T	how did you behave?
220	Mari	£I (2.0) mm I slept and (1.0) I ate and (1.0) I £=
221	T	=did you eat a lot?
222	Mari	£no
223	Ella	!oh n(h)o!=
224	Anu	=why y(h)ou are s(h)o <u>fat</u>
225		((loud laughter))
226	Mari	£it's my (2.0) yes [((waves her left arm))
227		[((loud laughter))
228	T	>what is the reason for you being so fat<
229	Mari	I must be fat because my (2.0) ((looks at the wordlist)) mm because those
230		quills n(h)eed so(h)me (.) f(h)at [(x) ((lifts up her arms and laughs))
231	Ps	[((loud laughter))
232	T	so that they wouldn't fall off (.) ºohº (2.0) <u>now</u> (1.0) we have brought these
233		creatures in front of us (2.0) would anyone (.) like to ask porcupine anything
234	Asta	>ok< where is your (.) own home
235	Mari	£I don't have a home?
236	Girl	why don't yo[u
237	Ella	[why ↑no:t↓
238	Mari	£I don't <u>need</u> a home
239	T	Reetta (xx[x)
240	Ella	[(>are you too lazy to)↑build one<
241	Mari	**no**
242	Ella?	<u>(rrr)</u>
243	T	so (.) Heidi (.) do you have a question?
244	Tea	£yes why don't you (1.0)build your own house
245		[(1.0)when the others build their house
246	Ella	[(lazy)
247	Mari	I don't know how (2.0)
248	Ps	((some belated laughter))
249	Pia	why don't you ask (.) somebody (.) to help you
250	Mari	I don't have anybody to ask ((smiles))
251	T	what did you do during the (2.0) dry season <u>then</u> (1.0)
252	Ella	◦ate and sleep◦
253	Mari	£I walked around and (2.0) ◦all kind of stuff◦ (2.0)
254	Ps	((some belated laughter))
255	Anu	someb(h)ody is l(h)ying now
256	Ella	so is here someone who would like to ↑take ↑with him
257		and [give him some <u>foo:d</u> and some <u>be:d</u> and [(x) ((acts out disbelief))
258	Ps	[((some laughter))
259	T	[ok thank you if this is every-
260		thing that we've got to say we should now make a decision about what to do
261		in this matter (.) because **(.)** [<u>**this** (1.0)</u>
262	P	[(xxx)
263	Ps	[((laughter)
264	T	**this** thing should not be repeated (.) next year (1.0) ok so we'll have to make
265		a decision what to do suggestions how are we going to solve this problem