UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

TEACHERS' EVALUATIVE TURNS IN FINNISH CLIL CLASSROOMS

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Minttu Pehkonen

Department of Languages
2008

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Minttu Pehkonen
TEACHERS' EVALUATIVE TURNS IN FINNISH CLIL CLASSROOMS

Pro gradu –tutkielma
Englannin kieli
Maaliskuu 2008 103 sivua + 1 liite

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää, millaisia evaluoivia vuoroja suomalaiset opettajat käyttävät vieraskielisessä aineenopetuksessa. Tutkimusaineisto koostuu videoiduista biologian, fysiikan ja uskonnon oppitunneista, jotka on kerätty osana laajempaa luokkahuonetutkimusprojektia. Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan neljää suomalaisen yläkoulun kaksoistuntia eli yhteensä noin kahdeksaa tuntia vieraskielistä opetusta. Opetuskielenä on englanti. Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan seuraavia kahta kysymystä: 1) Millaisia keinoja suomalaiset vieraskielisen aineenopetuksen opettajat käyttävät evaluoivissa vuoroissaan? 2) Kuinka kielelliset ja ei-kielelliset keinot yhdessä rakentavat evaluoivien vuorojen merkityksen? Tutkimus on luonteeltaan laadullista ja kuvailevaa.

Tutkimus pohjautuu keskusteluanalyysiin, joka tarkastelee ihmisten välistä vuorovaikutusta rakenteellisesti järjestäytyvänä kokonaisuutena. Tässä kokonaisuudessa voidaan erottaa erilaisia sekvenssejä, kuten luokkahuonediskurssin kolmijakoinen rakenne, joka muodostuu kysymyksestä, vastauksesta ja vastauksen evaluoinnista. Evaluoiva vuoro nähdään suuremman rakenteen osana, johon edelliset vuorot vaikuttavat ja joka puolestaan vaikuttaa tuleviin vuoroihin. Tutkimuksessa evaluoivia vuoroja tarkastellaan sekä kielellisen että ei-kielellisen kommunikaation kannalta ja ne on jaettu funktioidensa perusteella kolmeen ryhmään: oppilaan vastauksen hyväksyminen, osittainen hyväksyminen ja hylkääminen.

Tulokset osoittavat, että vieraskielisessä aineenopetuksessa opettajat käyttävät evaluoivissa vuoroissaan hyvin vaihtelevia keinoja. Nämä keinot sisältävät sekä kielellisiä että ei-kielellisiä toimintoja, jotka molemmat voivat useimmissa tapauksissa ilmetä joko yksin tai yhdistettynä muihin keinoihin. Vuoroissa, joissa käytetään molempia keinoja, ei-kielelliset keinot ovat usein kielellisiä toimintoja tukevia tai tehostavia, mutta ne voivat myös olla tasavertaisessa asemassa merkityksen rakentamisessa. Tulokset viittaavat myös siihen, että suomalaiset opettajat käyttävät vieraskielisen aineenopetuksen kontekstissa poikkeuksellisen suoria keinoja myös hylätessään oppilaan vastauksen.

Tutkimustulokset viittaavat siihen, että ei-kielellinen viestintä on luokkahuonekonteksteissa tärkeä osa interaktiota ja että se tulisi ottaa huomioon vuorovaikutusta tutkittaessa. Lisäksi tutkimustulokset osoittavat, että opettajien keinot evaluoivissa vuoroissa voivat olla moninaisempia ja moniulotteisempia kuin aiemmat tutkimukset ovat antaneet ymmärtää. Olisi kuitenkin kiinnostavaa verrata, kuinka evaluoivat vuorot eroavat toisistaan eri konteksteissa kuten vieraskielinen aineenopetus eri kulttuureissa ja eri ikäryhmissä, vieraskielinen aineenopetus verrattuna äidinkieliseen opetukseen tai vieraskielinen aineenopetus verrattuna vieraan kielen opetukseen.

Asiasanat: CLIL classroom. classroom interaction. institutional talk. conversation analysis. embodied activity. semiotic fields. IRE sequence.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

In classrooms, students are used to being observed and evaluated by their teacher at all times. Everything they do in relation to the topic at hand during lessons can be taken as a sign of their learning, development and motivation, and everything they say may affect the assessment of their schoolwork. Often the learning process of students is assessed by asking them questions relating to the topic at hand and then evaluating the responses. In the everyday context of classroom interaction this procedure is perceived as normal and rarely is it questioned by either teachers or students. The evaluative processes during lessons, however, are an interesting phenomenon that can be studied in order to find out what exactly goes on during this type of interaction in the classroom context.

This study explores the evaluative turns of teachers, which are used to evaluate students' answers to teachers' questions. The purpose is to examine the ways in which teachers give this evaluation, i.e. how they indicate whether an answer is acceptable or not. I concentrate on the evaluative turns of a three Finnish CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) teachers who teach different subjects through the English language at a lower secondary school. The evaluation they provide is oriented to the contents of the students' answers rather than on the language they use. As most studies on evaluative turns have concentrated on SLA settings and evaluation of the language that students use, it will be interesting to see how the evaluative turns oriented to the contents of answers differ from the evaluation given by teachers on learner language in SLA classrooms. The primary interest, however, is not on comparing the two settings. Rather, the aim is to find out the characteristics of evaluative turns in CLIL classrooms.

So far, evaluative turns in CLIL settings have received little academic interest, and there is therefore need for more research on the evaluation given on the contents of a student response in a setting where the language spoken is not the mother tongue of (most of) the participants. Neither have CLIL lessons in general been the object of many studies, excepting the work of a few pioneers in the field (see e.g. Nikula 2002, 2005, 2007, and Dalton-Puffer 2005 for studies on interactional aspects of CLIL

settings). Thus the present study will hopefully give more insights into what the interaction is like in these classrooms. Personally, as a soon-to-be-teacher, I feel that studying the interaction in classroom settings will help understand what goes on in the classroom and can therefore be important in developing better ways of teaching and communication in those settings.

In addition to belonging to the field of CLIL research, the present study conforms to the traditions of conversation analysis (CA), which has been used to describe many institutional settings, including classroom as one of the contexts of interaction (see e.g. Markee 2000, Seedhouse 2004, Arminen 2005). The CA perspective has been adopted as it offers tools for analysing the organisation of interaction and, as He (2004: 569, 575) states, it can offer insights into the classroom interaction and how interpersonal relationships in these settings "are collaboratively achieved by the participants". CA also has a rather holistic view on interaction in that it sees it as a way to realise social actions (or roles) in real-life situations (Arminen 2005: 8) and does not separate the non-verbal aspects from the verbal activity in analysing the meaning of turns. Moreover, the analysis in CA studies is, in the words of Seedhouse (2004: 15), "bottom-up and data driven", that is the analysis relies solely on what can be seen in the data and does not make hypotheses about the participants' beliefs, thoughts, motivations etc. Thus, the analysis is based on facts rather than assumptions about something that is not explicitly observable to the researcher. This ideology can be contrasted, for example, with the aim of some SLA studies to understand learners' cognitive processes on the basis of their external behaviour.

A number of studies have been made concerning the teachers' 'third turn' – that is, the evaluative turn. Mostly, however, they have taken the SLA perspective and focused the evaluation that is given by second or foreign language teachers on how their pupils use the target language. Quite a lot of research has been quantitative, and many studies have aimed at discovering the effects of feedback or evaluative turns on learning (see e.g. Mackey 2006). In these studies, the feedback types have often been classified in rather clearly defined groups for quantitative analysis, and varying ways of giving the same types of feedback have been overlooked. More often than not, the analysis has only taken into account the verbal actions of the teacher. In my study, a more qualitative approach is taken in order to describe and analyse the different ways

used by teachers to respond to their pupils' answers. Both verbal and non-verbal actions of the teacher are examined as I feel that leaving out one of those aspects would lead to an analysis missing important parts of what has been communicated. The more thorough examination of different aspects of the teachers' evaluative turns may help to better understand the intricate nature of the interaction between the teacher and the learners in classroom settings.

More precisely, the study will aim at answering the following research questions:

1) What are the devices used by CLIL teachers in their evaluative turns to indicate whether or not an answer provided by a student is accepted?
2) What is the role of non-verbal in relation to verbal communication in the evaluative turns? That is, how do verbal and non-verbal actions co-construct the meaning of evaluative turns as actions?

With the help of these questions, I hope to contribute to research on CLIL settings, providing some insights into the interaction in these contexts. In addition, the results may help teachers and teachers-to-be understand and reflect on what they do in classrooms and, in particular, how they communicate to students through their evaluative turns. It is important to note, however, that the study is descriptive in nature and does not aim at evaluating the methods of teachers in terms of right or wrong. The purpose is to discover and describe how the evaluative turns of teachers are constructed in CLIL settings.

2 CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING

In content and language integrated learning, a foreign language is used as a tool for learning, i.e. the language of teaching and learning is a second or a foreign language while another subject is learned. As formulated in Marsh (2002: 15), CLIL can be used as a name for "any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language, thus not usually the first language of the learners involved, is used as a medium in the teaching and learning of non-language content". For instance, a subject such as history may be taught and learned through English in some Finnish schools.

According to Nikula (1997: 6) the term CLIL can usually include both immersion, where all of the education is received in a foreign language, and types of education where only a part of the instruction is conducted through a second or a foreign language. In another paper, however, she differentiates immersion from CLIL altogether on the basis that immersion contexts mostly involve learning a language that is "widely used in the surrounding community", such as Swedish in Finland, whereas the target language of CLIL is usually a foreign language. Moreover, a CLIL teacher may be either a native speaker of the language used in the lessons or, more often, a non-native speaker, whereas teachers in immersion settings tend to be native speakers of the target language. (Nikula 2005: 28.) In neither of these models, however, is the primary focus on teaching the target language - it is, rather, on learning the subject through that language although, naturally, the education is hoped to enhance students' ability to perform in the target language. Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989: 182) therefore use the term "dual purpose" to describe the aims of this type of instruction, i.e. both development of language skills and enhanced knowledge on the subject matter are hoped for in those settings. Because of the different goals in CLIL classrooms and traditional foreign language classrooms, the interaction in these settings may differ (Nikula 2005), and therefore it seems important to study the interactional aspects of CLIL settings in more detail.

There are several different goals that have been set for CLIL education. These include developing students' intercultural communication skills and preparing them

for internationalisation as well as giving them the possibility of seeing the studied phenomenon from different perspectives. In developing language competence the focus is on oral communication. Furthermore, CLIL education aims at increasing students' motivation in learning and at promoting diversity of teaching methods and classroom practices. (Dalton-Puffer 2007.)

Lately, CLIL is continuously receiving more interest in Europe. The communicative aspects of language have become increasingly important in language teaching and learning, and this aim of language teaching is emphasized by the Council of Europe's common framework. It has been argued that in CLIL this objective can be reached as the students in this context acquire the language "in a naturalistic way". (Nikula 2002: 449.) Coyle (2002: 28) argues that CLIL has an important role in the process of making a learning society plurilingual and pluricultural through its four principles of content, communication, cognition and culture/citizenship, and that CLIL ideology therefore seems to be in accordance with the European Commission's Language Policy. Baetens Beardsmore (2002: 26) also claims that CLIL is the solution to the motivation problem of traditional foreign language lessons as the students have the possibility to acquire a foreign language while the focus is actually on learning a subject matter.

Nevertheless, some critical comments have also been made concerning the effectiveness of CLIL in teaching communicative competence. Dalton-Puffer (2005: 1290 – 1291), for instance, reports in her study on the use of directives in Austrian CLIL settings that the asymmetrical participant roles seem to be the same in EFL and CLIL classrooms, and that CLIL can offer opportunities to practise a target language in some social contexts but not in the whole array of them. She therefore implies that the CLIL setting may not be as authentic a situation for language learning as has been claimed, and she hopes for more research on the different aspects of classroom discourse so that a better understanding of the interactional nature of CLIL settings would be gained.

2.1 CLIL in Finland

The possibility to teach school subjects in foreign languages, when necessary, was for the first time allowed by the Finnish school laws at the beginning of 1980's. Teaching in other than the official languages, however, did not receive much popularity before the early 1990's when the Finnish Government added as one of its aims to increase the amount of teaching trough a foreign language in order to further develop language proficiency in the country. (Nikula and Marsh 1996: 33.) In 1996, an estimated 8,4 – 24,6 % of schools offered CLIL instruction, the percentage depending on the school level. The highest percentage of schools offering teaching through a foreign language was at the upper secondary level. (Nikula 2007, Nikula and Marsh 1996: 21 – 27). Despite the expected increase in CLIL education (Nikula and Marsh 1996), the number of schools offering some form of CLIL had decreased by 2005 (Nikula 2007). Nikula offers economical considerations and the debate over CLIL teachers' language requirements as possible reasons for the noticeable difference.

CLIL in Finland is usually offered to learners in general, as opposed to aiming it at a restricted group (Jäppinen 2005: 149). This may be seen as a sign of trying to avoid elitism although, despite this ideal, CLIL seems to be found in bigger towns more often than in the rest of Finland (Nikula 2007). The reasons for offering CLIL in Finnish schools seem to be related to the hopes of improving learners' language skills and increasing their interest in foreign languages, but schools' plans of internationalisation can also lie behind the decision (Nikula and Marsh 1996: 47 – 48). In addition, CLIL can be seen as an asset in the working life and also in the multicultural world as a whole (Jäppinen 2005: 149). Nikula (2007) also points out the fact that the implementation CLIL in Finnish schools still often relies on individual teachers' interest in offering education in a foreign language.

English is the target language that is most often used in Finnish CLIL, with 80% to 90% of schools offering CLIL using it as the medium of teaching. Other languages that are offered include Swedish (or Finnish in schools where Swedish is the official language), German, French and Russian. (Jäppinen 2005: 150, Nikula and Marsh 1996: 35.) CLIL teachers can be native or non-native speakers of the target language,

with the latter being the most common case (Nikula and Marsh 1996: 55 – 56). Normally, participation in CLIL is voluntary and less than 20% of schools' students or pupils receive instruction through a foreign language. There are, for instance, special groups or classes that participate in CLIL. The amount of CLIL varies from school to school but, on average, the time used to instruction through a foreign language amounts to less than 30 hours per year at the primary level and 31 to 80 hours at the upper secondary level. (Nikula and Marsh 1996: 42 – 43.) There is a wide array of school subjects taught in CLIL, the most common being natural sciences, geography, mathematics, history, domestic science, art and music (Jäppinen 2005: 150, Nikula and Marsh 1996: 38 – 41).

2.2 CLIL research

2.2.1 Learning outcomes of CLIL

CLIL settings have received little attention in classroom research although, according to Nikula (2005: 28) who studies the interaction in CLIL settings in comparison with EFL classrooms, the popularity of CLIL has increased in Europe since the 1990's. There are some studies on the effects of CLIL and language learning in CLIL settings, but the body of research in Europe is not very extensive. Nevertheless, research on immersion in the United States of America and Canada has been quite active since the 1980's (Nikula and Marsh 1996: 4). Genesee (1987), for instance, reports on studies on the effects of French immersion on Canadian students whose native language is English. He concludes that immersion students achieve a better communicative proficiency in French than students participating in normal second language instruction and that their native language competence (e.g. literacy skills) does not seem to get hindered by the participation in immersion. Their academic achievement also seems to be equal to that of other students of the same age.

These findings are supported by Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989: 213 – 214). They state that no differences have been found in the academic achievement of immersion students, on one hand, and students that receive their education in their first

language, on the other. In addition, the level of language development in immersion models tends to be higher than in regular foreign language classrooms and students are more confident in their second language skills.

Baker (1996) addresses issues of bilingual education, in general, and also draws conclusions of various studies that have investigated the outcomes of education where a second or a foreign language is used as the medium of instruction. Mostly, the studies referred to seem to agree with the reports Genesee (1987) and Brinton et al. (1989) as to the development of native and target languages as well as academic achievement. Nevertheless, he notes that there may be some limitations to the outcomes of immersion. Immersion students may lack grammatical accuracy in the target language, for instance, and can sometimes use the language in socially or stylistically inappropriate ways. A possible explanation for this is that not all forms of language are present in classrooms. Furthermore, immersion students tend not to use the target language much after graduating. (Baker 1996: 206.)

Jäppinen (2005) comes to similar conclusions as Genesee (1987) in her study on Finnish CLIL students' conceptual learning (cognitional development) in mathematics and science. According to her, CLIL students do not seem to differ in their cognitional development in this subject area from their peers that receive instruction in Finnish, except for a few cases in the study where CLIL students performed even better than other students on some of the tasks. Thus, there seems to be evidence that, at the very least, CLIL does not harm the academic development of students, and may even lead to better learning results.

Coyle (2006) discusses some of the reasons for using this type of education, presenting statements given by CLIL participants (teachers, students, teacher trainees and researchers). According to these statements, CLIL can raise language competence as well as make students more confident in their language skills, increase student expectations as they meet the challenges of CLIL and develop a greater variety of skills (problem solving, communication skills, risk-taking etc.). Furthermore, CLIL education is seen by participants as a way to raise awareness about cultures. More importantly, however, CLIL seems to motivate students and teachers more than other ways of teaching (e.g. traditional foreign language

teaching). In sum, CLIL education seems to be viewed very positively by people who, in one way or another, are involved in it.

2.2.2 Interaction in CLIL

As to interaction in CLIL, not much is known about how communication and language use in CLIL settings differ from those in foreign language classrooms. Furthermore, as yet, little attention has been paid to the issue in the field of conversation analysis (but see Kääntä, forthcoming, for an analysis of evaluative turns with restrictive functions in CLIL settings). There are, however, a few studies on CLIL interaction from a discourse-pragmatic perspective that are briefly presented here.

Nikula (2002, 2005, 2007) and Dalton-Puffer (Dalton-Puffer 2005, Dalton-Puffer and Nikula 2006) belong to the few exceptions that do consider aspects of language use and interaction in CLIL. They, both individually and in collaboration, have examined CLIL lessons from the point of view of pragmatics. Dalton-Puffer (2005) examines directive speech acts in Austrian CLIL classrooms in secondary schools. The results imply that the language environment in CLIL settings is more varied than expected. Students receive quite a large number of modified and indirect requests, for example, even though the setting, as other classroom settings, does not encourage them to use directives themselves.

Directives are also concentrated on in Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2006), which studies the behaviour of both teachers and students in Austrian and Finnish CLIL settings. In their data, directives are employed by not only teachers but also students, depending on the situation, however (e.g. whole-class interaction vs. small group activities). Both participants can also be rather direct, which seems to be a characteristic of classroom interaction. Accordingly, Dalton-Puffer and Nikula conclude that CLIL settings seem to have similar constraints on interaction as other types of classrooms, as well. These findings are also supported by Nikula's (2002) earlier work where modifying elements of talk in English are compared in Finnish EFL and CLIL classrooms. Teachers in neither of the settings in the data discussed

pragmatic aspects of language use explicitly in class and they used very direct strategies, i.e. rarely used modifying elements in their speech acts. This implies that classrooms have their own pragmatic rules and that they should therefore be studied as a unique social context.

The IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback, also called the IRE pattern) patterns in Finnish CLIL and EFL settings are also compared in one of Nikula's (2007) studies. She uses a discourse-pragmatic approach to analyse five CLIL lessons and five EFL lessons á 90 minutes, the video recordings of which have been taken from a wider range of classroom data collected in the Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä – the same data pool that has been used in the present study. The participants are native speakers of Finnish, with the exception of one student whose native language is English, and the age of the students ranges from 13 to 18 years, the students participating in the CLIL lessons being slightly younger. The results of the study support the findings of other studies that IRF pattern occurs very often in classroom interaction. It seems however that IRF is noticeably more common in EFL lessons than in CLIL settings (notice the contradiction if compared with the studies presented above that have not found great differences in the interaction of the two settings). Moreover, more IRF sequences are initiated by students in CLIL lessons than in EFL lessons. According to Nikula, the differences may be explained by the fact that the students in the two different instruction types seem to be socialised into different types of language user identities: in EFL students are expected to give short and exact answers to questions about the language itself, whereas in CLIL they are accustomed to use English as a medium of learning other subjects. In addition, the asymmetrical relationship between teacher and students seems to be clearer in EFL settings than in CLIL where students may take turns more freely. The results seem to be supported by Nikula's (2005) comparative study on pragmatic features of EFL and CLIL that concentrates on the distribution and functions of English in classrooms.

The findings of Nikula (2007) serve as a guideline for my own study as my aim will be to study the third turn of the IRE pattern (Initiation-Response-Evaluation), that is the evaluative turn of the teacher. It creates expectations about the possible results of the analysis in this study even though Nikula's methodological framework differs

slightly from the conversation analysis viewpoint in my present study. Even though Nikula's study reveals interesting points relating to the pragmatic aspects and interactional structures of the classrooms in question, it does not concentrate particularly on evaluative turns. Nor does it pay much attention to the non-verbal components of interaction, which is quite common in pragmatics that treats language as its primary interest (see e.g. Goodwin 2000: 1490). The present study can perhaps shed more light on how the interaction and, more specifically, evaluative turns in CLIL settings work at the level of *actions* as the focus is expanded to include non-verbal in addition to verbal actions. Furthermore, the CA perspective taken can offer new possibilities for analysing the sequential organisation of IRE patterns and how the preceding turns in the sequence affect the evaluative turns produced by teachers. In the next chapter, conversation analysis as a method of classroom research will be presented in more detail.

3 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS AS A METHOD OF CLASSROOM RESEARCH

Conversation analysis as a discipline is rather young. Its origins are in ethnomethodology, which studies the methods of society's members of doing being-in-the world. In CA, this idea can be seen in the way it studies talk as a way of *doing*. (Arminen 2005: 9.) Sahlström (1999), for instance, explains the interaction of teachers and students in terms of *doing being teacher* and *doing being student*. For CA, then, talk itself is worth studying and seen as an autonomous reality, and is not treated only as a medium for analysing other social issues, as has traditionally been the case in sociology (Arminen 2005: 2). This talk-in-interaction that is analysed can occur in the context of everyday conversation or in institutional settings, such as classrooms or TV interviews.

The main objective of CA is to study the organisation of talk-in-interaction and how people through that organisation "produce and reproduce social structure" (Psathas 1995: 56). That is, people orient to the social rules in their interaction, but in doing so, they also maintain the social order and make it real for themselves. Talk is therefore seen as social action where the participants orient to the conventions and rules underlying that action in order to make sense of it and to achieve their goals through it. Participants can also be "seen to talk context into being or out of being" as they choose which aspects of context they rely on in their interaction (Seedhouse 2005: 261).

As is evident from what has been said above, CA sees a sequentially organised structure in interaction. For CA, "sequential organization is both an integral feature of the social organization of talk and a methodological resource for its analysis" (Heath 2004: 270). It analyses the turns taken in conversations and how these turns form sequences in the evolving conversation (Arminen 2005: 1). Moreover, CA views sequences of actions as an important part of context as turns are shaped by the context in which they occur, that is, by the turns prior to them (Heritage 2004: 223). Goodwin and Heritage (1990: 289) note that, in addition to being context-shaped, turns are context-renewing since they "constitute the frame of relevance that will shape subsequent action" (see also Seedhouse 2004: 14, Arminen 2005: 6). Thus,

"social context is a *dynamically created* thing" (Heritage 2004: 223, emphasis added).

An important feature of CA is that it analyses conversation that occurs *naturally*, or, as Psathas (1995: 48) rephrases it: "how a phenomenon appears in the course of its *actual* production" (emphasis in the original). Recordings of actual interactions are therefore important in studying conversations, and detailed transcriptions of the interactions are produced for assistance in the analysis. The analyst can only examine what occurs in the actual data, and cannot draw conclusions about the context unless it is readily observable in the interaction itself. Thus, assumptions about the participants' intentions or beliefs cannot be made, except if it is demonstrable that participants themselves notice or orient to them in their interaction (Psathas 1995: 47).

Video recordings are of use to conversation analysts also because of the fact that they can capture both audible and visual aspects of interaction (Heath 2004: 279). The inclusion of visual aspects in the data is important as one of the central ideas in CA is that utterances and interaction in general consist of not only verbal aspects but also visual components such as gestures and other bodily actions (ibid. 2004: 271). As the role of non-verbal aspects is marginal in many other research orientations but forms an integral part of the analysis in the present study, the issue is explored in more detail in the following section. Before that, however, it can be summarised that in using CA as a method of research, the inferences made have to be supported by clear evidence from actual data, i.e. recordings of naturally occurring interaction, and the analysis focuses on the structural organisation of interaction, taking into account both verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication.

3.1 Conversation analysis and non-verbal actions

It was emphasised above that CA analyses both verbal and non-verbal aspects of interaction. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the two components would be examined as separate entities. On the contrary, verbal and non-verbal actions are

treated as aspects of the same action that complete each other and work in conjunction to form the meaning of utterances. Accordingly, conversation analysts emphasise that interaction is realised through the "coordination" of verbal and non-verbal actions (Heath 1984: 261) and that it is vital to analyse "talk and body behavior together as complementary aspects of talk in interaction" as sometimes the meaning may be apparent only in either the verbal or non-verbal actions (Schegloff 1984: 285).

The interest among conversation analysts in visual aspects of interaction increased after advances in technology made video recording possible (Heath 1986: 5). Presently, researchers can also exploit still pictures taken from video recordings and attached to study reports in order to illustrate relevant points of the interaction under scrutiny (see e.g. Goodwin 2000, 2003a, 2003b where still pictures and other illustrations are used to accompany transcripts). The new technologies have therefore made it easier to study social interaction in a more holistic way than earlier, as both audible and visual details of it can be captured, closely analysed and then presented to others through different media. Nevertheless, there is no generally accepted transcription system available for including non-verbal aspects (Heath 1986: 20).

An example of a CA study that examines non-verbal actions can be found in Heath (1986), which focuses on interaction in medical consultations. In particular, Heath studies how speech and body movement are socially organised in this type of an institutional setting. It is pointed out that the turn-by-turn evolvement of interaction, which is used as a resource in analysing talk, can also be used as a basis for analysing body movement (Heath 1986: 14). Some of the functions of non-verbal actions proposed include obtaining a display of recipiency from a hearer (i.e. using gestures, postural shifts etc. in order to gain the attention of a listener who is not gazing at the speaker or otherwise attending to what is being said, see also Heath 1984), maintaining participants' involvement in the ongoing activity and pointing out an object that is talked about (see also Goodwin 2003a for an account of pointing as an activity).

Goodwin (2000), another conversation analyst that has investigated the role of non-verbal behaviour in interaction, proposes a theory of action where the multiple

different resources available in interaction are taken into account. Talk and non-verbal actions are seen to "elaborate each other", and attention is based to social, cultural and material aspects of the environment. Furthermore, Goodwin suggests that talk itself does not consist of mere verbal utterances but gains its power from various sign systems, such as gestures, social arrangements, structures of interaction, the ongoing activity and material aspects in the environment (ibid. 2000: 1491 – 1492, 1499). He uses the term *semiotic fields* to refer to these different aspects of interaction, and uses examples of a little girls' hopscotch game and of archaeological excavations to show how talk, ongoing activity, gestures, posture, gaze and semiotic structures of the environment (hopscotch grid, archaeologists' charts, dirt of specific colour on the ground) can all work together to create and to help understand the meaning of an action. He also refers to embodied activity, which can be understood as non-verbal actions that occur in an interaction. The structuring of human interaction through the interplay of different semiotic fields is also investigated in Goodwin (2003a) and (2003b) that examine pointing as an action and use of body in interaction in archaeological excavation sites, respectively. All three studies come to the same conclusion that analyses should not concentrate on individual sign systems (i.e. only talk or only gestures), but rather investigate all the semiotic fields in conjunction so that a better understanding of interaction can be obtained.

What Goodwin's theory offers for the present study is a framework for analysing evaluative turns from a very multifaceted point of view. By taking into account the other semiotic fields in addition to speech, more balanced and truthful observations can be made of the ongoing interaction than by focusing on individual aspects. As it will be shown later on in the analysis (chapter 5), teachers can communicate with their students through multiple semiotic fields. In initiating a sequence, for instance, they may ask a question about something they have drawn or written on the blackboard and, in evaluating student responses, they often use both verbal and non-verbal actions. In examining only verbal actions, important aspects of the interaction would be ignored completely. Thus, the present study tries to incorporate more semiotic fields into the analysis in order to better help understand the interaction in CLIL classrooms.

3.2 Conversation analysis and institutional interaction

In addition to everyday conversation, CA has been applied to studying institutional settings, such as medical consultations, courtroom activities or classroom interaction. In fact, these settings have been a focus of CA from its beginning (Heritage 2005: 103). In studying institutional settings, CA aims at discovering how talk is specialised in order to achieve the goals of that particular encounter. The participants may orient to the particular institutional context and to the expertise knowledge relevant to that context, but CA studies suggest that the context is not a bounding constraint. Rather, the context is only made real by the participants themselves when they orient to it. (Arminen 2005: 1, 19, 31.) During an encounter at a police station, for instance, a police officer and a civilian may either orient to that particular physical context and the institutional roles or not make it relevant. If they happen to be friends, they will probably have a normal conversation where the more official context is not oriented to. In another case, the civilian may be making a report about a theft, and then the situation is likely to be a more formal one where the institutional roles are made relevant by the participants.

CA aims at describing the institutional interaction through an examination of what actually goes on in the data. Even though Arminen (2005: 27) suggests that the objective is to find the characteristics of institutional practices, CA does not make assumptions about the meanings that interactants give to the institutional settings. He (2005: 32-36) also points out that the institutional contexts are multi-layered, with various relevant variables, such as gender, age, social status, etc. Thus the context is affected by multiple possible factors, and that may make the analysis of the institutionality problematic. CA therefore takes an evidence-based approach where analyses are empirical and inductive, and the relevance of the institutionality in interaction is only assumed when there is evidence in the participants' interaction that they are orienting to those particular aspects of context.

However, there seem to be unique characteristics to institutional interaction as compared with ordinary conversation. Heritage (2005: 106) points out that there are specific participants that have to be present in institutional settings (e.g. a doctor and a patient, or a teacher and students). There is usually also a specialisation in the

practices of conversation, and formally different patterns of interaction can be recognised. Furthermore, the participants themselves seem to acknowledge these conventions, at the same time maintaining them (Arminen 2005: 44-45). In classrooms, for instance, the participants usually seem to conform to the "rules" of that context, and the interaction is organised according to the different status that the teacher has in relation to the pupils (asymmetrical role distribution). This asymmetry can be seen, for instance, in what kinds of rights and obligations participants have in conversation (Heritage 2004: 237). Arminen (2005: 57) suggests that CA may help in understanding these aspects of institutional interaction, and, according to Heritage (2005: 115-137), this understanding can be achieved through an analysis of the turn taking, sequence organization, turn design and lexical choice in the interaction.

3.3 Classroom interaction from the perspective of conversation analysis

The classroom setting is one of the institutional settings that have been studied from a CA perspective. Interaction in classrooms has its unique practices that tell it apart from other institutional settings. Many of the characteristics are related to the unequal power relationships in the classroom – in Markee's (2000: 71) words, classroom interaction is "a teacher-fronted pedagogical speech exchange system". In addition, interaction in classrooms seems to be built using distinctive patterns that are not usually found in different types of interaction. One of these patterns – the three-part pedagogic cycle (Arminen 2005) – has been considered the basic pattern in traditional pedagogic interaction and has been the subject of many studies. It will be discussed in more detail in 2.2.3 below.

Ordinary conversation, citing Markee (2000: 71), is "open-ended" and "locally managed". That is, the structure of the conversation and turn taking are not decided before-hand but are shaped during the conversation as it evolves. By contrast, turns are traditionally often pre-allocated in classroom settings (Markee 2000:71), and the possibilities for turn taking are different for the teacher and the pupils: the teacher can usually take every second turn, whereas individual pupils can only be given a turn by the teacher and have to compete for the turn with their peers (Sahlström

1999: 84). It has to be emphasised that this can be observed in the *public* talk of traditional teacher-fronted classrooms, and as Tainio (2005: 181) remarks, this is not the most common case in many classrooms. There is overlapping talk, and often pupils can keep interrupting the teaching. Sometimes the latter can take place in the form of what Sahlström (1999) calls the displayed non-participation while talking with other pupils (the interaction that falls outside of the public agenda of the classroom interaction).

Thus, even if the point of departure for many studies of classroom interaction has been the special three-part structure and the authoritative role of the teacher, it has been found that the amount of teacher-fronted talk in classrooms has been diminishing – even though it still is a part of classroom interaction (Tainio 2005: 181). Jones and Thornborrow (2004) also claim that the organisation of classroom interaction can be very adaptable according to the activity at hand. CA studies therefore seem to be shifting their attention away from the traditional three-part structure to other forms of interaction that go on in classrooms (see e.g. Sahlström 1999, Tainio 2005). Nevertheless, as the three-part pedagogic cycle still has a significant role in classroom settings, it is worth studying in detail in order to better understand how it, as a part of the whole interaction in classrooms, works.

3.4 The three-part structure of pedagogic interaction: the pedagogic cycle

The pedagogic cycle is probably the most traditional form of teaching. It consists of three parts, which have been called differently by different classroom researchers. Markee (2000: 70) reports three different versions: the IRF pattern (initiation-response-follow-up) used by Sinclair and Coulthard in their work; IRE pattern by Mehan, where E stands for the evaluation move; and McHoul's shortening QAC for question-answer-comment. In this study, I use the term *evaluative turn* for the third turn, to simulate the nomination used by Mehan, and the term for the whole three-part structure used here is therefore IRE pattern or sequence. I have chosen this term as I feel that the term *evaluation* best describes what teachers usually do in classrooms in relation to the answers given by their students – they are constantly

evaluating the performance of the students in order to be able to guide and assess their development. Nonetheless, it should be noted that, in addition to its valuable role in assessing student learning, the evaluative turn can also be used for other purposes, such as ensuring learning, shaping what is taught and selecting important points to emphasize them (see e.g. Sinclair and Brazil 1982: 45). In some studies, the terms 'feedback' and 'follow-up' are also used to refer to the same kind of a phenomenon as I study here (see e.g. Nikula 2007, Sheen 2004). Nevertheless, the term *evaluative turn* better narrows down the focus of the present study to one particular type of phenomenon, that is evaluation of student responses instead of any type of feedback given on student performance. Moreover, the term chosen is more clearly tied to CA as turns and turn-taking are central phenomena in this field of research.

In the pedagogic cycle, the first turn is a question or another initiation move by the teacher. The second turn is then given to a student who answers the question. The answer is then evaluated by the teacher, and, in a very simplified model, the teacher then initiates another sequence with the similar pattern. It has to be noted that often the questions asked by teachers are display questions, that is, questions that teachers already know the answers to and that are only asked in order to check pupils' knowledge (Markee 2000: 72). The next adapted example of the three-part structure of a pedagogic cycle comes from Richards (2006: 53):

T:	But the writing is on 'weekends' which tells you::
S:	When
T:	Whe::n. *Ye::s*.

Here the teacher initiates the sequence by asking (although not in an explicit question form) a question. One of the students takes the second turn, answering the question, and the teacher indicates that the answer is correct in the third turn, i.e. accepts the answer. This seems to be a rather typical example from a classroom setting.

As mentioned above, the three-part structure of classroom discourse is often used to ask display questions in order to be able to evaluate students' learning. This is suggested, for instance, by Margutti (2006) who studies question-answer sequences in classroom settings. Cazden (2001: 46) also sees the structure as the basic pattern in

traditional lessons, but she suggests that the pattern is not used *only* to ask display questions (to which the teacher knows the answer) and to check student knowledge. Rather, teacher uses the pattern for many purposes, such as asking metaprocess questions ("How did you know that?") in order to make students think about their learning processes and making authentic inquiries when s/he genuinely does not know something that students do. Nassaji and Wells (2000) also present similar arguments about the nature of evaluative turns and the IRE pattern, in general. According to them, the structure can be used to co-construct knowledge together with students or to initiate discussions, for example, and the third move may also be employed to request justifications of the answer or other students' counter-arguments. In addition, taking into account the findings of recent research, Markee (2004: 492) describes classroom discourse as "a *nexus* of interrelated speech exchange systems rather than as a unified speech exchange system that is characterized by a single set of question-answer-comment practices". Thus there seems to be a variety of structures and patterns observable in classrooms instead of just the traditional three-part structure.

Moreover, the three-part structure of classroom interaction has been criticised over the past years. As Wells and Arauz (2006: 380) point out, for instance, it does not provide students with many opportunities to state their own ideas and opinions, and it clearly differs from everyday interaction. In their article, they seem to suggest that the interaction in classrooms should move towards being more dialogic than it is or has been. As the three-part structure nevertheless seems to be used frequently in classroom interaction even nowadays (Nassaji and Wells 2000: 382, Margutti 2004), the phenomenon is worth studying in more detail.

3.5 The evaluative turn of the teacher

According to Arminen (2005: 114), the evaluative turn of the teacher may be a confirmation of the answer – repetition or positive assessment, for instance (see the example above) – or either a reformulation or a rejection of the answer. He also notes that the third turn can be left out altogether. Usually, however, the third turn is

observable in the classroom interaction, and many (SLA) studies have suggested that the role of evaluation may be important in the process of learning (see e.g. Mackey 2006).

Some previous research has shown different ways to provide evaluation of student answers. Margutti (2004), for instance, reports on different practices that teachers seem to adopt in constructing evaluative turns. According to her, positive evaluation can be achieved through a repetition of what student has said, for instance. This may be emphasised with a higher volume or a rising pitch in voice, and is usually accompanied by no temporal delay in producing the evaluation. Often positive evaluations are also expanded to include more than just a repetition of a student response (e.g. reformulation of the answer in teacher's words) or, alternatively, a repetition is embedded within a larger structure. Kääntä (forthcoming) also shows in her analysis of evaluative turns how evaluations can be expanded to include multiple turns.

As Margutti (2004) observes, in rejecting a student answer, teachers may also use repetition although with different prosodic features from positive evaluations and with a temporal delay before the evaluation. It is noteworthy that repetition is also used by hearers in everyday conversations to indicate that there is a problem in what the speaker has said (see e.g. Drew 1997), and that this device therefore does not seem a characteristic of classroom interaction only. In classrooms, teachers may also rephrase the question so that the student who has provided an incorrect answer can try again (self-repair) or use repair initiators that invite other students to provide the right answer (i.e. to repair the incorrect answer provided by another student in the form of other-repair). A partial repetition of a student answer may also be employed together with a repetition of the original question. (Margutti 2004.) In addition, there are cases when teachers cannot accept answers as such nor reject them. On these occasions, they can use the strategy of adding something to student answers or, alternatively, rephrasing them (Sinclair and Brazil 1982: 45). Margutti (2004: 428, 440) calls these reformulations a way of giving a "downgraded acceptance" of a student answer.

As to the research conducted on evaluative turns, there have been studies made in the field of SLA that have concentrated on the feedback provided by teachers on learners' use of language (notice that the term feedback is often used in SLA studies instead of evaluative turns). Sheen (2004), for instance, examined the different types of correctional feedback, i.e. negative feedback that implicitly or explicitly rejects a student response, found in different classroom settings. She used four English classrooms from different countries and with variant learners (ESL and EFL, different ages, different educational backgrounds), and compared the different feedback types found in the data. Her results included classifications of the different types of correctional feedback on language use, and she concluded that the instructional setting may have an impact on the kind of feedback used.

The correctional feedback types Sheen found were the following: 1) explicit correction, i.e. the teacher states the incorrect form and gives the correct form, 2) recasts, i.e. the teacher changes an erroneous utterance produced by a learner or a part of it without changing its meaning, 3) clarification requests that signal that the teacher has not understood or that there is a mistake in a student utterance, 4) metalinguistic feedback, i.e. the teacher does not provide the correct answer but gives metalinguistic information on what is incorrect, 5) elicitation, i.e. the teacher elicits the correct form a student by different strategies such as requesting a reformulation of the utterance, and 6) repetition, i.e. the teacher repeats the incorrect form without changing it. In addition, combinations of different feedback types were observed in the data. As these feedback types are clearly characteristic of correcting erroneous language rather than the contents of a response, they cannot, as such, be applied to the present study.

Mackey (2006) studied the effect of feedback in the process of noticing an L2 form in an ESL classroom context and learning it. The SLA perspective was taken in this study, as well, and the term *interactional feedback* used in it seemed to refer to a wider range of phenomena than just evaluative turns of the IRE sequence, e.g. corrections of form when a student is explaining something that is not produced as an answer to a question posed by a teacher. She used observation and recordings of lessons, learning journals written by students, questionnaires, oral tests and interviews as her data. The results suggested that, compared with a control group, the

students who received corrective feedback on particular forms noticed those forms better. There was also a positive relationship between noticing the form and the development of using that form correctly. It seems, then, that feedback provided by the teacher can have positive results in students' learning.

Ohta (2000) concentrated on the impact of recasts in lessons where the students studied Japanese as a foreign language. According to Ohta's definition, recasts are teacher responses that implicitly correct or expand students' answers, i.e. a type of corrective feedback (negative evaluation) mentioned earlier. The data used were recordings of private speech, i.e. speech that students produced only for themselves, during Japanese lessons at university level. Ohta (2000: 49) reports that some L2 studies have considered recasts less effective than other types of feedback. The findings of Ohta's study, however, suggested that recasts were quite effective as to giving rise to private speech. Students seemed to contrast their incorrect responses with the correct responses provided by the teacher or other students and to correct their utterances in their private speech even when the recasts were not directed to them but to another individual or the whole class. It seems then the evaluative turns can be important in the learning process of students.

The studies I have briefly introduced here were conducted using the SLA perspective, and are therefore not strictly related to my research questions. However, they shed some light on the different possible types of evaluative turns and tell about the importance of evaluation. They are therefore a useful point of departure for my own study. In addition, it will be interesting to see how the evaluative turns aimed at assessing the contents of the pupil responses may differ from the feedback in SLA settings where the emphasis is usually on the linguistic aspects of answers. Nevertheless, all the studies presented above lack detailed, qualitative descriptions of evaluative turns (or feedback), and therefore tell little about how evaluation and interaction in general is structured in classrooms.

A CA perspective is taken in Hellermann's (2003) study on the interactive functions of prosody in teacher repetition in evaluative turns. He studies how teacher repetitions of students' answers can have different meanings and functions according to the changes in prosody and concludes that positive and negative evaluation can be

implied by different intonation contours in repetitions. It is also suggested that the prosodic features of teacher talk can help in accomplishing additional interactive work and that "teachers and students use intonation contours (tone) as part of their systematic work toward convergence in classroom discourse" (Hellermann 2003: 98). As the emphasis of the study, however, is more on investigating how prosody can be used to accomplish different types of interaction work rather than on finding characteristics of evaluative turns and interaction in classrooms, its importance for the present study is merely the fact that it makes relevant not only what is said verbally but how it is said in studying teacher meaning.

Another study that has concentrated on third turns as evaluations of the contents of student responses is the above mentioned Margutti's (2004) dissertation on how instructional sequences are constructed in Italian primary school, where the language used is the mother tongue of both the teacher and the pupils. Taking the CA perspective, she studies interactional sequences as a whole, treating the third turn as a part of it. She presents different ways in which teachers can evaluate pupils' answers and also notes that children, too, seem to be welcome to evaluate others' answers. According to the findings of the study, teachers can use verbal practices (repetition, reformulations, re-issuing the original question, etc.), prosodic features (emphasis) and temporal deployment (temporal delay of evaluation or no delay) in designing either positive or negative evaluation (Margutti 2004: 440-441). Margutti's work is of importance to my study as it also includes some non-verbal aspects in the analysis instead of concentrating solely on the verbal aspects of the third turn (i.e. she takes into account the prosodic features of the evaluative turns). What I feel it misses, however, is an account of how non-verbal actions, such as movements of hands, head or torso or other behaviour of teachers, can form a part of the turn and support what is being said. These issues are mentioned only briefly in some of her examples but are not discussed fully in the analysis.

Kääntä (forthcoming) analyses a very particular function of evaluative turns from the CA perspective. She investigates how evaluative turns can be used to restrict students' behaviour in CLIL classrooms, using data from the same corpus as Nikula (e.g. 2005, 2007) and the present study. What is important in her article is the investigation of other semiotic fields, or, as Kääntä formulates it, semiotic resources,

in addition to talk and that she draws attention to the fact that evaluative turns can have multiple functions even though evaluation of student performance can be seen as the main purpose of these turns. The analysis shows that evaluative turns can have either an explicit or an implicit restrictive function that may be related to guiding students' problematic behaviour in a more desired direction. Moreover, this function is gained through multiple semiotic resources as teachers use non-verbal behaviour in addition to talk and adapt their actions to suit the context. Thus the importance of examining teachers' behaviour as a whole, as demonstrated in Goodwin (2000, 2003a, 2003b), is further highlighted by Kääntä's article.

In conclusion, we can condense the findings of previous research into six claims. First, there seem to be three different categories of evaluative turns as to how they regard student responses: acceptance, downgraded acceptance and rejection. Second, teachers seem to employ various different devices in these turns, such as repetition or reformulation of student responses. Third, evaluative turns may extend over multiple turns. Fourth, they may have other functions besides evaluating student responses. Fifth, they seem to have a positive effect on students' learning. Last, both verbal and non-verbal actions have been found out to be important in forming the meaning of evaluative turns. What the previous studies lack is a more detailed account of the various devices available for teachers in evaluating student responses. In the present study, an effort is therefore made to examine evaluative turns in CLIL settings more comprehensively in order to have a better understanding of the nature of this phenomenon.

4 THE PRESENT STUDY

4.1 Aims of the study

The aim of the study is to find answers to the following two questions: 1) What are the devices used by CLIL teachers in their evaluative turns to indicate whether or not the answer provided by the pupil is accepted or not? 2) What is the role of non-verbal in relation to verbal communication in the evaluative turns? That is, how do verbal and non-verbal actions co-construct the meaning of the evaluative turns?

By non-verbal actions I refer here to the gestures and other bodily actions of speakers that accompany speech or sometimes occur independently from verbal communication. McNeill (1992: 1) defines gestures as "movements of the hands and arms that we see when people talk". In this study, movements of the head and body have also been included in the analysis as speakers can use their whole bodies in diverse ways to accompany their speech. For example, a person talking about a football game may use his or her legs in order to demonstrate how a player kicked the ball and scored. In addition, other actions, such as writing on a blackboard have been analysed as parts of evaluative turns in the study, and I therefore prefer the term *non-verbal action* to *gesture*, as the latter is often used more narrowly, including only movements of hands and arms.

The different non-verbal actions are here taken to inform the hearer about what the speaker is trying to communicate or, in other words, to form a part of the meaning of what is being expressed by him or her. In some cases, they may form the whole meaning without any verbal constituent. Accordingly, Kendon (2004: 1) distinguishes different uses of gestures: they can be used "in conjunction with spoken expressions, at other times as complements, supplements, substitutes or as alternatives to them". Thus a gesture, or a facial expression, can be used independently to convey a whole message or it can give part of the meaning of the message that would not be revealed just by the spoken expression. Alternatively, gestures can be something extra, merely emphasizing or companying a spoken message that, *per se*, would be enough to make the hearer understand the whole

message. In this study, examples of all these uses of non-verbal actions are analysed in the third turns of the teachers, although it has to be emphasised that the non-verbal actions are here thought to be integral components of interaction, that is, verbal and non-verbal components of utterances cannot be completely separated from each other as they both contribute to the meaning conveyed in interaction (see section 3.1).

4.2 Data

The data of the study consist of the video recordings of four CLIL lessons that have been recorded earlier for use in a project called English Voices by researchers at the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä (notice that Nikula has examined data from this data pool in many of her studies, see e.g. Nikula 2007). The participants are three different male teachers whose native tongue is Finnish as well as Finnish – and a few English speaking – students who attend to CLIL teaching in English at a lower secondary school in central Finland. The students are about 13 to 15 years old and are native speakers of Finnish, with the exception of three students whose native language is English (see Table 1 for information on the participating students). The lessons are double lessons, that is the length of each lesson is approximately 90 minutes, usually with a break after the first 45 minutes. Altogether, the data consist of 6 hours of video recordings. The subjects of the lessons are the following: biology (two lessons with the same teacher and students), religious studies and physics. A lot of the interaction in all these lessons is lead by the teachers, and there are therefore several instances of the pedagogic cycle – and thus of the evaluative turns.

Table 1. The students in the data (NS = native speaker).

Lesson	**Grade**	**Number of students**			**Native language of the students**
		Male	**Female**	**Total**	
Biology 1 and 2*	9th	3	6	9	Finnish, except for one male NS of English
Physics	7th	-	6	6	Finnish
Religion **	7th , 8th, 9th	7	12	19	Finnish, except for three male NS of English

* The same students participate in both of the biology lessons in the data.

** Some of the students in the religious studies lesson also participate in the biology lessons.

The lessons have been recorded by two video cameras, one focusing on the teacher and the other one on the students. In the analysis, only the material provided by the camera focusing on the teacher has been used, and little attention has therefore been paid to the non-verbal actions of students. This can be justified by the fact that the aim of the study is to find out how the evaluative turns are constructed and, therefore, the teachers are the central focus in the analysis.

As van Lier (1994: 37) states, recording the lessons is important as there is too much going on at the same time in classrooms for the researcher to notice and to remember everything, and because classrooms are familiar to nearly all of us, which means that we can easily make assumptions from the basis of our personal experiences. Recording therefore makes it easier for the researcher to keep the analysis more objective. From the CA point of view, recording is also important because of the preference to analyse *only* what is observable in the data.

4.3 Methodology

The data have already been transcribed by members of the research team of the English Voices project at the University of Jyväskylä, and I have been given the permission to use the transcripts in the present study. Nevertheless, I have made some modifications in them, using the conventions of conversation analysis (see e.g. Arminen 2005 for an appendix explicating the conventions proposed by Atkinson and Heritage), as most non-verbal aspects and some other details have been left out in the original transcripts. The CA conventions have also been modified for the purposes of the present study in order to demonstrate when and how the non-verbal actions occur.

The non-verbal actions in the data have been written in capital letters on a separate line under the line indicating talk. Sometimes, when a non-verbal action occurs without any simultaneous speech, there is just one line indicating that action. When a non-verbal action is performed at the same particular moment as a certain word or an

utterance, for instance, the following symbol has been used to mark the relevant point ◦---◦, where the first white bullet indicates the beginning of the action and the second shows when the action is over (see line 3, on which the action of pointing is performed during the production of the word *where*). The development of a suitable transcription system was aided by Piirainen-Marsh and Kääntä (2006), who have used a similar system to the one used here. Further details of the transcription methods can be seen in the appendix.

Extract 1. An example of the transcription system.

1	T	um centimetres times newtons *WRITING ON BLACKBOARD*
2		and so (.) *MOVES TO THE LEFT*
3 →		where is this one. ◦-----◦ *POINTS AT WRITING ON BLACKBOARD WITH RIGHT HAND,* *FACING TOWARDS BLACK BOARD*
4		(.) *TURNS TO GAZE STUDENTS, POINTS TO THE SAME WRITING WITH LEFT HAND*
5	LF3	six hundred and [ninety]
6 →	T	[*TURNS TO FACE BLACKBOARD*]
7		yeah *WRITES THE ANSWER ON BLACKBOARD*

In this example, taken from a physics lesson, the teacher is writing an answer to an exercise on the blackboard. The answer is only a part of the problem the class is solving and the teacher moves left next to a part of the blackboard where there is still one part of the exercise that has not been solved (line 2). He asks for the answer for that part of the exercise, pointing at the relevant point on the blackboard (line 3). He turns around to look at the students and waits for the answer, at the same time changing the hand that is now pointing at the blackboard. It is noteworthy here how the teacher turns back to face the blackboard even before one of the students, LF3, has finished her answer (line 6). He then produces a short affirmative answer (line 7) and immediately starts writing the correct answer on the blackboard. Thus there is no

gap between the student response and the evaluative turn. In the results, it will be argued that this is a characteristic of teachers' positive evaluation in the data.

The data have been examined using both the video-recordings and the transcripts, and the relevant extracts have been separated for further analysis. The analysis adopted conforms to the traditions of CA, using evidence that is directly observable in the data. The approach is a qualitative one, the emphasis being on giving detailed descriptions of the evaluative turns. Quantitative methods have only been used when comparing which of the methods of evaluating student answers seem to be the most common in the lessons studied.

For the third turns of the teachers present in the data, different ways of evaluating the student responses have been distinguished, paying attention to both verbal and non-verbal actions. The devices of evaluating pupils' answers have been grouped under general headings but the emphasis in this study is on describing the third turns in more detail. Particularly interesting in the analysis has been the examination of the role of non-verbal expressions in the evaluative turns in relation to the verbal evaluation given by the teacher. The aim has been to find out how the non-verbal and verbal behaviour of the teachers together construct the meaning of the evaluative turns, rather than to concentrate on one of these aspects exclusively.

At this point, some problems in the analysis of the evaluative turns should be mentioned. As the phenomenon focused on in this study is human interaction, it can be expected that not everything will follow the quite simplified patterns proposed by the theories presented above. Accordingly, there have been difficulties in deciding which instances should be included in the analysis as examples of evaluative turns or even as examples of the IRE pattern, in general. It is quite common in the data, for instance, that the teacher asks students to perform an action, such as writing the answer of an exercise on the board, and then evaluates the outcome of that action. In addition, sometimes one question performed in the data requires a series of replies by students. In all these cases, the vital factor in deciding which instances are analysed as IRE sequences has been the presence of a clearly identifiable evaluative turn for each of the replies. In the cases mentioned above where one question is followed by several responses and evaluations, for example, each of the evaluative turns has been

analysed separately, as if parts of separate IRE sequences. In the following extract, for instance, the teacher asks one question (line 1), which receives two answers by different learners (lines 2 and 7). The teacher gives an evaluation of both of those answers (lines 4 and 8).

Extract 2. Religion / The symbol of dove.

1	T	do you remember what's the symbol of dove
2	LM1	peace
3	LM3	[(xxx)]
4 →	T	[yes yeah very good] °--° *POINTS AT LM1*
5	LM5	the white dove.
6	T	uhuh
7	LF	the holy spirit
8 →	T	holy spirit also. good °---° *POINTS AT THE LEARNER*

In this example, both of the evaluative turns are counted as separate evaluative turns as they are directed at different learners: the one on line 4 is an evaluation of LM1's response on line 2 and the other one is an evaluation of a female learner's turn on line 5.

The evaluative turns, for their part, are here taken to be turns that clearly evaluate a response of a student, be it verbal, non-verbal or both, that follows a request of the teacher to perform that particular action of replying (i.e. initiation). Accordingly, the response can be a verbal answer to a question or an action of writing an answer on the blackboard. Similarly, the evaluative turn may consist of either verbal or non-verbal elements or of both. Moreover, the IRE patterns with questions analysed in the study are all examples of sequences with a *display* question, i.e. examples of sequences initiated by genuine questions were not included in the analysis. Note also

that the evaluative turns analysed in this study are all teachers' turns, i.e. IRE sequences initiated by learners are not included in the focus of the study. Some of the problematic cases will be discussed further in the following chapters that report the findings of the study.

5 RESULTS

In the following sections, I will present the findings of the study. The evaluative turns have been grouped under three general categories: acceptance, rejection and cases of downgraded acceptance, a term used by Margutti (2004) to describe instances where an answer is only partially accepted. In other words, the teacher accepts only a part of the answer, while pointing out a problem with it. The analysis shows that there are different devices used by the teachers according to whether a response given by a student is evaluated positively (i.e. accepted) or negatively (i.e. rejected). Differences in both verbal and non-verbal actions can be seen, and the devices range from temporal adjustments of the turn to repeating parts of responses and to laughter. It is shown that non-verbal actions not only support verbal actions in the evaluative turns but can also function as evaluations *independently* of talk. It is noticeable in the data, however, that most of the evaluative turns are formed using several different devices, and usually those devices include both verbal and non-verbal actions. In addition, the evaluations of student responses can, in fact, extend over multiple turns.

Most of the evaluative turns in the data are cases of acceptance. In the interaction during the lessons, 107 evaluative turns were identified. Of these evaluations, 80 (i.e. circa 75 per cent of the evaluative turns) were analysed as being examples of acceptance, in comparison with 17 rejections of responses and 10 instances of downgraded acceptance. The overwhelming majority of positive evaluations may be explained by the fact that usually the teachers in the data select the next speaker among learners who show willingness to answer by putting a hand up, for instance. Accordingly, the response is often given by a learner who is quite certain that he or she knows the answer. Moreover, it is quite common in the data that a learner gives a response without waiting for the teacher to select the next speaker. Extract 3 is an example of this.

Extract 3. Religion / Apostle Paul.

1	T	um okay what did apostle Paul preach
2	LM4	[a]bout Jesu[s]
3	T	[*TURNS TO LOOK AT LM4*]
4	LM	[(xx)]=
5	T	=yes about Jesus °---° *POINTS AT LM 4 WITH ONE THUMB UP*

The question asked by the teacher is not directed at any of the learners in particular. As he finishes the question, however, LM4 proceeds to take the turn. Notice how the teacher turns to look at LM4 only *after* the learner has started his turn, not before it (line 3). That is a clear demonstration of the fact that the teacher has not indicated that he particularly wants LM4 to answer the question. Rather, it may be that LM4 perceives the question as an invitation for anybody to give a response and he follows to take the floor.

As to acceptances, the devices used in the evaluative turns vary rather widely. The most straightforward acceptances consist of a single affirmative element (e.g. 'yes', 'yep') that is produced with little or no delay after the student response. In fact, affirmatives and positive appreciations ('very good') seem to be the prevailing devices in the data. Acceptances can include more complex structures, however, and these range from repetitions of student responses to expanding the responses to intricate non-verbal actions. A more detailed analysis of acceptance can be found in section 5.1, which offers examples and descriptions of different devices used by the teachers in the data

After the section on acceptances, an account of downgraded acceptance follows (5.2), which will show that evaluative turns are not always a matter of simply accepting or rejecting a student response. In the section on negative evaluations or rejections (5.3), it will be shown that teachers can use more oblique devices in rejecting an answer than in accepting it. Some of the devices include mitigating the

negative, temporal delay in producing the evaluative turn, humour and non-verbal actions that support the message of the verbal evaluation. Nevertheless, several instances of direct rejections can be found in the data, as well, and, in fact, it will be shown that they are common in the rejections of the participating teachers.

All in all, it can be seen in the following analysis that the devices used by the CLIL teachers in the data in evaluating student responses are very diverse and seem to depend on the type of evaluative turn in question, i.e. whether the evaluative turn will be an acceptance, a downgraded acceptance or a rejection. In addition, although this aspect is not focused on in the present study, it should be noted that the devices seem to vary according to the context where they occur as well as the particular teacher. Moreover, the evaluative turns often cannot be analysed as a simple matter of pronouncing an affirmative or a negation but, rather, have to be seen as intricate structures where an interplay of several, sometimes very indirect, devices make up the meaning.

5.1 Acceptance

Acceptance is the first type of the evaluative turns. With varied devices, the teacher indicates that the response that a student has given is what has been expected. Usually, it is a case of accepting the correct answer to a question but it can also be an evaluation of a non-verbal action that a learner has performed, such as writing the correct answer on the board or performing a calculation correctly in a physics lesson.

As it was mentioned above, the vast majority of the evaluative turns in the data are positive evaluations and therefore acceptances of learner responses. As it was expected, the devices used to positively evaluate a learner response differ from those used to give a negative evaluation. In her study, Margutti (2004: 411) shows that one of the devices to indicate acceptance of an answer is to repeat the answer (or a part of it) with no temporal delay and using emphatic prosody. According to her, teachers also often use embedded repetitions, where the answer of a learner is repeated by the teacher inside another syntactic structure, and post-repetition turn expansions, which

can, for example, consist of reformulation of the answer to make it clearer or of added information.

The same devices that Margutti mentions are frequently used by the teachers in the data of the present study, as well. Positive evaluations are generally produced with minimal or no temporal delay and sometimes they even overlap with the end of a learner response (see Extract 5 in 5.1.1). Repetition is used extensively, as well, although it does not seem to constitute such an overwhelming majority as in Margutti's data. Rather, positive appreciations (e.g. *very good*) and affirmatives (*okay*, *yeah*), which are rare in Margutti's data, seem to be used more frequently by the CLIL teachers of the present study. Whether this is a difference of cultural origins or with another basis is a question that cannot be answered within the limits of the present study.

In addition, reformulations of correct answers and turn expansions are both common devices in the data. Moreover, there are several cases where non-verbal actions stand as devices to show acceptance of learner responses. With the exception of prosodic features, these are not mentioned in Margutti's dissertation and therefore a comparison between the present study and that of Margutti cannot be made as to the occurrences of non-verbal actions in evaluative turns. Non-verbal actions in the data of the present study are used as devices that can co-construct the meaning of the evaluative turns together with verbal actions, support what is being said or stand alone to form an evaluation of a student response (see section 5.1.6). The most frequently, however, several devices are used together in the formation of a single positive evaluation, usually including both verbal and non-verbal actions. See, for instance, Extract 4 where the biology teacher uses an ensemble of different devices (line 4) in accepting the answer of LM1 (line 3).

Extract 4. Biology / Signs of pregnancy.

1	T	what do ↑you think (.) what is the first mark for the mother (.)
2		that (.) she probably is pregnant. (2.7) Mikko
		°-----°
		GAZES AT SEVERAL LEARNERS, THEN FASTENS HIS GAZE ON LM1
3	LM1	missing periods
4	T	yeah missing periods. a week or or so
		°---°
		NODS

The class has been talking about pregnancy and the development of human embryos. The teacher has also been showing pictures of the different stages of the development in the book he has in his lap. He then asks the class about the first sign of pregnancy. He gives the floor to LM1 (line 2) who has put his hand up during the pause in the teacher's talk. After LM1's answer (line 3), the teacher's evaluative turn (line 4) indicates an acceptance of the answer.

At least six or seven different devices can be seen in work in forming this turn. First, the use of the affirmative 'yeah' is a clear sign that the answer is perceived as correct by the teacher. Second, there is only a minimal gap or temporal delay between the student response and the evaluative turn (the importance of this will be discussed in the next section). Third, the teacher nods when he gives the affirmative, which emphasizes the acceptance. Fourth, there is an exact repetition of the learner's answer ('missing periods'). Fifth, the falling tone of this repetition may be seen as an indication that the answer is seen as a fact by the teacher, i.e. the prosodic features do not suggest that the teacher is questioning the answer. Sixth, additional information is given (i.e. an expansion) that gives the phenomenon a time frame (notice how the short time frame, 'a week or so', may accentuate the idea of 'missing periods' as really being the first sign). Last, the teacher engages in another activity at the end of his turn, that is, starts leafing through a book that he has in his lap (line 5). This may be seen by the students as yet another sign that the question has been answered satisfactorily and that they can now change the topic.

As it can be seen, positive evaluation of a response is not a question of selecting a single device among mutually exclusive alternatives but a process where different actions can co-construct the meaning. It is important to keep this interplay of several factors in mind when viewing the descriptions of separate devices below.

5.1.1 Absence of temporal delay

The absence of temporal delay between a student response and an evaluative turn of a teacher is one of the most notable features of accepting an answer. Usually, when the evaluation is positive, there is only a minimal gap between the two last turns of the IRE sequence or they can even overlap. The acceptance of a student response can be seen as an example of preferred actions, which, in general, are characterised by an absence of temporal delay (Margutti 2004: 393). This may be related to the fact that as teachers can be more direct when giving an acceptance than when rejecting an answer, they do not need so much time to reflect on how to deliver their message. In addition, as Margutti (2004: 393) notes, when a teacher asks a question, he or she is expecting a certain kind of an answer. If a student gives the expected answer, the teacher is able to quickly recognise it.

Extract 5. Physics / Jet engines in space.

1	T	but Minna do you have an answer =
2	LF2	= the the the jet engine can't work in space because
3		there's no air in [space.]
4 →	T	[that's] right °----------° *NODS*
5		cause the jet engine always needs air °----------° *WALKS TO BLACKBOARD*
6		(7.8) *DURING SILENCE TEACHER WIPES OFF TEXT ON BLACKBOARD AND WRITES CORRECT ANSWER ON IT*

7 T it needs air to work

Extract 5 is situated within a longer sequence where the class is checking answers to exercises that they have had to do at home. Some of the students have written the answers to the exercises on the blackboard but the teacher sees problems with many of them. This IRE pattern is a part of a longer sequence where they are having a look at the answer to the question why a jet engine cannot work in space. The teacher has already rejected the answer on the blackboard and has asked another student to give her response. The teacher partly rejects the answer, however, and gives the floor to LF2 (line 1), thus initiating another IRE sequence.

LF2's response seems to be the expected answer to the question as the teacher's turn overlaps that of LF2 (lines 3 and 4). It is especially interesting here that the teacher's evaluative turn begins at the same time as LF2 starts to pronounce the word 'space', which is an integral part of the answer. It implies that the teacher has recognised LF2's answer as the expected one and is sure that it will end as he is expecting it to end. The overlap between LF2's turn and the teacher's turns therefore suggests that the evaluative turn will be an acceptance of the answer. Accordingly, the teacher proceeds to give an appreciation of the answer and to reformulate it (line 5: 'the jet engine always needs air'). He then wipes off the incorrect answer on the blackboard and writes the accepted answer on it. Moreover, he further emphasises the answer by offering a modified repetition of his own words after finishing writing (line 7).

Even though the absence of temporal delay is very characteristic of acceptances in the data, there are a couple of instances where a delay occurs because of a non-verbal action of the teacher. Margutti (2004: 392) also notes this phenomenon in her study and sees it as a case of the non-verbal action delaying the production of an evaluative turn. In the data used in the present study, however, most of the cases where a delay does occur before a verbal acceptance are instances where non-verbal actions form a part of the evaluative turn. A common example of this is where a teacher writes the correct answer on the blackboard or the overhead projector. In Extract 6 the class is checking the answers to homework and the teacher has asked how a foetus gets nutrition inside the womb. Nevertheless, the initiation turn does not start an IRE sequence as one of the students points out an error in the teacher's pronunciation.

After a few turns the teacher asks LF6 to answer the same question, this time successfully initiating an IRE sequence (line 1).

Extract 6. Biology / Food for the baby.

1	T	[how does it happen Elina]
2	LM	[(xxx)]
3 →	LF6	the mother's blood brings [it to the baby]
4	LM1	[(xx][x)]
5	LF5	[°the placenta°]
6 →	LF6	[yeah to the] placenta which then [transfers it].
7	LM	[*LAUGHS*]
8	LM	[(xx)]
9 →	LF6	to the baby.
10 →	T	*STARTS WRITING ON TRANSPARENCY BUT PEN DOESN'T WORK SO LOOKS FOR NEW ONE*
11	LM	°umbilical cord°
12		(2.3)
13	LM	°(xx[x)°] °(xxx)°
14	LF	[°(xx)°]
15	LM	°umbilical [(cord)°]
16	LM	[°umbili]cal (right)°
17	LF6	oh yeah
18	T	*STARTS WRITING AGAIN*
19	LM1	napa[nuora that's so much easier in English]
20	LF5	[°(xxx)°] °(x)°
21		(1)

22	LF	(couldn't) [(x)]	
23	LM		[hey psst]
24		(1.2)	
25	LM	(bold)	
26	LM	(xxx)	
27	→T		placenta (.) means istukka *STOPS WRITING*
28		(1)	
29	T	OKAY what else	

What is interesting in this extract, is the fact that the teacher only gives a verbal acceptance of the student response when circa 20 seconds have elapsed since LF6 has ended her answer (notice student response on lines 3, 6 and 9 and the verbal acceptance on lines 27 and 29). Thus it seems as if there is a temporal delay in the production of the evaluative turn even though it is an instance of acceptance. The teacher's non-verbal actions, i.e. looking for a new pen (line 10) and writing the answer on the blackboard (lines 10, 18 and 27), seem to cause the delay in the production of the turn.

It is essential to see, however, that the teacher starts writing on the transparency immediately after LF6 has finished her turn, with only a minimal gap between the student response and the teacher's action, and, moreover, what he is writing is in fact the answer to his question given by LF6. Thus the teacher does indeed start the production of his evaluative turn without a temporal delay, only his action is a non-verbal one. It is interrupted, however, by problems with the pen and he finds a new one (line 10). He then continues writing the answer (line 18) and, when finished, ends the turn with a verbal action (lines 27 ad 29). Yet, for the students, the action of writing the answer has already been the sign of acceptance (note that writing the answers on a transparency is a prevalent action in checking the answers on this lesson). This particular evaluative turn is, therefore, not a deviation from the general principle that an acceptance is produced without a temporal delay.

5.1.2 Affirmatives and positive appreciation

The use of affirmatives or positive appreciation is a recurrent device in the data as to accepting a student response. Out of the 80 acceptances in the data, 69 have some type of an affirmative or an appreciation of the type 'that's right', 'good' etc., which is quite contrary to the findings of Margutti (2004: 386). As noted above, her study seems to suggest that positive appreciation of students is rare in teachers' evaluative turns, especially if compared with the numerous instances of repetition.

In most cases, a positive evaluative turn with an affirmative element also begins with this element. Extract 7 from the religious studies lesson is a case in point.

Extract 7. Religion / Preaching Christians.

1	T	what other reasons [do you think]
2	LM	[(xxx)]
3	T	(.) that could have been
4	LL	*2 SEC OF UNIDENTIFIED TALKING*
5	T	which affected that Christianity was growing
6		(1.4)
7	LM5	(xxx)
8		(2.1)
9	T	I mean just guess (3) °----------° *MOVES HANDS AND ARMS IN RAPID SUCCESSION AS IF INVITING LEARNERS TO ANSWER*
10	LF9	*PUTS HER HAND UP*
11	T	°yes° °----° *POINTS AT LF9*
12	LF9	there was pre- um Christians who preached °(a lot)°
13	→T	yes (0.9) very good um you see Christianity (.) also as Islam (1.3)

14 they are re- religions (1.8) in which it's very important that you are
15 (.) preaching it. (0.8) for those people who are who doesn't know it.
16 (1.4) i- in Christianity Jesus he commands us that go and preach and
17 baptise and teach what he has been teaching (.) us (0.9) um in Islam
18 also (1.7) you have to (2.4) go and and and (.) preach it to other
19 people (3.2) so it's inside built in Christianity that that it must be
20 preached and and that a- also affects (5.2) okay

In Extract 7 the class is finding out reasons for the growth of the Christian Church in the Roman Empire. They have already spoken about some phenomena affecting the growth and the teacher asks the students for other reasons (lines 1, 3 and 5), initiating another IRE sequence. A pause follows, however, and the teacher expands his initiation turn (line 9). Finally, LF9 volunteers (line 10) and the teacher gives her the floor (line 11). LF9's response is followed by the teacher's evaluative turn with a minimal gap between the two turns, which already signals a confirmation of the answer. The acceptance itself (line 13) consists of an affirmative element ('yes'), followed by a positive appreciation of the response ('very good') and an expansion of the turn, where the teacher further explains the role of preaching in Christianity and Islam (lines 13 to 20). At the end of the extended turn, the teacher adds another affirmative element ('okay' on line 20), which can be perceived as a signal that the sequence is complete and another topic can be pursued.

In addition, an affirmative element or positive appreciation can function alone to signal acceptance. However, it is not very common in the data. One of the few examples follows.

Extract 8. Physics / Kilograms and newtons.

1 T um no think about um (.) one kilogram (.)
°----------°
RAISES HANDS AT THE LEVEL OF CHEST

2		weighs ten newtons °----------° *PUTS HANDS TOGETHER*
3	LF2	oh ↑yeah but that's ↑gra:ms
4	LF3	oh yeah we have to make that into kilograms.
5	LF5	so: u:m=
6	LF3	=can you take (that off too)
7		(1.5)
8	LF1	so >is it< is it [<two point] ou eight>
9	LF3	[so that would be (x)]
10	T	yes

In this extract, the students are calculating exercises on the blackboard during a physics lesson. It should be noticed that the actual initiation of this action was the request of the teacher for students to calculate this exercise on the blackboard. As a way of evaluating the performance (i.e. the response), the teacher has remarked that there are several mistakes in the calculations and the students have been trying to find out the correct way to calculate the exercises. This particular extract could therefore be seen as a sub-sequence of a kind that will result in an evaluative turn of its own.

Earlier, a clue has been given by the teacher that they are using the wrong units and he then encourages the students to rethink the calculation by pointing out the relation between two different units (lines 1 and 2). This could be seen as a type of an initiation. Some of the students see the problem in their calculation (lines 3 and 4) and LF1 offers a new result for the calculation (i.e. response, line 8). The acceptance of the teacher follows, consisting of only the affirmative element 'yes' (line 10). It should be noted that evaluative turns consisting of only one affirmative element and no other devices seem to be more common in the case of this particular teacher than of the other teachers in the data.

More frequently, the affirmative elements or positive appreciations of student responses are accompanied by other devices, as was seen in Extract 7. Often they seem to work together with non-verbal actions, such as nods, pointing at students or writing the answer on the blackboard (see 5.1.6 for a more detailed analysis of non-verbal actions).

Extract 9. Religion / The symbol of dove.

1	T	do you remember what's the symbol of dove
2	LM1	peace
3	LM3	[(xxx)]
4	T	[yes yeah very good] °--° *POINTS AT LM1*

This example is a part of Extract 2 presented earlier (section 4.3). The teacher's evaluative turn here (line 4) is directed at LM1 who has produced a response (line 2) and this is emphasized by the action of pointing at LM1 that coincides with the affirmative element 'yes'. The positive appreciation of the student further stresses the fact that the response has been accepted.

In sum, affirmative elements and positive appreciation of student performance are very common among the acceptances in the data. They are usually accompanied by other devices, which can be both verbal and non-verbal actions, although they can also appear alone. In addition, acceptances can include both affirmative elements and positive appreciations at the same time.

5.1.3 Repetition

In Margutti's (2004) work on the IRE sequences, repetition appears as one of the principal devices in evaluative turns, in general, and in showing acceptance, in particular. Although not quite as frequent in the data of the present study, they do constitute an important device in positively evaluating a student response. They can

be realised as exact, modified or partial repetitions of student responses. The different types of repetitions can be accompanied by other devices in the evaluative turns, such as affirmative elements, expansions of responses or non-verbal actions. Extract 10 (which was already viewed in 5.1 as Extract 4) is an example of an exact repetition with an affirmative element, an expansion and non-verbal actions accompanying it.

Extract 10. Biology / Signs of pregnancy.

1	T	what do ↑you think (.) what is the first mark for the
2		mother (.) that (.) she probably is pregnant. (2.7) Mikko
		°-----°
		GAZES AT SEVERAL LEARNERS, THEN FASTENS HIS GAZE ON LM1
3	LM1	missing periods
4	T	yeah missing periods. a week or or so
		°---°
		NODS
5		*STARTS BROWSING BOOK IN HIS LAP*

The evaluative turn in this IRE sequence consists of many different devices as was already discussed in 5.1. Only a part of the acceptance is realised through a repetition, which in this particular case is an exact repetition of a student response (‘missing periods’ on line 4). The repetition is preceded by an affirmative element and followed by an expansion of the turn, where more information on the topic is given. In addition, there are non-verbal actions that support the verbal actions (the nod on line 4 and the browsing of the book on line 5), and all the different devices together form the acceptance. On the grounds of this particular extract, repetitions do not seem to have as singular an importance in acceptances of the present data as in Margutti’s study but, rather, function along with other devices to form the meaning of the evaluative turns.

Extract 11 is an interesting case of modified repetition. It has been taken from the religious studies lessons, and the students are sitting by computers. The topic in

question is the spread of the Christian Church and the changes it underwent during its infancy.

Extract 11. Religion / Growing church.

1	T	well one question here is that did it became smaller. *LOOKING AT COMPUTER SCREEN FROM BEHIND LM4'S BACK*
2	LM4	no it didn't
3	→T	[no okay he said that it didn't (1.3)] °---° *POINTS AT LM4 AND STARTS TO PACE*
4	LL	[*UNIDENTIFIED TALKING*]
5	→T	[no it didn't is the correct answer.] °---° *NODS HIS HEAD EMPHATICALLY*
6	LL	[*UNIDENTIFIED TALKING*]

In this extract, the teacher asks if the Christian Church became smaller during its infancy and LM4, near whom the teacher is standing, promptly answers. Interestingly, the teacher produces a modified repetition in his evaluative turn where he reports to the other students what LM4 has said (line 3). He even uses the third person ('he said') when referring to LM4, thus making the other students, and not the student that responded, the addressees. It could be argued, however, that 'no okay' is the actual evaluative part and that the report of what LM4 has said is, in fact, another turn that has a different recipient (the fact that the teacher starts to move away from the student at the end of 'okay' could be seen as supporting that). Yet, the teacher repeats the answer again (line 5), embedding it inside a larger construction where he evaluates the response as being correct. Thus, everything that the teacher says on lines 4 to 5 could be seen as constituents of the evaluative turn.

As to partial repetitions of student responses in evaluative turns, they seem to be rarer than modified or exact repetitions. There are only three examples of them, two of them being instances where the teachers leave out a part of the student response that is an integral segment of the response (i.e. seems to form a part of the actual

answer) but that is not necessary for the answer to be understood (e.g. repeating only a noun phrase instead of the whole sentence). The third one is a case where the response of a student includes more than just the expected answer and where the teacher thus leaves out the part that does not constitute the actual answer to the question (see the following extract).

Extract 12. Religion / Bad world.

1	T	what ↑are you able to say about the religious world apostle Paul
2		met in Athens.
3	LM4	it was it was
4	T	what kind of world was it
5	LM4	a bad world.
6	LM	very bad.
7	LL	*8.4 SEC OF UNIDENTIFIED TALKING IN THE FRONT OF THE CLASSROOM*
8	T	okay. *POINTING AT A LEARNER*
9	LF	I'm not sure but I'm (guessing) that they weren't that religious
10	T	they were not that religious *NODS*

Here the teacher asks about the religious world during apostle Paul's time. He does not pay attention to the responses of two male students (lines 5 and 6) but gives the turn to a female learner (line 8; it should be noted that the student cannot be seen on the recording so it cannot be verified if she has put her hand up before the teacher gives her the floor although this could be inferred from the teacher's turn, i.e. from the fact that he says 'okay' when pointing at the learner rather than asking her is she can answer the question). The student's turn begins with a hesitative clause 'I'm not sure but' and an introductory, still hesitative preface, 'I'm (guessing) that' (line 9). The actual answer to the question asked by the teacher is 'they weren't that religious'. In the evaluative turn, the teacher repeats the last part of the student's response with a minor change (line 10). It seems, therefore, that the teacher wants to

confirm the expected answer and to show that the hesitation has not been necessary, i.e. the answer is correct and accepted by the teacher. This is further underlined by the non-verbal action of nodding that follows the verbal utterance.

As it can be seen, most of the repetitions in the data function together with other devices in forming an acceptance. Differing from the data of Margutti (2004), they do not seem to be as frequent as appreciating a student, for instance. Neither are they used in rejections as they are in Margutti's data but seem to be an exclusive device of the acceptances. Nevertheless, they do seem to have important functions in the evaluative turns and it could be argued, on the basis of the examples presented here, that they can be used to emphasise the correctness of student responses and to ensure that all the students hear the correct answer. For more conclusive results on the functions of repetitions, further research would be needed, however.

5.1.4 Reformulations of correct answers

In some cases, even correct answers are subordinated to reformulations in teachers' evaluative turns. These instances are not abundant in the data, however, and only a couple of examples will be discussed here. Some of the reformulations summarise student responses, others clarify them, while still accepting them. Extract 13 is an illustration of the former.

Extract 13. Biology / Nice and warm.

1	T	in what ways it is getting harder. (.) Thomas
2	LM3	[it's nice and warm inside the womb] and then when it comes
3	LF6	[°(xxx)°]
4	LM3	out it gets cold.
5	T	yeah (0.9) it it goes [goes from the] nice and warm (.) °---° *SLIGHT NOD*
6	LF5	[°(xx)°]

7	T	environment to [this:] very (.) cold world
8	LF5	[°(x)°]
9	LF6	if you [want °(xx)°]
10	→T	[so the temperature] (.) um (.) changes.
11		*WRITES ON BLACKBOARD*

This sequence begins after another IRE sequence where the biology teacher has asked one of the students how the life of a baby changes when it is born. The student has answered that life gets harder for the baby and the teacher has given a humorous downgraded acceptance of the response. The sequence of Extract 13 is then initiated as the teacher asks the students to elaborate on the previous response (line 1). LM3 is then selected by the teacher as the next speaker and his response follows (lines 2 and 4).

The evaluative turn of the teacher consists of multiple devices that show acceptance. He first produces an affirmative, which is accompanied by a nod and followed by a short pause (line 5). Thereafter he produces what may be analysed as a modified repetition of LM3's response (lines 5 and 7; note that LF5 and LF6's turns are a part of a different interaction sequence than the IRE sequence under discussion). In addition, he reformulates the student response (line 10) and writes it on the blackboard. As can be seen on lines 5 and 7 then, LM3's answer has already clearly been accepted and thus the reformulation is not necessary to achieve that aim but, rather, seems to function as a summary of what has been said by the student (and the teacher himself).

Extract 14 is taken from the same biology lesson as the previous extract and is situated within a discussion on how genes decide the physical features of human beings and on how some genes are dominant and others recessive. In this particular example, the students are required to find out the type of hair the children of given parents will have (straight/curly) on the basis of their genes. The turns of interest here are the ones starting on line 10 with the teacher selecting LF6 as the next

speaker (i.e. as the respondent). The IRE sequences on lines 1 to 10 will be addressed in more detail in section 5.3.

Extract 14. Biology / Hair issues.

1	T	what about the hair (.) of every children they could have
2		(1.5) could these people have the (.) have (x) children with (.)
		°----------°
		POINTS AT BLACKBOARD
3		with straight hair. (1) Mikko
4	LM1	yes
5		(1.2)
6	LM2	↑what
7	T	how is it possible.
8	LM1	I don't know cause (1) god works in mysterious ways.
9 →	T	*LAUGHS*
10		£that was a good an- answer£ of course Elina
11	LF6	I [don't think] they could [because the]
12	LM2	[she ↑(x)]
13	LM	[(xx) ↑(did)]
14	LM	yeah (xx)
15		[*LAUGHS*]
16	LF6	[they o-] if they had if [there was two small]
17	LM1	[°(xxx)°]
18	LF6	[double u genes then they could but] now that there's only
19	LM1	[°(xxx)°]
20	LF6	one in each pair there's a big double u which is dominant

21 LF6 and [so °they (x]x)°

22 →T [okay] so in every possi[bility] the children always have

23 LF6 [°(x)°]

24 T at least one big double u (0.8) which is dominant.

The teacher asks if the parents with their genes given on the blackboard can have children with straight hair (lines 1 to 3). LM1 gives a response that is not accepted and LF6 is then selected by the teacher as the next speaker (line 10). LF6 proceeds to give the correct answer, concentrating on the genes of the parents. Interestingly, the evaluative turn of the teacher contains almost exactly the same information as LF6's response, except for being more concise and viewing the issue from the point of view of the children's genes instead of the parents' (lines 22 and 24). Thus the teacher is, as it were, clarifying the answer of LF6 to the rest of the class by showing which the resulting genes of the children would be.

In the light of these examples, it seems that reformulations are used by the teachers in their evaluative turns in order to summarise or clarify correct student responses. The responses are accepted but, nevertheless, modified in the turns of the teachers, perhaps in order to facilitate the comprehension of all students. Similar purposes can be observed in expansions of responses, which will be examined next.

5.1.5 Expansions

Another category of the devices used in acceptances is expansions. In the present study, they are taken to be extensions of student responses performed by the teacher in the context of an evaluative turn. In the data, there are 19 instances of teachers expanding the responses, while still accepting them. The length of the expansions varies from short remarks to long extended explanations. Frequently, they seem to contain additional information on the issue at hand that the students are yet not required to be familiar with. Occasionally, the additional information is not relevant to the students' learning but, rather, a comment made by a teacher on an interesting

matter. Usually, however, expansions serve to introduce important facts related to the topic.

Extract 15. Biology / Fully developed organs.

1	T	next one. *GESTURES WITH HAND AS IF POINTING BUT NOT POINTING AT ANYONE IN PARTICULAR*
2	LF3	*STANDS UP AND WALKS TO BLACKBOARD*
3	LF	(xx)
4	LF6	no (3) the six (x)
5	LF3	um most organs are fully developed when it's *PLACING A SHEET OF PAPER ON BLACKBOARD*
6		about four week- no eight weeks old
7	T	eight weeks um (2.3) most organs are °fully developed.° (1.7)
8		of course they are not ready because they are so small. (1) °----° *SHOWS INDEX FINGER AND THUMB OF ONE HAND AS IF HOLDING A TINY OBJECT BETWEEN THEM*
9		but fro- from now on (1.1) [um they only grow they got] °----------° *WALKS TO BLACKBOARD*
10	LF5	[(xxx)]
11	T	more size *WALKS AWAY FROM THE FRONT OF THE CLASSROOM*

The context of this sequence taken from one of the biology lessons is an exercise where the students have to locate certain stages of the development of the human embryo on the right places on the timeline of pregnancy. The teacher has drawn a line on the blackboard and given each student a different sheet of paper with one stage of the development written on every one of them. The teacher has explained the idea of the exercise to the students and requested them to perform it, which could be seen as a type of a general initiation for the whole exercise. At times, the teacher does produce another initiation, designed particularly to request the next response (as

is the case in this extract), but at other times, the students proceed to perform their action of putting their sheets on the blackboard and explaining them without an apparent request made by the teacher. Thus they are still responding to the first initiation made by the teacher. Before this particular sequence occurs, several students have already placed their papers on the blackboard.

The IRE sequence in Extract 15 is initiated by the teacher by requesting another student to perform the action of placing a sheet on the timeline (line 1). Accordingly, LF3's response turn consists of the non-verbal action of walking to the blackboard and placing the sheet on it (lines 2 and 5) as well as of the verbal action in which she reports the stage in question (lines 5 to 6). In his evaluative turn, the teacher first repeats the time frame of the particular stage (line 7). LF3 has almost given an incorrect time but she has self-corrected it immediately (line 6) and the teacher may want to confirm the correct time and broadcast it to the others by repeating it. In addition, he repeats the stage of development, i.e. the completion of the development of most organs (line 7). After a short gap, he expands the response by saying that the organs are not completely ready, however. At first, this may seem like a rejection of LF3's response (i.e. the organs are not fully developed, after all). But what the teacher adds next (lines 9 and 11: the organs only need to *grow* more, i.e. not to develop in any other ways) shows that the answer is, indeed, accepted. This expansion seems to be a case of important additional information that the students need to fully understand the stages of development of the human embryo.

Extract 16 is an illustration of another expansion that seems to have the function of facilitating the understanding of students. The sequence occurs in the religious studies lesson when the class is engaged in learning about the early Christian Church. The term 'Holy Communion' has appeared in one of the previous sequences and the teacher has asked what it means. One student response has already been rejected by the teacher, which brings us to the present illustration.

Extract 16. Religion / Holy Communion.

1	T	okay Nelli °----° *POINTS AT LF8*
2	LF8	um isn't it that when: I'm not sure but is it that they drink
3		that wine and
4	T	yes *NODS*
5	LF8	(xx)
6	T	yes (.) Holy Communion (2.6) it's the thing which people are °--° °---° *NODS* *POINTING AT L?*
7		joining in the church su- during Sunday services distributing
8		the bread and the wine and then they say that they in the altar
9		that this is the blood of Jesus Christ set for you and this is
10		the body of Jesus Christ given for you

In this extract, the teacher selects LF8 as the next speaker to answer the question about Holy Communion after rejecting a response offered by another student (line 1). LF8's response (line 2) is evaluated by the teacher by the non-verbal action of nodding and by pronouncing the affirmative 'yes', with only a minimal gap occurring between the turns of these two participants (line3). These simultaneous actions of acceptance, as well as the name of the phenomenon, i.e. "Holy Communion", are repeated (line 6). It is after these actions that the expansion occurs (lines 6 to 10). In this expansion the teacher is giving more information on the ritual (i.e. when it is held, what the wine and bread symbolize), apparently in order to facilitate understanding of the meaning of the ritual.

The next extract is an example of a short expansion that is an additional comment to the topic at hand and not necessarily important in understanding the overall issue. It is taken from a biology lesson, again related to the development of human embryos inside the womb. It is part of the larger action introduced earlier where the students

are placing sheets with different stages of the development onto a timeline drawn by the teacher on the blackboard. The initiation sequence is not on view in this illustration but, as it was mentioned earlier, the action of the teacher of requesting the students to do this exercise can be taken as the general initiation sequence for all the following actions of students of placing a sheet on the blackboard and explaining the stage of development verbally (see Extract 15).

Extract 17. Biology / Swimming in womb.

1	LM3	*MOVES TO BLACKBOARD AND PUTS ONE SHEET ON IT*
2		four months old mother feels it moving inside that [because]
3	LM	[(x)]
4	LM3	it's moving around stretching his [muscles]
5	LM	[(x]x)
6	T	okay [yeah] (1) sort of a (.) swimming [inside] the womb
7	LM3	[(x)] [yeah]

The evaluative turn of the teacher begins with two affirmative elements ('okay' and 'yeah' on line 6). Preceded by a gap, a short expansion follows. This expansion cannot, as such, be taken as important additional information that would help the students to understand the phenomenon better. Rather, it is a slightly humorous, additional comment, the evaluative function of which may be questionable. Nevertheless, it is considered here to be an element of the evaluative turn as it does reinforce the response of LM3 with its related choice of vocabulary (cf. 'moving around' and 'swimming' that both refer to movement). This expansion could also be viewed as a way of creating positive atmosphere in the classroom, which is a topic that cannot be examined further in the scope of this study.

As the examples above demonstrate, expansions can have different functions inside the evaluative turns. Accordingly, they may facilitate students' understanding of a phenomenon they are studying, introduce new facts about the topic or merely be additional comments that are not relevant to the learning process but may reinforce

the positive evaluation. Thus the different elements of evaluative turns may be seen to have other functions besides that of forming a part of an acceptance or a rejection.

5.1.6 Non-verbal actions

Non-verbal actions form a very diverse group of devices appearing in the evaluative turns. Even though they cannot be categorised into a single uniform group, an attempt will be made in this section to introduce the most common types of non-verbal actions related to acceptances. Broadly speaking, there are two general categories of non-verbal actions in relation to acceptances: those that occur concurrently with verbal actions and those that form the evaluative turn alone, unaccompanied by any verbal elements.

Out of the 80 acceptances in the data, 42 have non-verbal elements in them. The overwhelming majority of them (37) accompany verbal evaluative elements, with only five forming the acceptance alone. All these five are instances of writing the student response on the blackboard or the overhead projector and, interestingly, are performed by the same teacher during the same biology lesson. This may, but does not necessarily, imply that using certain types of non-verbal actions as the only elements of acceptances are characteristic of only some individual teachers or certain contexts.

Extract 18 is an illustration of non-verbal actions occurring unaccompanied. The class has been discussing how the genes of the parents affect the genes that the baby gets, and they are now looking at an example of a particular set of genes in sperm cells and ova. One of the students has already given the answer regarding the sperm cells of the example, and here the teacher asks for the possibilities for the ovum.

Extract 18. Biology / Ovum genes.

1	T	ovum (1.8) what are the possibilities for that (2.9) Elina
2	LF6	double u (.) [and]
3	T	[*TURNS AROUND AND STARTS WALKING TO BLACKBOARD*]
4	LF6	↑little double u
5	T	*STOPS IN FRONT OF BLACKBOARD AND WRITES ANSWER ON IT*

The evaluative turn of this sequence can be seen to begin already before LF6 finishes her response as the teacher turns around and moves to the blackboard to write the answer on it (line 3; notice that the response turn continues on line 4). Arguably, the beginning of the response gives the teacher a reason to anticipate the correct answer to be pronounced by the student. The actual acceptance is formed by the action of writing the answer on the backboard as the response has been given by LF6 (line 5). It is noteworthy that this is the only device in this sequence used to show acceptance of the response.

As to the non-verbal actions that occur alongside verbal devices, most of them are nods that occur in unison with affirmative elements. In Extract 19, the evaluative turn consists of an affirmative element, accompanied by the non-verbal action of nodding and followed by a modified repetition of the student response.

Extract 19. Religion / Alpha and omega.

1	T	okay and someone already spoke about alpha and omega. (1.9) *DRAWING ON BLACKBOARD*
2	T	what does it mean. yes °--° *FACING STUDENTS* *POINTS AT LF4*
3	LF4	(x) the beginning and the end
4	→T	yes °--° *NODS*

5 LM3 (lot's of sixes) got two of ↑them

6 LM two [(xx)]

7 T [that Christ is] the beginning and the end

°----------°

POINTS AT THE TWO SYMBOLS IN RHTYHM WITH THE WORDS

This sequence occurs when the class is revising some symbols related to Christianity. The teacher asks what alpha and omega refer to and selects LF4 as the respondent. She produces the correct answer, which is then accepted by the teacher (lines 4 and 7; notice that the turns on lines 5 and 6 are part of another interaction sequence among some of the students). The non-verbal action of the evaluative turn (i.e. the nod on line 4) is performed at exactly the same time as the verbal affirmative element 'yes', giving it more stress. It is characteristic of the data and especially of this particular teacher that the first part of the acceptance is an affirmative element accompanied by a non-verbal action, usually a nod.

Writing a correct answer is the second most used non-verbal device in the case of acceptances, and it is often preceded by an affirmative element ('yes', 'okay' etc.). In addition, pointing and other gestures involving hands (e.g. putting up a finger as if counting the correct answers) are used together with verbal elements. Extract 20 is another example taken from the religious studies lesson and illustrates the use of pointing in acceptances. The sequence has already been seen in connection with affirmative elements and positive appreciations (Extract 9) and as an illustration of the methodology (Extract 2) and a short account will suffice.

Extract 20. Religion / The symbol of dove.

1 T do you remember what's the symbol of dove

2 LM1 peace

3 LM3 [(xxx)]

4 →T [yes yeah very good]

°--°

POINTS AT LM1

5 LM5 the white dove.

6	T	uhuh
7	LF	the holy spirit
8	→T	holy spirit also. good °---° *POINTS AT THE STUDENT THAT GAVE THE CORRECT RESPONSE*

There are two different turns here that evaluate student answers, which in turn are two different responses to the same question (and yet, both correct). Interestingly, both of them also include the non-verbal action of pointing at the student that has given the correct answer (it should be noted, however, that the object of the second pointing cannot be verified because the student cannot be seen on the recording). Moreover, both occur at the beginning of the evaluative turn. In the first evaluative turn (line 4), though, the pointing occurs simultaneously with a verbal affirmative element, whereas in the second (line 8), it coincides with the first word of the repetition that the teacher produces of the student response. A reason for the pointing may be a wish to emphasise that it has been that particular student that has given the correct answer but this cannot be proven only by interpreting the outer behaviour of the participants in the recorded data. A factor that may support this theory, however, is the fact that there has been overlapping talk and several interactions taking place at the same time during the lesson, although it is not very disturbing during this particular sequence (only the turn of LM3 on line 3). The fact that the pointing is situated at the beginning of the turns, in turn, may help the students to orient themselves to what the teacher says (situating an action at the beginning will probably draw more attention than performing it in the middle of the turn).

In sum, the non-verbal actions can function alone in the acceptances although, more commonly, they emphasise the verbal actions that they accompany. Often affirmative verbal elements and nods occur simultaneously but, in addition, non-verbal devices include other actions and can coincide with other verbal elements. Furthermore, the frequency of non-verbal actions seems to vary considerably between different teachers. Only five occurrences of non-verbal actions were found in the evaluative turns of the physics teacher, whereas the religious studies teacher used them the most abundantly. Most importantly, however, the extracts above show that the evaluative

turns should not be examined without taking into account the non-verbal actions as they can form a part of the meaning of the evaluation as well as function unaccompanied as whole turns.

5.2 Downgraded acceptance

In the data, 10 evaluative turns were identified as downgraded acceptances. In these cases, the teacher neither accepts nor rejects a student response. Rather, a part of the answer may be accepted and another part rejected, or the response may be evaluated as insufficient alone, requiring additional information or specification. In addition, one of the evaluative turns identified as a downgraded acceptance includes accepting the contents of the response but rejecting the way of performing it (see Extract 23). The devices used in downgraded acceptances include some of the same devices that are used in the cases of rejections. For instance, teachers may hesitate or mitigate the response, use humour or request other students to complete the response. As those devices will be examined more thoroughly in the next section on rejections, only some examples that clarify the concept of downgraded acceptances will be presented here. It has to be noted, however, that, in addition to using some of the same devices as rejections, downgraded acceptances also always include a part similar to acceptances.

The first example is Extract 21, which is taken from one of the biology lessons. The teacher asks the students about the changes that take place after the birth of an infant and requests one of the students to give a response. It can be seen in the extract how this response is taken humorously and given a downgraded acceptance by the teacher.

Extract 21. Biology / Hard life.

1	T	the [changes] what happened what's [happening]
2	LM	[Hanna]
3	LM2	[pass me the] (x)

4 T when the baby is born (1.2) how does the *life* life of of the

5 T baby change.

6 LM2 thanks

7 T when when it is born.

8 (1.6)

9 LM1 luck

10 T what have you found out (5.9) ↑Roosa

11 LF5 life gets ↑harder

12 LF6 [*LAUGHS*]

13 →T [*LAUGHS*]

14 → £we- [we-£]

15 LF5 [it] it has to breathe and [(x)]

16 T [life]
°--°
WRITES THE WORD 'LIFE' ON BLACKBOARD

17 LF6 £oh my [god£]

18 T [gets]=
°---°
WRITES 'GETS' ON BLACKBOARD

19 LF5 =and grow teeth and learn

20 T harder
°-----°
WRITES 'HARDER' ON BLACKBOARD

21 (.) £this£ (2) this reminds me about one
°-° °--°
LAUGHS LAUGHS

22 blues song. (1.1) by Charlie Patton.

23 (1.1)

24 LF5 °(okay)°

25 T life is hard and then you'll die. (1.1) [okay]

26 LM3 [(x]x)=

27 LF5 =but it still has many years ahead of [it]

28 LM1 [of] course

29 LM1 [°(xxx)°]

30 →T [oh yeah that's true] life £gets harder£ (2.5) okay
°---°

ADDS QUOTATION MARKS ON TEXT ON BLACKBOARD

It is on line 10 in the extract above that the teacher initiates the IRE sequence and chooses LF5 as the next speaker by requesting her to give a response to his question about the changes taking place when a baby is born. Immediately, LF5 answers the question (line 11). This is followed by a short laughter by another student and the teacher, who seems slightly perplexed by the response (lines 12 and 13; see 5.3.4 for how humour and laughter work in rejections). Moreover, the teacher clearly shows signs of hesitation, apparently trying to pronounce the word 'well' but only being able to start uttering it because of his laughter (line 14). Thus, the response seems to have been unexpected by the teacher and it is evident that the teacher fails to treat the answer seriously.

Nevertheless, the teacher writes the response on the blackboard (although later adding quotation marks on line 30), repeating it as he writes (lines 16, 18 and 20). He then makes a humorous comment about a connotation the response has roused in him (lines 21, 22 and 25). In the end, he once again repeats the response with laughter in his voice and adds 'okay' as if to accept the answer (line 30; notice that by the utterance 'oh yeah that's true' the teacher is addressing LF5's turn on line 27 and not the response on line 11). The non-verbal action of adding quotation marks to the text 'life gets harder' on the blackboard, especially in the context of laughter and humour preceding it, obviously downgrades the acceptance, however. Thus, laughter, hesitation, humour and the non-verbal action at the end of the sequence can all be seen as working together as devices in giving a downgraded acceptance in this particular sequence – as well as treating the response as not a serious one.

In the following extract, taken from the same biology lesson as the previous example, the teacher initiates the sequence by asking why the blood of a mother cannot be allowed to mix with the blood of the foetus. The evaluative turn that follows the response is a downgraded acceptance where the response is partly accepted.

Extract 22. Biology / Foreign bodies.

1	T	[think of a reason why the mother's blood is not] allow- -lowed
2	LF	[°(xxx)°]
3		*LAUGHS*
4	T	to mix with the baby's blood. (1.9) so they have
5		[bo- both of them] have [um this] [different] and and very own
6	LF5	[°(xx)°]
7	LF6	[(what)]
8	LF5	[°(xx)°]
9	T	circulation. (6.1) Thomas
10	LM3	because [if there's any harmful] substances or foreign bodies
11	LM1	[°(xxx)°]
12	LM3	in the mother's blood (.) and that >goes baby's blood< it could
13	LM3	affect the baby and the baby could die.
14	L	(xx English)
15	→ T	okay [yeah] *MULTIPLE NODS, THOUGHTFUL EXPRESSION*
16	LM3	[like if the] mother is ill >it can affect the baby<
17		or if the mother >has been drinking lots of alcohol or taking drugs<
18		and [so (xx English) the baby's blood and cause °(x[x)°]
19	LF5	[mother's blood ↑(xxx) °(xx)°]
20	→T	[yeah]

21		[um more or less true] [um substances like alcohol or or drugs]
22	LF5	[°(xxx)°]
23	LM	[°(xxx)°]
24	T	(.) they they uh unfortunately (.) [they can go through placenta]
25	LM	[°(xxx)°]
26	T	to the baby's blood. (1.1) but then then um [things] like bacteria
27	LF6	[°(xx)°]
28	T	and those they they are too big to go through the placenta

As it can be seen, the teacher starts the evaluative turn hesitatively once (line 15) but is interrupted by LM3 who continues explaining his response. Then he takes the floor again and gives an evaluation of the response (lines 20, 21, 24, 26 and 28). In this turn, he first utters an affirmative that is a common device in acceptances (line 20), but this affirmative, however, is followed by the hesitative 'um' (line 21). This hesitation already signals that the response may not be what the teacher has expected. The utterance 'more or less true' (line 21) strengthens this perception. Although the teacher does use the word 'true' (an acceptance), the attached 'more or less' clearly implies that the response is not completely correct (a downgraded acceptance). An expansion follows, where the teacher explains that the response is true in the case of some foreign substances but not in all the cases of other substances (lines 21 to 28). In sum, the teacher uses different verbal and non-verbal strategies in giving the downgraded acceptance.

The last example on downgraded acceptance is a sequence from the religious studies lesson and occurs in the context of revising some Christian symbols. Here, the actual response is not rejected but the mode of giving the response is and, therefore, the evaluative turn in this particular sequence can be thought of as a downgraded acceptance.

Extract 23. Religion / Ictus.

1	T	ictus very good do you remember what it means ictus *(T CANNOT BE SEEN ON FILM DURING THE REST OF THE INTERACTION)*
2		(3)
3	T	[um]
4	LM2	[Jesus] Christ son of god saviour
5	T	ah don't check it *direct* from the notebook
6	LL	*LAUGHTER*

The sequence is preceded by another sequence where the teacher has drawn a symbol on the blackboard and asked what it stands for. He has accepted the response of one of the students (the correct answer being 'ictus'), and now initiates another sequence, asking whether the student (LM2) knows what ictus actually means. After a delay, LM2 answers, reading the notes in his notebook. The teacher then starts his evaluative turn (line 5; note that it begins without a minimal gap after the response as in acceptances), which rejects the way the student has performed the requested action, i.e. checking the answer in the notebook and reading it out loud, but not the answer itself. It is interesting that there is no perceivable temporal delay used in the production of the evaluation and neither does the teacher seem to hesitate. This may imply that, as the teacher does not need to reject the answer itself, it is easier for him to produce the evaluative turn even though it does include some form of rejection. Another interesting aspect of this evaluative turn is that it is presented in the form of a directive. Not only is the teacher therefore evaluating the response but he is also giving a directive which is aimed at changing a certain type of behaviour (i.e. the mode of giving a response).

As a conclusion, it can be said that the devices used in downgraded acceptances usually include at least one of the devices used in rejections, such as hesitation or temporal day. In addition, devices used in acceptances can also always be seen in downgraded acceptances. Non-verbal actions are frequent in these evaluative turns but they do not seem to occur alone but only in conjunction with verbal devices. Downgraded acceptances are given when a part of the answer is accepted, whereas

another part is not, or when the mode of response is not accepted although the response itself is. Next, attention will be turned to the devices the teachers in the data use when wholly rejecting responses.

5.3 Rejection

As it was mentioned above, 17 out of the 107 evaluative turns examined in the present study are rejections of student responses. Although they constitute a smaller group than acceptances, certain characteristics can be perceived that differentiate the devices used in rejections from those used in acceptances. First, there may be a temporal delay before the evaluation is given (see 5.3.5), for instance, and, second, the rejection may be mitigated with expressions such as 'I think' or 'perhaps' (5.3.6). Third, the non-verbal actions differ from those used in giving acceptances, with shaking the head being one of the most obvious examples (see 5.3.3). In the case of rejections, non-verbal actions also only seem to occur accompanied by verbal actions. Fourth, humour seems to be used more in connection with rejections (see 5.3.4), which can also serve as a type of a hedging of the negative evaluation. Finally, the teacher may reformulate the question (or give a hint) or ask other students for the correct answer to show that the response has been rejected (5.3.1).

What is somewhat surprising, however, is that direct rejections without mitigation are used quite often in the data. In other words, the teachers occasionally reject incorrect answers without any form of softening or hesitation (see 5.3.2). This may be due to the different relationship between the participants in classrooms as compared with the more equal roles that speakers have in everyday conversations between friends, for instance. Thus, politeness strategies are perhaps not needed that much in classroom interaction.

In section 5.1, it was noted that acceptances are more often than not performed using an ensemble of different devices functioning together to form the message of the turn. Not unnaturally, this phenomenon can also be observed among rejections.

Nevertheless, there are two cases where only one device is used, that being a simple negative element ‘no’. These will be discussed as part of the direct rejections (5.3.2).

5.3.1 Repeating or reformulating the question and asking others

It was mentioned above that rejections can involve a repeated or reformulated question or asking another student to respond to get the expected answer. In fact, in 10 out of the 17 rejections in the data the teacher asks the question again in one form or another or gives the floor to another student and, thus, initiates another IRE sequence. Sometimes the question is repeated or reformulated without any other sign of rejection but more often another device indicating rejection precedes this procedure.

Extract 24 is taken from one of the biology lessons. The teacher has asked what a phenotype means and LM3 has given an answer that has not been expected by the teacher. The sequence presented below follows.

Extract 24. Biology / One word.

1	T	in other words.
2	LM3	environment and genes.
3	LL+T	*LAUGHTER*
4	T	with one word.
5	LM3	genesenvironment.
6	T	*LAUGHS*
7		okay.

The initiation of this sequence (line 1) is, in fact, also an evaluation of the previous response LM3 has given and can also be counted as a repair initiator (see Extract 33). By asking him again for the response, the teacher indicates that the response is rejected. The new response of LM3 is a humorous one (line 2) and is met with

laughter on the part of the teacher and other students. The teacher then reformulates the question, once more signalling rejection (line 4). Note that, besides the reformulation, only the laughter can be seen as an indication of the rejection at this point. The new response (line 5) is also rejected and the teacher is showing that it is not taken seriously by laughing. The teacher then utters ‘okay’, which is not given to show acceptance but rather, as it will be seen in the explanation for Extract 33, to indicate that the question sequence has come to an end.

The rejection in Extract 25, on the other hand, includes a negation of the student response, a non-verbal action and asking other students.

Extract 25. Religion / Disciples.

1	T	who remembers what is Holy Communion
2	LM3	[uh wasn’t it (divas) and um [Judah and] the saint David]
3	T	[*SMILING THROUGHOUT LM3’S RESPONSE*]
4	LL	[*LAUGHTER*]
5	LM3	and [(x)]
6	T	[£no£] *SHAKES HIS HEAD*
7	LM3	the disa- the um the disabled the disaip- disciples
8	T	no (it was-) it’s not the Holy Communion °----------° *SHAKING HIS HEAD*
9	LM3	oh.
10	T	um someone else would you be able to have any (x)
11		*GAZES FROM ONE STUDENT TO ANOTHER*

The teacher’s question (i.e. the initiation turn, line 1) does not get the expected answer from LM3 in this sequence (line 2). The evaluative turn of the teacher starts with a negative ‘no’, which is accompanied by laughing voice and a non-verbal

action, i.e. shaking the head (line 6). The student reformulates his answer (line 7) but the teacher still signals rejection (line 8). The negative element is repeated by him and the response of the student is negated ('it's not the Holy Communion'). Again, these verbal actions are accompanied by the non-verbal action of shaking the head. Finally, the teacher asks other students if they know the answer, initiating another IRE sequence. Notice that the initial question is not repeated or even reformulated but the teacher asks whether any other student could respond to the question formulated earlier.

In conclusion, rejections often seem to include initiating another IRE sequence by repeating or reformulating the original question asked by the teacher or by asking other students to respond to it. Usually, they are preceded or accompanied by other devices, such as negative verbal elements or non-verbal actions, that also signal rejection (see 5.3.3 for more detailed descriptions of these non-verbal actions). The negative verbal elements are also important devices in direct rejections, which will be examined next.

5.3.2 Direct rejections

Opposite to many of the examples that will be presented in the sections below, a number of the rejections in the data involve no mitigation or hesitation at all. There are six rejections that can be analysed as solid cases of direct forms of rejection. These rejections usually include uttering a negative element of some sort, most often a simple 'no'. In addition, as was seen above, the teacher may ask another student to respond or reformulate the question after the negative element. Direct rejections are employed more often by the physics teacher than the other two and, accordingly, the first example is a sequence taken from the physics lesson. The class is talking about the concept of force and has been counting the total effect of opposite forces in one of their exercises. The teacher is helping the class with the exercise, writing and drawing on the blackboard as he speaks.

Extract 26. Physics / Putting together.

1	T	so when you put these together (1.1) you get (0.9) how much *FACING BLACKBOARD, DRAWING ON IT AS HE SPEAKS*
2		*FACES STUDENTS*
3	LF2	twenty eight
4	T	no

In this straightforward IRE sequence the teacher asks a question, which LF2 responds to with a minimal gap between the turns (lines 1 to 3). The response is not the expected one, however, and thus the teacher rejects it b simply uttering the negative 'no' (line 4). The rejection is very direct and involves no temporal delay or mitigation. After the evaluative turn, a student asks what the teacher has asked and the teacher repeats the question in a more detailed and clarifying fashion.

As the direct approaches are, indeed, quite straightforward, it will suffice with only one more example. This one is taken from one of the biology lessons, and the topic is the development of the human embryo or foetus.

Extract 27. Biology / Middle stage.

1	T	um but if we um think about the sex (.) which it's it is going to
2		be. what do you think um (.) when does it happen (1.4) I mean
3	T	on which stage (.) of this thing (1) um
4		(1.9)
5	LM3	↑the middle stage
6	T	[no]
7	LM2	[fer]tilisation
8		(1.9)
9	T	↑what

10	LM2	fertilisation
11	T	that's true. (1) because um the sex is depending *NODS AND POINTS AT LM2*
12		(.) um it depends on the genetics.

Once again, the sequence is very straightforward. The question asked by the teacher is answered by LM3 after a gap of 1.9 seconds (line 5). The device use is again extremely direct and only involves the unambiguous 'no' (line 6). The rejection is actually overlapped by the response of another student (line 7), and that particular response is accepted by the teacher (lines 11 and 12).

As is apparent in the extracts above, some of the rejections in the data are very direct indeed, incorporating no forms of hedging. Usually, the teacher subsequently asks the question again or reformulates it. In addition, the negative elements may be accompanied by supportive non-verbal actions. These will be the focus of the following section.

5.3.3 Supportive non-verbal actions

Analysing acceptances, it was seen that non-verbal actions often form a critical part of the evaluative turn. It was concluded that there are two types of non-verbal actions in the data: those that are accompanied by verbal actions and those that form an acceptance alone. In the case of rejections, non-verbal actions also occur often. Nevertheless, there are no instances of non-verbal actions that make up the evaluative turn alone. In other words, all the non-verbal actions in rejections are accompanied by verbal actions and often seem to support or reinforce the message signalled by the verbal devices. Thus, the non-verbal actions that occur in rejections are here called supportive non-verbal actions. In addition, non-verbal actions seem to be rarer in the case of rejections than in acceptances, with the exception of laughter, which is more frequent in rejections.

An important note concerning laughter should be made here. It will be discussed together with humour in 5.3.4. Laughter could, however, be considered as one of the

supportive non-verbal actions used in giving rejections. The reason for it being examined separately from other non-verbal actions is that it often goes hand in hand with instances of humour in the data and I therefore wanted to analyse those two, interrelated phenomena as one entity. In spite of this, it should be kept in mind that most of what is said here about other non-verbal actions is true of laughter, as well. For instance, laughter usually accompanies verbal devices of rejection and can sometimes be thought of as supportive of the verbal message.

As to non-verbal actions, shaking the head is the most often used device in rejections. Extract 28 presents one of these rejections where the teacher shakes his head. It is taken from the religious studies lesson, and the class is again discussing religious symbols. The teacher has drawn a symbol on the blackboard and one of the students has taken a turn to note that the symbol in question is a cross.

Extract 28. Religion / Vampires.

1	T	yes. and what's the idea behind the cross
2	LM1	to scare away vampires
3	T	*SHAKES HIS HEAD AND THEN LAUGHS SLIGHTLY*
4		not not

This extract is one of the two clear examples in the data where a student is accountable for incorporating humour into an IRE sequence (see 5.3.4). After the teacher has asked the students about the meaning of the symbol, LM1 gives a humorous response (line 2). The teacher first shakes his head and laughs and, finally, utters two negatives (lines 3 and 4). It is interesting here how the non-verbal action of shaking the head actually precedes the verbal utterance 'not not'. Nevertheless, it does not occur alone although its role may be more than merely supportive. Rather, the non-verbal action in this case seems to be quite equal with the verbal action. The verbal action may even be considered the supportive action as the head shaking indeed occurs first.

The next example of head shaking is a clearer illustration of a supportive non-verbal action. The sequence has already been introduced as a part of Extract 25.

Extract 29. Religion / Judah and David.

1	T	who remembers what is Holy Communion
2	LM3	[uh wasn't it (divas) and um [Judah and] the saint David]
3	T	[*SMILING THROUGHOUT LM3'S RESPONSE*]
4	LL	[*LAUGHTER*]
5	LM3	and [(x)]
6	T	[£no£] *SHAKES HIS HEAD*

Looking at line 6, it is evident that the verbal negative 'no' and the non-verbal action head shaking are produced simultaneously. Thus, the non-verbal action could be thought of as a supportive device strengthening the meaning of the verbal message. Alternatively, the two devices can be considered equal in expressing the rejection.

In addition to head shaking, the rejections in the data include two other non-verbal devices. These may best be analysed as actions that emphasise a part of an utterance, e.g. while reformulating the question. Thus, these non-verbal actions also support verbal actions in formulating the message. Extract 30 is an example of this. It is taken from the physics lesson and, more precisely, from the context of checking homework exercises. One of the students has written her response on the blackboard but the teacher finds a problem with it.

Extract 30. Physics / Greater effect.

1	T	well (1.9) °----° *GAZE SHIFTS BACK TO BOOK AND IS HELD THROUGHOUT PAUSE*
2		what do you mean by greater effect *SLOWLY FACES STUDENTS AND GAZES AT THEM*

3 LF5 the greater force

4 LF4 like (xx)

5 T no if the force is the same
°--- -------° °-----°
LAYS BOOK ON TABLE *MOVES ARMS INTO AN OPEN POSITION, MAKES A BEATING MOVEMENT WITH LEFT HAND*
6 *PUTS HANDS BACK TOGETHER*

In this extract, the teacher asks one of the students about what she has written on the blackboard (line 2). The student, LF5, responds (line 3) but is met with a rejection of the response. The teacher utters the negative 'no' and restates a presupposition of the exercise (i.e. 'the force is the same'), thus encouraging a new response (line 5). The last word of this turn, i.e. 'same', is emphasised both by the voice of the teacher and a sequence of related non-verbal actions. This action (sequence) does not seem to have a symbolical meaning but, rather, a part of it may exclusively be used as a type of a 'beat' (see McNeill 1992: 15 for further details on beats) that sections temporal aspects of a turn and emphasises the most important part of it. As the teacher starts pronouncing the word 'same', he moves his hands and arms away from each other and immediately makes a small beating movement with his left hand, as if emphasising the word 'same'. Immediately after this beat and after uttering the word 'same', he moves his hands back together, holding a pen, which he previously had in his right hand, with both of his hands now. Thus the teacher is trying to attract the student's (or the students') attention to a critical aspect of the exercise by emphasising an element in his utterance with two different non-verbal devises at the same time – prosody and the non-verbal action (or sequence of actions) involving his hands.

As a conclusion on non-verbal actions in rejections, it can be noted that they do not occur alone but are accompanied by verbal devices. Often, they are used as supportive devices in signalling rejection. The repertoire of non-verbal actions is quite narrow, only including the action of head shaking and two other non-verbal actions that are mainly used as emphasising devices. Thus the non-verbal actions

used in acceptances are more varied and can function more independently than those found in rejections. Nevertheless, it has to be marked that non-verbal actions still play an important role in forming or emphasising meanings in rejections.

5.3.4 Laughter and humour

One of the most striking characteristics in the interaction between the students and the teachers in the data is the use of humour and laughter, which is especially noticeable in the biology and religious studies lessons. They are also used in at least five rejections of student responses (two more instances include smiling and/or a change in the voice that may possibly be caused by laughter), and can sometimes be seen functioning as a type of mitigation. Nevertheless, laughter and humour are here examined separately from mitigating devices as the function is not always clear and some of the instances of laughter could even be considered quite bold actions in the context of rejecting a student response. In addition, in at least two of the cases, the student responding seems to be the one to create the humorous mode of the sequence and, therefore, the teacher may only be aligning to this humorous mode (see Extract 33).

Extract 31, which is taken from one of the biology lessons, serves as the first illustration of the use of humour and laughter in rejections. This is an extract where the class is discussing heredity and how the genes of the parents affect what their offspring will look like. There is an example of imaginary parents on the blackboard and the teacher asks a question concerning them, i.e. initiates an IRE sequence.

Extract 31. Biology / Mysterious ways.

1	T	what about the hair (.) of every children they could have
2		(1.5) could these people have the (.) have (x) children with (.) °----------° *POINTS AT BLACKBOARD*
3		with straight hair. (1) Mikko

4	LM1	yes
5		(1.2)
6	LM2	↑what
7	T	how is it possible. °---° *SMILES*
8	LM1	I don't know cause (1) God works in mysterious ways.
9	T	*LAUGHS*
10		£that was a good an- answer£ of course Elina

The question the teacher asks (lines 1 to 3) is responded to by LM1 (line 4) who is selected by the teacher as the next speaker. A gap of 1.2 seconds follows and is ended by one of the students who questions the response of LM1 (line 6). The teacher only reacts to the response after the turn of LM2, beginning his evaluative turn (line 7). This evaluation is actually in the interrogative form and questions the possibility of the situation proposed in LM1's response. Thus there is a hint already of the fact that the response is being rejected. It should be noted that the teacher is smiling when he finishes the question, which implies that he may not be asking it seriously and that it may be a rhetorical one. LM1 responds, however, giving a persuasive answer coloured with humour (line 8). The teacher laughs and compliments the response while still giving the floor to another student who has put her hand up (lines 9 and 10; the teacher utters the name of the student he asks to respond, i.e. 'Elina'). This is the final and a very obvious device telling LM1 that his response is being rejected. Nevertheless, it is important to notice the role of humour in hinting and preparing the student for rejection even before it is clearly articulated. In a way, they may be seen as an attempt on the part of the teacher to hedge the rejection in this extract. In addition, however, they seem to have the purpose of maintaining a humorous and relaxed atmosphere.

The next example is a sequence from the religious studies lesson. The evaluative turn of this sequence employs, in addition to temporal delay and the negative 'no', laughter as an indication of rejection (notice that the other devices besides laughter

that are observable in the sequence will be examined more closely in Extract 35 of section 5.3.5). The teacher has drawn a symbol on the blackboard and is now asking what the symbol represents.

Extract 32. Religion / Pig.

1	T	do you know what it °---° *RAISES RIGHT HAND, INDEX FINGER POINTING UP*
2	LM5	enigma=
3	T	=stands for
4	LM3	isn't it (xx)
5	LM1	pig
6	T	[*GAZES AT LM1*]
7	LL	[*LAUGHING*]
8	→T	£pig£
9		[*LAUGHS*]
10	LM1	[yeah]
11	T	no

The evaluative turn in this extract begins after circa two seconds have elapsed since the student response. In repeating the response (line 8), the teacher has a laughing voice, which implies that the response may not be taken very seriously by him (note that it is not very certain that the student has produced the response in earnest himself). Furthermore, he laughs before eventually completing the evaluative turn with the conclusive 'no' (lines 9 and 11). Apparently, the laughter functions as a sign that the student response cannot be taken seriously.

The last example on laughter and humour in rejections is Extract 33, a sequence of the same biology lesson as Extract 31. In this case, the humour is clearly introduced by a student.

Extract 33. Biology / In other words.

1	T	okay so what is a phenotype. °-------------------------° *POINTING AT BLACKBOARD ON HIS RIGHT*
2	LF4	[genes (x)]
3	LF5	[°(xx)°]
4	LM3	[genes and] environment
5		(1.4)
6	T	in other words.
7	LM3	environment and genes.
8	LL+T	*LAUGHTER*
9	T	with one word.
10	→LM3	genesenvironment.
11	→T	*LAUGHS*
12		okay.
13		(1.4)
14	LF5	°(x[xx)°]
15	T	[can we say] (.) outfit.

The extract could actually be seen as a continuum of three sequences, where the initiation turn of a following sequence serves as the evaluation for the preceding sequence (e.g. line 6 could be thought of as an evaluation of the response on line 4 and as an initiation of the sequence that follows on lines 7 to 9, and so on). The sequence of most interest for the analysis of humour and laughter in teachers' rejections is the one that starts on line 9 (notice, however, that the humorous mode has already been initiated by LM3 on line 7), where the teacher asks LM3 to give his answer in one word. This turn (as well as the one on line 6) can be seen as a repair initiator, i.e. the teacher has found something wrong with the response and tries to

make the student to change the response. The response of LM3 is an obvious attempt to be witty and humorous (line 10), as has been his previous response (line 7). Thus, he can be seen as the initiator of humour in this extract.

The evaluative turn of the teacher consists of four different elements or devices. The first is the laughter, which can be analysed as an appropriate response to a joke but also as an indication that the response will be rejected (line 11). The second element is the affirmative 'okay', which may seem surprising at first in the light of the humorous response. However, it must be noticed that the affirmative is not, in fact, an acceptance of the response itself but rather, perhaps, an acceptance of the fact that the teacher will not get the expected response from the student and a sign that the sequence comes to an end. Interestingly, 'okay' does not seem to appear in acceptances as much as it does in rejections. The third element seen in the evaluative turn is the gap, the role of which is not clear. The teacher may be hesitating as to how to complete the evaluative turn or waiting for another student to respond. During the gap, the teacher holds still, looking hesitative, which may imply that he is pondering on what to say next. Finally, the teacher himself offers an answer in the interrogative form, this being the fourth element of the rejection (line 15).

In sum, laughter and humour seem to signal rejection by implying that a student response cannot be thought of as a serious attempt to answer a question. In a very serious context, they would seem like rather bold actions that may hurt the feelings of a student. In the data, however, the boldness is reduced by the fact that, more often than not, the students themselves are oriented to the ongoing interaction with a hint of humour. Sometimes, as was seen in Extract 31, humour may even serve as a way to mitigate the rejection and thereby reduce the risk of embarrassment. Other two devices that may be seen to be caused by the teacher's desire to avoid risky actions are examined in the following two sections that conclude the analysis on evaluative turns.

5.3.5 Temporal delay and hesitations

Even though temporal delay and hesitations, according to previous research (see e.g. Margutti 2004), seem to be common devices in rejecting responses, they are infrequent in the data of the present study. Usually, the gaps between a student response and a rejection by a teacher are minimal, precisely as in the case of acceptances. In fact, there is an instance where a rejection overlaps the end of a student response. The case is illustrated in the following extract from the religious studies lesson (notice that this sequence is a part of Extract 25 presented above).

Extract 34. Religion / Judah and David.

1	T	who remembers what is Holy Communion
2	LM3	[uh wasn't it (divas) and um [Judah and] the saint David]
3	T	[*SMILING THROUGHOUT LM3'S RESPONSE*]
4	LL	[*LAUGHTER*]
5	LM3	and [(x)]
6	T	[£no£] *SHAKES HIS HEAD*

The correct answer to the question asked in this extract and its evaluation were seen in Extract 16. The response by LM3 in this particular extract (line 2) is not accepted by the teacher, however, and the teacher pronounces the rejection already when LM3 is still continuing his turn (line 6). The rejection is mitigated by the smiley voice of the teacher in pronouncing the word 'no' but, at the same time, emphasised by the shaking of head, and there is no sign of hesitation in performing the rejection.

The next extract is an illustration of a sequence where the rejection does include a temporal delay. It, too, is taken from the religious studies lesson and was presented earlier as Extract 32. The teacher has drawn a Christian symbol looking like the letter p with a cross on it (i.e. the monogram of Christ) on the blackboard.

Extract 35. Religion / Pig.

1	T	do you know what it °---° *RAISES RIGHT HAND, INDEX FINGER POINTING UP*
2	LM5	enigma=
3	T	=stands for
4	LM3	isn't it (xx)
5	LM1	pig
6	T	[*GAZES AT LM1*]
7	LL	[*LAUGHING*]
8	→T	£pig£
9		[*LAUGHS*]
10	LM1	[yeah]
11	T	no

In this extract, three students try to answer the question without the teacher giving them the floor (lines 2, 4 and 5). The answer of LM1 (line 5) attracts the teacher's attention, which can be seen in the way he fixes his gaze on the student that has produced the response (line 6). Nevertheless, he only starts his evaluative turn after a gap of circa two seconds, during which other students are laughing (line 7). The teacher seems to need time to construct his turn, which eventually begins with an amused repetition of the student response and a short laughter (lines 7 and 8). Only after this does he produce the negative 'no' (line 10). It is questionable in this particular sequence whether the teacher repeats the response because he needs to check if he has understood correctly what the student has said or whether he is trying to mitigate the rejection. Nevertheless, the temporal delay implies that the teacher sees a problem with the response, i.e. it is not the expected answer.

Extract 36 presents an example of hesitation. It precedes the sequence seen in Extract 5.

Extract 36. Physics / Slow jet engines.

1	T	um (.) Mari °--° *POINTS AT LF1 WITH SPONGE*
2	LF1	yeah but (x) um
3		(2.6) *TEACHER TURNS TO WIPE BLACKBOARD BUT TURNS BACK AND GAZES AT LF1 WHEN SILENCE CONTINUES*
4	LF1	hm so I think the jet engine can't work in >space cause< um
5		like in the start it can't go that high cause um
6		[there's the] [um]=
7	T	[*TURNS TO LOOK AT BLACKBOARD*] [*GAZES BACK AT LF1*]
8	LF3	= ilmakehä
9	LF1	yeah ilmakehä so it [will (x)]
10	T	[atmosphere] *NODS*
11	LF	fire
12	LF1	wouldn't it cause it doesn't go that fast [(x)]
13	→T	[well.] (.) °------° *MOVES HAND WITH SPONGE IN IT IN CIRCLE*
14	T	[um you] mentioned something important (x) *LEANS TO TABLE*
15	LF2	[can I]
16	T	but Minna do you have an answer

The class is checking answers to homework exercises and the teacher has stated that there is a problem with a response that has been written on the blackboard by one of the students. LF1 has asked for the floor by putting her hand up and the teacher selects her as the next speaker (line 1). LF1's response extends over multiple turns

(lines 4 to 6, 9 and 12), with other repair by other participants in between (lines 8 and 10). The teacher's evaluative turn overlaps the end of the student response but it begins with the mitigating "well", which is followed by a short gap and a hesitative "um" (lines 13 and 14). This hesitation clearly shows that the teacher thinks there is a problem with the answer and a rejection can be expected. The hesitation can also be seen in the non-verbal action of the teacher of moving his hand in a circle, as if waiting for more explanation or trying to decide what to say. Moreover, the utterance "you mentioned something important" (line 14) further mitigates the rejection. Finally, the "but" and asking another student that has requested for a turn to answer indicate that the response has been rejected (line 16).

In summary, temporal delay and hesitations are fairly exceptional in the data but, where they do occur, they are clear signals of rejecting a student response. In fact, they never appear in acceptances in the data although, as it was seen in 5.2, downgraded acceptances may include short temporal delays or some hesitation. In the last section mitigation, another quite infrequent device in the present data, is examined.

5.3.6 Mitigating the negative

As it was seen, the rejections in the data are rarely produced with a temporal delay. In addition, few of them include mitigation, i.e. are softened with expressions such as "I think", "well" or positive appreciations of parts of the response in order to mitigate the possible threat to the student's face (see, however, section 5.3.4 on laughter and humour). This device can reduce, for instance, the prospective embarrassment the student may feel for producing an incorrect answer (the concepts of face and politeness are discussed more extensively in pragmatics and introduced e.g. in Brown and Levinson 1978). The rejection seen in the previous extract (Extract 36 in 5.3.5) includes some of the clearest examples of mitigations in the data, and aspects of the mitigation in it are elaborated here.

The first word pronounced by the teacher ("well" on line 13) in his first evaluative turn can be seen both as a mark of hesitation and as a mitigation that already signals

rejection to the students. Another mitigating element in this example is the utterance "you mentioned something important" (line 14), which softens the upcoming rejection. In a way, the teacher is trying to evaluate the response positively although he is indicating with other devices that it is not the expected response. What finally confirms the rejection, then, is the conjunction 'but' followed by a request for another student to perform the response turn (line 16). Thus, the teacher indicates that, even though he positively evaluates the response as 'something important', it is not the correct answer to the question at hand. It is interesting to notice how the teacher never produces an explicit rejection of the student response but, rather, implies it through hesitating and mitigating as well as giving the turn to another student.

All in all, then, temporal delay and mitigation are used quite rarely in the rejections of the data and direct forms of rejection seem to be employed more. It should be remembered, however, that in section 5.3.4 humour and laughter were examined as possible mitigating devices in rejections. In Chapter 6, the findings of the present study will be summarised and discussed.

6 DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the devices used by Finnish CLIL teachers in their evaluative turns that form a part of the pedagogical cycle called the IRE pattern. In the analysis, both verbal and non-verbal aspects of the devices were taken into account, illustrating how both of these aspects are intertwined in human interaction. The qualitative approach taken was based on conversation analysis, which concentrates on studying the organization of interaction, and the evaluative turns were accordingly studied as parts of larger IRE patterns. Thus, it was indicated how each evaluative turn formed a part of a larger sequence, i.e. an IRE pattern, and how their contents and devices were dependent on the turns preceding it, especially the response of a student that was evaluated.

In performing the analysis, the evaluative turns found were divided into three general types of evaluation according to their function: acceptances, downgraded acceptances and rejections. The examination of these distinct categories shed light on the differences observable in the devices used in each type. In addition, it was established that different devices often co-operate in forming evaluative turns and that both verbal and non-verbal devices have to be considered when assessing evaluative turns as instances of classroom interaction.

6.1 Results

The results of the study demonstrate that there was a rather wide array of devices used in the evaluative turns of the CLIL teachers and that some of these devices, such as laughter and humour as well as direct approaches in rejections, had not been identified in previous studies. Moreover, these devices varied according to the function of the evaluative turn, i.e. whether the evaluative turn was an acceptance, a downgraded acceptance or a rejection of a student response. In addition, the results demonstrate that non-verbal actions frequently functioned as integral devices in giving an evaluation of a student performance, either in collaboration with verbal actions or as independent devices. In the case of acceptances, non-verbal actions were frequently used as independent devices indicating acceptance but, as to the

rejections, they only occurred in conjunction with verbal actions. Furthermore, non-verbal actions showed a greater variety in the context of acceptances than in that of rejections.

The devices used in acceptances consisted of absence of temporal delay, affirmatives and positive appreciations of student performance, repetitions of student responses or of parts them, reformulations of student responses, expansions of responses and a variety of non-verbal actions. The devices used in the data thus corresponded largely to those found in the study of Margutti (2004). The first of these devices, namely absence of temporal delay, was expected to be frequent in the data as acceptances involve evaluating a response that has been expected by the teacher who is therefore often able to infer that the correct answer is being formed when a student is only beginning his or her turn. Moreover, when giving an acceptance, teachers do not run the risk of threatening a student's face and can thus be more direct than in rejecting a response. Hence the performance of the acceptance does not require time-consuming preparations in order to minimise the risk of hurting a student's feelings.

Affirmatives and positive appreciations were also very common in the data. In fact, compared with previous research, positive appreciations seemed to be surprisingly frequent devices in the acceptances of the CLIL teachers. This may imply that the teachers in the data were rather concerned with giving students positive evaluation of their performance in class. Mostly, positive appreciations included short utterances such as 'that's right' or 'very good'. An interesting point was that affirmatives and appreciations of student responses could function alone in acceptances although they were more frequently accompanied by other devices, such as repetition.

In addition to the frequency of positive appreciations, the role of repetitions in the present data seemed to differ from the one they had in previous research. Namely, they were only used in acceptances and usually in conjunction with other devices, whereas earlier research reports cases of rejections with repetition of student response as well as instances where repetitions function alone to signal an acceptance. It was suggested in the analysis that many uses of repetitions in the data of the present study were attempts to emphasise the correctness of the answer or to ensure that all students heard the correct response. Their functions could also be

close to those of reformulations, which sometimes seemed to have the purpose of clarifying an aspect of a response or summarising the main idea of it.

As for expansions, it was found that they often included some form of additional information that was either an important fact relevant to the topic the class was studying or an interesting remark somehow related to the issue. As the expansions in the data often had a role of giving additional information rather than merely signalling acceptance, it was suggested that the devices used in evaluative turns could have double functions. In addition to forming a part of the evaluative turn, then, different devices could also have another function, such as relating the topic of the IRE sequence to a larger context or to give more information on it.

Acceptances were also noticed to employ multifaceted non-verbal actions. These included actions that were used independently of verbal actions to signal acceptance, such as writing a student response on the blackboard, and actions that accompanied verbal actions, such as nodding performed simultaneously with an affirmative 'yes'. As non-verbal actions were sometimes utilised independently of verbal actions, it was postulated that merely analysing verbal actions in evaluative turns would result in defective conclusions about the devices used in them.

Downgraded acceptances were defined as evaluative turns where student responses were partly accepted and partly rejected or, alternatively, considered insufficient alone. This category of evaluative turns included devices similar to those used in acceptances as well as devices that were also used in rejections, with both types observable within the same turn. As was the case with acceptances, downgraded acceptances also usually included both verbal and non-verbal devices. However, non-verbal devices never occurred alone. It is important to note that the devices used in the data also included other devices besides reformulations, which seem to be viewed by Margutti (2004) as a prevailing device in signalling downgraded acceptance.

As for the rejections in the data, the results were rather surprising if compared with those of Margutti (2004). She found that temporal delay was a standard device used in rejections in her data, whereas in the present study they were rather infrequent.

Hesitations were observable in the data but they were as infrequent as temporal delay, and so were mitigating devices.

In contrast, laughter and humour were employed to a greater extent. Laughter in connection with rejections may seem to be a very bold and possibly risky action but in the data it actually sometimes appeared to mitigate the rejection. Moreover, it was discovered that sometimes it was a student that shifted to humorous mode in a response, for instance, and the teacher merely accepted this change in mode. Thus, delimiting the analysis strictly on the evaluative turns and excluding examination of preceding turns would have given an inaccurate impression of the use of humour in rejections.

Direct approaches were also observed to be a recurrent device in the data, which was surprising on the basis of previous research. The rejections in these cases were produced without hesitations or hedging devices and frequently included simple negative elements such as ‘no’ or ‘no, it’s not’. This device is not mentioned to occur in the context of rejections in earlier studies. The teachers of the data, therefore, seem to use unusually direct devices in their rejections. Several explanations may be offered for this explicit difference in the results of the two studies: it may be caused by the different contexts of the classrooms, i.e. CLIL setting versus a setting where children learn through their native language, by cultural factors or by the fact that the language used as the medium of teaching is not the native tongue of any of the teachers. In addition, a closer examination of the questioning type in each sequence would be needed as rejecting an incorrect response does not always seem to constitute a face-threatening act. The scope of the present study does not, however, allow for an infallible conclusion to be made.

Often, the straightforward rejections in the form of direct formulations were followed by a repetition or a reformulation of the initial question. Notice that repetitions of *student responses* were never used in rejections of the data even though this is mentioned as one of the devices in rejections in Margutti (2004). Repetitions and reformulations of questions were generally directed at other students, and occasionally, another student was given the turn without repeating the question. Repeating the question or giving another student the floor were both suggested to

have a double role in the ongoing interaction. Firstly, they completed the rejections directed at one student and, secondly, new IRE sequences were initiated by them.

Non-verbal devices in rejections were suggested to be supportive or, as best, equal of the verbal actions. No independent non-verbal actions were identified in the data and the most common device was observed to be head shaking accompanied by a negative verbal element. Moreover, the range of different kinds of non-verbal devices was narrower in rejections than in the case of acceptances.

All in all, the devices used in the evaluative turns of the CLIL teachers were diverse and seemed to differ from those used in SLA settings. The results also suggested that the devices used by teachers may be more diverse than has been claimed by previous research. In addition, it was evident on the basis of the analysis that non-verbal actions often functioned as important devices in the evaluative turns, occasionally even as sole devices indicating acceptance. It is therefore important to consider both verbal and non-verbal elements when examining human interaction. Furthermore, the analysis evidenced that it is crucial to take into account the larger context where a turn occurs, i.e. to observe the preceding turns and the activity type, in order to make conclusions about the nature of the turn. For instance, humour in the teachers' rejections was seen to sometimes be a mere acceptance of the humorous mode initiated by a student and, certainly, the functions of evaluative turns were outgrowths of student responses, with acceptances following expected responses and incorrect answers being succeeded by rejections. In conclusion, producing an evaluative turn seems to require a complex interplay of different devices that are opted out of an array appropriate for the type of evaluative turn in question.

6.2 Implications

The aim in carrying out the present study has been to observe the evaluative turns of Finnish teachers in CLIL contexts and to find prevalent patterns in the types of devices they employ. This objective may be seen as a display of a more general interest in examining interactional features of classroom settings. Classroom settings have been the subject of quite a wide array of studies but, so far, CLIL contexts have

been largely ignored in academic research on interaction. Furthermore, CLIL contexts have not been the topic of research done in conversation analysis. Thus a clear need in performing this type of research was seen and the present study has been an attempt to fill the void. Accordingly, the study is hoped to provide new insights into the structure of talk-in-interaction in CLIL contexts.

In addition, the study may highlight some aspects of interaction in classrooms that would not normally be consciously contemplated by teachers. Evaluative turns can be seen as an indication of the status quo of relationships in the classroom, and by reconsidering the devices they use, teachers may be able to affect the atmosphere in the classroom. Moreover, besides revealing points about CLIL teachers' evaluative turns, the results may shed some light on teachers' communication in more general terms.

In spite of the fact that differences between CLIL and SLA settings were not included in the focus of the present study, the findings may be compared with those of other studies that have concentrated on evaluative turns in SLA classrooms to see how these two settings influence the devices used. In analysing the data, it was clear that the participating CLIL teachers evaluated the contents of student responses rather than how they uttered them (Extract 23 served as an exception of this pattern). The circumstances seem to be quite the contrary in SLA settings where the main objective is to learn a language rather than other subject matter through it. As no data from SLA classrooms were analysed here, however, no general observations could be made regarding the differences between the two settings. They may thus serve as an interesting topic for further research.

As to other limitations of the study, it must be remembered that the data examined have been rather modest. Three different teachers and four lessons were presented in it, and the results should therefore not be generalised to excess. It cannot be determined on the basis of the data whether the results obtained are only applicable to the particular teachers in question or whether they speak about CLIL settings, or even classroom settings, in general. As it was mentioned above, the surprising results regarding direct approaches and lack of temporal delay in rejections, for instance, may be an indication of cultural characteristics, differences in the classroom setting

or of lack of competence as to the language used in the lessons. The issue cannot be sealed merely on the grounds of the present study and would require closer examination that would involve comparing CLIL settings with participants of different cultural backgrounds.

Keeping in mind the limitations, the study has nevertheless offered insights into the evaluative turns, in particular, and the interaction, in general, in these particular CLIL contexts. It has also been demonstrated that taking into account both verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication is required when analysing interactional sequences. Moreover, the study has made it clear that conversation analysis is a valuable tool in making interactional structures in classroom contexts perceptible for analysis and that these structures have to be considered in their entirety when examining separate turns.

As a conclusion, it is suggested that further research be carried out on CLIL settings so that more could be discovered regarding the characteristics of its interaction. Questions about differences between CLIL contexts in different cultures, for instance, may offer an interesting starting point for new studies. Other interesting topics may include examining in more detail how evaluative turns in CLIL settings differ from those in SLA classrooms or in contexts where subject matter is taught through the native language of learners, or analysing how devices used in acceptances or rejections vary according to the age group of the students. Either way, the present study has hopefully succeeded in arousing more interest in CLIL settings and in raising questions that will lead to further research on the nature of talk-in-interaction in these classroom settings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Baetens Beardsmore, H. 2002. The significance of CLIL/EMILE. In D. Marsh, *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension. Actions, Trends and foresight potential*. Jyväskylä: The Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä, 24 – 26.

Baker, C. 1996. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brinton, D.M., M.A. Snow and M.B. Wesche 1989. *Content-based second language instruction*. New York, NY: Newbury House Publishers.

Brown, P. and S. C. Levinson 1978. *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Coyle, D. 2002. Relevance of CLIL to the European Commission's language learning objectives. In D. Marsh, *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension. Actions, Trends and foresight potential*. Jyväskylä: The Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä, 27 – 28.

Coyle, D. 2006. Content and language integrated learning motivating learners and teachers. *Scottish Languages Review* [online], 13. (7 May 2007) http://www.scilt.stir.ac.uk/SLR/Issue%2013/SLR13%20Coyle.pdf.

Dalton-Puffer, C. 2005. Negotiating interpersonal meanings in naturalistic classroom discourse: directives in content-and-language-integrated classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 1275 – 1293.

Dalton-Puffer, C. 2007. Research on CLIL – where do we stand? Lecture presented at the University of Jyväskylä, 23 January, 2007.

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

Drew, P. 1997. 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, 69 – 101.

Genesee, F. 1987. *Learning through two languages. Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Goodwin, C. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1489 – 1522.

Goodwin, C. 2003a. Pointing as situated practice [online]. In S. Kita (ed.), *Pointing: where language, culture and cognition meet*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 217 – 241. (11 May 2007) http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/clic/cgoodwin/03pointing.pdf.

Goodwin, C. 2003b. The semiotic body in its environment [online]. In J. Coupland and R. Gwyn (eds.), *Discourses of the body*. New York, NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 19 – 42. (11 May 2007) http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/clic/cgoodwin/03sem_body.pdf.

Goodwin, C. and J. Heritage 1990. Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 283 – 307.

He, A. W. 2004. CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 568 – 582.

Heath, C. 1984. Talk and recipiency: sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 247 – 265.

Heath, C. 1986. *Body movement and speech in medical interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, C. 2004. Analysing face-to-face interaction: video, the visual and material. In D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage, 266 – 282.

Hellermann, J. 2003. The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society* 32 (1), 79 – 104.

Heritage, J. 2004. Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data. In D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage, 222 – 245.

Heritage, J. 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders (eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 103 – 147.

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

Jäppinen, A.-K. 2005. Thinking and content learning of mathematics and science as cognitional development in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Teaching through a foreign language in Finland. *Language and Education* 19 (2), 148 – 169.

Kendon, A. 2004. *Gesture: Visible action as utterance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kääntä, L., forthcoming. Opettajan arvioivat vuorot oppilaiden toiminnan ohjailemisen keinona englanninkielisessä aineenopetuksessa. To appear in S. Leppänen, T. Nikula and L. Kääntä (eds.), *Vieras, toinen, oma kieli? Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Mackey, A. 2006. Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (3), 405 – 430.

McNeill, D. 1992. *Hand and mind. What gestures reveal about thought.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Margutti, P. 2004. *Classroom interaction in an Italian primary school: instructional sequences in pedagogic settings*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of York, Department of Sociology.

Margutti, P. 2006. "Are you human beings?" Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education* 17 (4), 313 – 346.

Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. 2004. Classroom talks: an introduction. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 491 – 500.

Marsh, D. 2002. *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension. Actions, Trends and foresight potential*. Jyväskylä: Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä.

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

Nikula, T. 1997. Terminological considerations in teaching content through a foreign language. In D. Marsh, B. Marsland and T. Nikula (eds.), *Aspects of implementing plurilingual education: Seminar and field notes.* Jyväskylä: The Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä, 5 – 8.

Nikula, T. 2002. Teacher talk reflecting pragmatic awareness: A look at EFL and content-based classroom settings. *Pragmatics* 12 (4), 447 – 467.

Nikula, T. 2005. English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education* 16 (1), 27 – 58.

Nikula, T. 2007. The IRF pattern and space for interaction: Observations on EFL and CLIL classrooms. In C. Dalton-Puffer and U. Smit (eds.) *Empirical perspectives on CLIL Classroom Discourse*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 179 – 204.

Nikula, T. and D. Marsh 1996. *Kartoitus vieraskielisen opetuksen tarjonnasta peruskouluissa ja lukioissa*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Ohta, A. S. 2000. Rethinking recasts: a learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom. In J. K. Hall and L. S. Verplaetse (eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 47 – 71.

Piirainen-Marsh, A. and L. Kääntä 2006. Directions for action and the organisation of participation in EFL and CLIL classrooms. Paper presented at the International Conference on Conversation Analysis ICCA, Helsinki, 10 -14 May, 2006.

Psathas, G. 1995. *Conversation analysis. The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richards, K. 2006. 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (1), 51 – 77.

Sahlström, F. 1999. *Up the hill backwards: On interactional constraints and affordances for equity-constitution in the classrooms of the Swedish comprehensive school.* Uppsala Studies in Education 85. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Schegloff, E. A. 1984. On some gestures' relation to talk. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 247 – 265.

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

Seedhouse, P. 2005. Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying conversation analysis,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 251 – 266.

Sheen, Y. H. 2004. Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research* 8 (3), 263 – 300.

Sinclair, J. McH. and D. Brazil 1982. *Teacher talk.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tainio, L. 2005. Luokkahuoneen vuorottelujäsennyksen rikkomukset. In L. Kuure, E. Kärkkäinen, and M. Saarenkunnas (eds.), *Kieli ja sosiaalinen toiminta – Language and Social Action.* AFinLA Yearbook. Publications de l'association finlandaise de linguistique appliqué 63, 179 – 192.

van Lier, L. 1994. *The classroom and the language learner. Ethnography and second-language classroom research.* London: Longman.

Wells, G. and R. M. Arauz 2006. Dialogue in the classroom. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences* 15 (3), 379 – 428.

Wooffitt, R. 2005. *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: a comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Adjusted from Arminen (2005), Wooffitt (2005), and Piirainen-Marsh and Kääntä (2006). Notice that all of the names of the participants appearing in the transcripts are aliases.

(2.5)	pause, the length indicated in seconds and tenths of seconds
(.)	short pause, measuring has not been possible
(x)	unintelligible fragment, probably one word
(xx)	unintelligible phrase
(xxx)	unintelligible fragment beyond phrase length
(guess)	a probable interpretation of an unclear fragment
[	beginning of overlapping speech or non-verbal action
]	end of overlapping speech or non-verbal action
=	no interval between adjacent utterances produced by different speakers
cu-	a sharp cut-off of speech
underlined	emphasis of a segment of speech
↑	rising intonation (marked immediately before the onset of the rise)
↓	falling intonation (marked immediately before the onset of the fall)
.	stopping fall in tone (not necessarily the end of utterance)
£laugh£	fragment spoken with a smile voice or a laughing voice
> <	speech that is produced quicker than surrounding talk
<>	speech that is slower than surrounding talk
word	incorrect pronunciation of an English word
°quiet°	fragment inside degree signs is quieter than the surrounding speech
LOUD	fragment that is louder than the surrounding speech
ACTION	smaller capitals in italics on a separate line indicate non-verbal actions
◦----◦	dashes between two white bullets under a fragment of speech indicate that the action described under this symbol occurs at the same time as the speech fragment
T	teacher

LF3	identified female student
LM1	identified male student
LF	female students (impossible to decide which one)
LM	male student (impossible to decide which one)
L	student (impossible to identify even if it is a male or female talking)
LL	many students producing e.g. speech or laughter at the same time