

HUMOUR IN EFL CLASSROOMS:
**A comparative case study between elementary and
secondary school lessons**

Master's thesis

Sanna Paajoki

**University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
March 2014**

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Sanna Paajoki	
Työn nimi – Title HUMOUR IN EFL CLASSROOMS: A comparative case study between elementary and secondary school lessons	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Maaliskuu 2014	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 96 sivua + 3 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Tämä laadullinen tapaustutkimus pyrkii selvittämään sekä opettaja- että oppilasaloitteisen huumorin roolia opetuksessa. Ilmiötä tarkastellaan eri huumorilajien kautta: ironia, kiusoittelu, leikinlasku, kiehellä leikittely ja pilailu. Tutkimus on vertaileva, sillä tavoitteena on kuvailla oppilaiden luokka-asteen yhteyttä käytetyn huumorin määrään, huumorilajiin ja siihen onko huumori opettaja- vai oppilasaloitteista. Tämän lisäksi pohditaan huumorin positiivisia ja negatiivisia vaikutuksia luokan ilmapiiriin. Tarkoituksena ei ole yleistää vaan tutkia yksittäistä tapausta: miten kaksi luokkaa, yksi alakoulun ja yksi yläkoulun luokka, ja heidän yhteinen opettajansa käyttävät huumoria oppitunneilla.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen aineisto koostuu vuonna 2013 suomalaisessa yhteiskoulussa kerätystä materiaalista ja sisältää kaksi viidennen luokan ja kaksi yhdeksännen luokan englannin oppituntia, sekä näiden luokkien opettajan haastattelun. Oppitunnit videoitiin, jonka jälkeen videoitu materiaali litteroitiin ja siitä poimittiin sekä opettaja- että oppilasaloitteiset huumorisekvenssit. Analyysin kautta määriteltiin eri huumorilajit ja niiden ominaisuudet, jonka jälkeen materiaalista poimitut huumorisekvenssit luokiteltiin näiden mukaisesti ja niitä lähdettiin tarkastelemaan keskusteluanalyysinmenetelmin. Myös opettajahaastattelu litteroitiin, jonka jälkeen se analysoitiin sisällönanalyysin avulla. Haastattelun tarkoituksena oli tarkastella opettajan näkemyksiä huumorinkäytöstä suhteessa siihen millaisena huumori näyttäytyi hänen oppitunneillaan kuvatussa aineistossa.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittivat, että seuratuilla tunneilla oppilasaloitteinen huumori oli yleisempää kuin opettaja-aloitteinen huumori. Erot opettajan ja oppilaiden huumoriin reagoimisessa ja huumorin käytössä eri luokka-asteilla olivat kuitenkin vähäisiä ja rajoittuivat lähinnä ironiaan ja kiusoitteluun. Huumorisekvenssit olivat iän lisäksi sidoksissa muihin elementteihin, kuten opettajan opetustyyliin ja oppitunnin sisältöön. Pohdittaessa huumorin vaikutuksia luokan ilmapiiriin, havaittiin vaikutusten olevan lähinnä positiivisia. Negatiivisuutta ilmeni eniten oppilaiden välisessä huumorissa ja oppilaiden aloittamissa huumorijaksoissa. Huumorisekvenssien sisältö oli kuitenkin harvoin täysin negatiivinen, vaan negatiivisuus oli yhteydessä esimerkiksi työrauhan häiriintymiseen.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords humour, classroom interaction, conversation analysis, thematic interview, case study, comparative research	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
2	CLASSROOM INTERACTION	7
2.1	Classroom as a hierarchical institution.....	8
2.2	The study of classroom interaction from a CA perspective.....	8
2.2.1	From the focus of ordinary talk to studying classroom interaction.....	9
2.2.2	CA and L2 classroom interaction.....	10
2.3	Structural features of classroom interaction	12
2.3.1	Turn-taking practices in classroom talk	12
2.3.2	Organisation of sequences defining classroom talk.....	14
2.3.3	The organisation of repair in classroom talk	17
3	HUMOUR IN INTERACTION	18
3.1	Defining humour.....	19
3.2	CA and humour	20
3.3	The study of humour in classrooms	21
3.4	Effects of humour on classroom atmosphere and rapport.....	23
3.5	Humour in childhood and adolescence	24
3.6	Defining various types of humour	26
3.6.1	Irony.....	26
3.6.2	Teasing.....	28
3.6.3	Banter.....	30
3.6.4	Language play.....	32
3.6.5	Joking.....	34
4	THE PRESENT STUDY	34
4.1	Research questions.....	35
4.2	Methods of data collection.....	36

4.3	Description of data.....	38
4.3.1	Participants.....	38
4.3.2	Lesson activities.....	40
4.4	Data analysis.....	41
5	TYPES OF STUDENT AND TEACHER HUMOUR IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL LESSONS.....	44
5.1	The use of irony in teaching.....	44
5.2	Students and the teacher as teasers.....	50
5.3	Student teasing developing into banter.....	60
5.4	Language play in EFL classroom talk.....	67
5.5	The rare example of a canned joke.....	72
6	THE INTERVIEW: THE TEACHER'S VIEWS AND THEIR CONNECTION TO THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS.....	75
7	DISCUSSION.....	80
7.1	Comparison of humour use in elementary and secondary school.....	80
7.2	Positive and negative effects of humour on classroom atmosphere.....	83
8	CONCLUSION.....	87
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	90
	APPENDICES.....	97

1 INTRODUCTION

Humour is a biological attribute all humans possess (Polimeni and Reiss 2006:347) and thus, there are many theories trying to explain humour and its functions, including philosophical, psychological, sociological, anthropological and linguistic perspectives (Dynel 2009: 1284). An explanation for the wide range of disciplines that study the area might be found in Nahemov's (1986:4) perception of different qualities concerning humour: Our sense of humour, aging, individuality, time, social situation and emotions all have an effect on what we find amusing or humoristic. Because of all the qualities that change over time, it seems impossible to have just one theory that could cover all aspects of humour. In light of this, the present study focuses on the use of humour in the specific context of EFL (English-as-foreign-language) classrooms during childhood and adolescence, and aims to point out differences in the use of humour between the two age groups by examining both teacher and student initiated humour.

In the modern classroom, humour plays a great role in creating a positive learning environment. Schooling at the beginning of the 20th century was concise and no joking was allowed in the classroom (Nahemov 1986:8). However, today the use of humour can be seen as a possibility to "enhance positive interaction in the pedagogical relationship" (Anttila, interviewed in Spåre 2008). A positive and interactive relationship between a teacher and his/her students is vital when creating a positive learning environment. Accordingly, multiple studies have shown the connection between a positive learning environment and learning outcomes (Määttä and Uusiautti 2012:23-24). As humour can improve the positive relationship between a teacher and his/her students, it can also enhance learning. Nevertheless, one should not forget the complexity of humour: What someone considers amusing, might be offensive to another. Consequently, not all humour is positive; both teacher and student humour in classrooms can also be aggressive, leading to conflicts or even bullying.

Positive or negative, the use of humour can be seen throughout different educational levels, although its nature and quality is different in each. In elementary school riddles and different types of word play create amusement and thus are used repeatedly in textbooks and different classroom activities. In contrast, teenagers are likely to find

riddles childish as the enjoyment of these jokes decreases through age (Simons, McCluskey-Fawcett and Papini 1986:61), while other kinds of jokes and forms of humour start to get appreciated. Overall, what children and teenagers find humorous and how they use humour is related to their developmental level (Simons et al. 1986:66), but is also individual and connected to issues such as social context and people's emotions (Nahemov: 1986:4).

The present study is a case study that examines how a teacher uses humour in her teaching and how students initiate humour during a lesson. Furthermore, the study aims to compare the different types of humour that are used in classrooms at two age levels, in the 5th grade and 9th grade, in order to see if there are any differences in the content or the amount of humour appearing during the lessons with different age groups taught by the same teacher. The comparison of different age groups is interesting, because of obvious differences between the cultures of the age groups, that is, the behaviour of children versus teenagers. Also, previous research shows that different aspects of humour and what we find to be amusing change from childhood to adolescence (Simons et al. 1986: 53). Thus, the present study aims to point out these changes. Finally, the effect of humour on the atmosphere of the classroom is considered.

The data for the present study was collected by videotaping lessons and conducting an interview with the teacher. Conversation analysis (CA) has been used as the theoretical and methodological framework because of the detailed information it provides when studying an interactional phenomenon such as humour. Through CA one can get a specific view on how humour is built in interaction through the talk and actions of the participants. In addition, a thematic interview with the teacher was conducted to understand the teacher's perceptions of humour use in classrooms in relation to the empirical findings. The methods used in the present thesis allow in-service teachers and teacher trainees to get a more in-depth view on the interaction between a teacher and his/her students and show how communication, and more specifically humour, is built through sequences of interaction in a classroom.

There are multiple studies done in the field of classroom humour but as a conversation analytic case study that has a specific focus, the current thesis is able to provide additional information to the field. Recent studies that look at humour in a classroom through CA analysis, include the works of Saharinen (2007) who looks specifically at

teasing in two upper secondary school classrooms and Haapaniemi (2011) who focuses on conversational joking in upper secondary CLIL classrooms. Both of the studies focus on a specific age group, lacking the comparative aspect that the current study provides. As a case study, the current thesis does not aim to generalise, but to present an example of how humour can be perceived in EFL classrooms. Nevertheless, the study is an important addition to the field of classroom research as it provides a detailed view of humour use in a specific context. It challenges previous findings, but also gives more specific information on how humour is built in interaction, since previous studies have often focused only on teacher initiated humour. The case study is both qualitative and comparative, looking at different age groups and considering both teacher and student initiated humour. Differing from the popular approach of looking at upper secondary school, college or adult learners, the current study looks at younger learners. The findings of the present study will provide explicit information on the use of humour in EFL classrooms and present interesting differences between the two age levels.

The theoretical background of the current study is presented in two chapters. Following the introduction, chapter 2 presents classroom interaction, what it includes and how it has been studied in the field of conversation analysis. Chapter 3 looks at humour in interaction by discussing the definition of humour, how it has been studied in relation to both conversation analysis and classrooms, and more specifically in relation to classroom climate and age. Also, different types of humour are defined through examples of data. The theoretical background is followed by chapter 4 on data and methods used in the current study. The analysis and the results are presented in chapters 5 and 6, followed by the discussion and conclusion in chapters 7 and 8.

2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

When studying interaction specifically in a basic education classroom, it is important to consider certain conventions that are typical to this particular surrounding. In the following chapter the effect of rules and hierarchical qualities of interaction in the classroom is discussed. Next, classroom interaction is presented from a conversation analytic perspective. I begin by explaining the term conversation analysis and how it is used as a research method. This general view is followed by a more detailed description of how classrooms have been studied in CA and finally, the structural features of classroom interaction are explained.

2.1 Classroom as a hierarchical institution

There is a clear hierarchical system that guides the actions of both the teacher and students in a basic educational setting. A part of our common knowledge is that the teacher as opposed to the students in a classroom has a higher status which affects the way the teacher addresses the students and vice versa. Saharinen (2007:261) describes the interaction between a teacher and students as institutional talk that is guided by the teacher. In other words, the teacher in a classroom is the leader and responsible for the content of the lessons, but also controls the students and their actions. On the other hand, the teacher's role has become less strict over time and students are allowed more power over the conversation than before (Vepsäläinen 2007:156). It should be noted that particularly in modern classrooms power is not necessarily owned by the teacher, but is built through the relationship between the teacher and her pupils and is "continuously under negotiation by all participants" (Thornborrow 2002:113). While a teacher is entitled to hold authority over students, the students are more involved in guiding and influencing classroom talk.

School as an educational institution applies certain disciplines that are stated in the national curriculum and which guide the behaviour of both teachers and students. In the Finnish education system basic education is given from age seven until age sixteen and a national curriculum is provided to guide basic education. A key idea in the curriculum is to not only educate but to instruct the students and help them understand the different values and ways of acting that form our society (Opetushallitus 2004:14). Because of the instructional point of view in basic education, rules are needed in every classroom. In the first years of schooling, rules might be written down and put on the wall of the classroom, but mostly rules are unwritten norms of social interaction that are merely mentioned if broken. These unwritten rules and expectations guide how students should act in school or during lessons (Tainio 2007: 16) and is another point which makes interaction in a school surrounding and specifically in a classroom unique.

2.2 The study of classroom interaction from a CA perspective

Conversation analysis as a research method is not self-explanatory. Thus, the following chapter will provide a brief explanation of the term and how the use of CA began and evolved. It will then consider how CA has been applied in the study of second language

(L2) classroom interaction.

2.2.1 From the focus of ordinary talk to studying classroom interaction

Before looking specifically at L2 classroom interaction from a CA perspective, the term **conversation analysis** and how CA began should be explained. As Hutchby and Wooffit (1998:13) put it, conversation analysis is “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction.” In other words, CA is only interested in naturally occurring interaction. However, what we consider to be natural interaction can be argued upon. In the early CA studies the interest was mostly in “ordinary talk” such as dinner conversations among friends, but later “institutional talk” also became an increasing area of interest, including for example medical conversations or classroom contexts (Markee 2000:24). Naturally, the social situation and the conversational qualities of a discussion with a friend versus a discussion with a doctor and a patient or a teacher and a pupil differ. Nevertheless, both could be studied by using conversation analysis, since they are examples of talk-in-interaction, a term introduced by Emanuel Schegloff (ten Have 2007:4). Thus, **talk-in-interaction** better describes in detail the focal phenomenon of interest in conversation analysis, i.e. talk and all that the term covers.

In historical terms conversation analysis began in the 1960's. CA invalidated the general idea that everyday conversation is chaotic and based on pure coincidence by proving that interaction consists of different organised activities (Hakulinen 1998a:13, ten Have 2007:3). The idea originated in the 1960's in California from the work of Harvey Sacks and his associates Gail Jefferson and Emanuel Schegloff (ten Have 2007:5). Sacks initiated the original research programme, with the assumption that everyday conversation could be “a deeply ordered, structurally organised phenomenon” that could ideally be looked at by using recorded data, which enables repeated observation (Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:15). Sacks started by analysing tape recordings of telephone calls to the Suicide Prevention Center in Los Angeles in the years 1963 and 1964, which led him to develop what is now called conversation analysis (ten Have 2007:6, Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:17-18).

As we saw from the history of CA, institutional contexts were studied from the very beginning of CA studies when Sacks looked at phone calls made to the Suicide

Prevention Centre. However, a new growing attraction towards the study of institutional talk, including classroom interaction, started to rise between the decades 1970-1980, when the distinctive features of institutional talk and how it differs from ordinary conversation started to be examined (Peräkylä 1998:178). Contexts such as news interviews, courtrooms and classrooms were the first to be studied, since they were seen as “drastically different” from ordinary conversation and included specific turn-taking systems (Heritage 2005:111). In classroom interaction, the works of McHoul (1978) and Mehan (1979) were among the first to focus on the special features that make talk institutional. The studies of McHoul (1978, 1990) are discussed later in detail, when focusing on the structural features of classroom talk (chapter 2.3).

2.2.2 CA and L2 classroom interaction

More recently, CA has also been applied to the specific environment of a language classroom. I will focus next on the work of Seedhouse (2004), who has looked at the organisation of second language classroom interaction. Seedhouse (2004:183-184) suggests that in a L2 classroom there is a “core institutional goal” which is teaching learners the L2. Based on this goal, he further points out three “interactional properties” that originate from this goal and which shape the interaction in all language classrooms, thereby differentiating the form of interaction from other types of institutional talk and ordinary conversation.

1. Language is both the vehicle and object of instruction.
2. There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, and interactants constantly display their analyses of the evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction.
3. The linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher in some way.

(Seedhouse 2004:183-184)

Through these features, Seedhouse points out that although there is diversity between various language classrooms, the interaction has a unique sequence organisation that can be adapted to all language classrooms. This sequence is based on the normative link between different linguistic patterns and forms of interaction produced by learners and the pedagogical focus that is introduced during classroom interaction (Seedhouse 2004:191). Through examples of different L2 classroom contexts, Seedhouse points out that by looking at turns-at-talk in classroom interaction, we see how the pedagogical focus is interpreted by the participants during interaction. For example, if a teacher introduces a new group task, the students will interpret and apply the teacher’s

directions in the upcoming interaction. The interpretation may not always be successful, but yet it exists and emerges through students' interaction.

In addition to the three interactional properties describing language classroom interaction, Seedhouse suggests *a three-way view* of the L2 classroom context. This view describes the complexity of L2 classroom interaction: How it can be seen as unique, but at the same time similar to other institutions; and accordingly, how the interaction works on a number of different levels at the same time (Seedhouse 2004:208-209). The three-way view presents L2 classroom interaction in three "decreasing circles" that describe these different levels. The L2 classroom context is the middle circle, which is surrounded by the *institutional context* and surrounding the *micro context* of interaction. Seedhouse (2004:213) argues that all three levels of context are constantly talked into being in L2 classroom interaction, while the focus shifts between different levels in relation to broadening or narrowing one's perspective. The three-way model characterises how "all instances of L2 classroom interaction have the same properties and use the same basic sequence organisation, while at the same time portraying the extreme diversity, fluidity, and complexity of the interaction" (Seedhouse 2004:214).

The models presented by Seedhouse are strictly based on the pedagogical focus of classroom talk. However, it should be noted that not all talk which takes place in an institutional context is institutional (Peräkylä 1998, Heritage 2005) and thereby, not all classroom talk is pedagogical. Interaction in an L2 classroom can be unrelated to the educational goal and include different types of noninstitutional talk, such as social chat. According to Seedhouse (2004:200-202) both teachers and students can talk the institutional context *out of being* by moving away from the pedagogical focus and engaging in off-task talk, such as social chat. In this respect, classroom interaction is highly "dynamic and variable" (Seedhouse 2004:203), since it can include different kinds of talk. In his work, Seedhouse excludes noninstitutional talk when referring to classroom interaction. However, in the present study the emphasis is on examples of humour in classroom interaction which occurred both in institutional and noninstitutional talk. Accordingly, both types of interaction are included in the data.

2.3 Structural features of classroom interaction

Conversation analysis has identified different structures of social organisation that are present in all forms of talk and interaction: turn-taking, sequential organisation and repair. Although the three levels are differentiated, they are all intertwined in conversation and all work at once. The structures of social organisation are the basis of all interaction and guide people's interpretations of talk in social situations (Hakulinen 1998a:16), including teaching. Next, these different organisations of interaction are first defined and then explained in relation to classroom interaction.

2.3.1 Turn-taking practices in classroom talk

As the name of the term already reveals, turn-taking refers to the system of taking turns during a conversation. The turn-taking model, created by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), is based on the realisation that "turns in conversation are resources which [...] are distributed in systematic ways among speakers" (Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:47). There is a set of rules people have internalised, which allows them to know when to talk and for how long, and on the other hand, when to give someone else their turn to speak (Hakulinen 1998b:32-33). These rules are often broken, but without the system of turn-taking all conversation would be chaotic, full of interruptions and overlapping talk and it is therefore of central importance in social interaction.

According to Sacks et al. (1974:702) the turn-taking model includes two turn components and a corresponding set of rules. The two components are called turn constructional component (TCC) and turn allocation component (TAC). Firstly, a turn constructional component marks the construction of a turn and includes various turn constructional units (TCU), which in English include "sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical constructions" (Sacks et al 1974:702). Secondly, a turn allocation component refers to completing a turn and allocating a turn to the next speaker. Sacks et al. (1974:703) name two techniques for this: either the current speaker selects the next speaker or a turn is allocated by self-selection. Accordingly, the turn constructional units and turn allocation components lead to the marking of transition relevance places (TRP) which indicate potential places for speaker transfer to occur and thereby, the completion of a TCU.

Considering the hierarchical qualities of a classroom, turn-taking in this specific context is to some extent more formal and predictable than in an everyday conversation. McHoul (1978) was among the first to come up with a view on the organisation of turn-taking in traditional classrooms. As Markee (2000:92) points out, his view is an adaptation of the turn-taking model for ordinary conversation introduced by Sacks et al. (1974) and focuses on traditional teacher-led view of a classroom. Below is a simplified version of McHoul's rules adapted from Tainio (2007:33).

- I. After a teacher has completed a turn:
 - A) The teacher selects a student as the next speaker, who starts speaking.
 - (a) The teacher names or in some other clear way displays the next speaker.
 - (b) The teacher allocates the turn to the whole class or a group of students from which one should be selected as the next speaker.
 - B) If a student does not accept the turn, the teacher continues.
- II. After a student has completed a turn:
 - A) If a student does not select the next speaker, the teacher continues.
 - B) If the student selects the next speaker it should be the teacher.
 - C) Only if the teacher does not continue, can the selected student continue speaking.

(Tainio 2007:33, an idiomatic translation)

In McHoul's view on turn-taking one can clearly see that the teacher is the one controlling the participation by choosing the next speakers among students. McHoul's view shows the basic norms students learn in school by describing teacher-led lessons. However, since in a modern classroom interaction works on multiple levels, McHoul's model rarely applies on its own anymore and new perspectives are needed (Tainio 2007:34). As students have begun to take more part in shaping classroom discussions through their increasing level of participation (Thornborrow 2002:131), the turn-taking organisation of a modern classroom can only be described as partially fixed.

The turn-taking organisation in a modern classroom is often dependent on the teaching method that is used. Next, I will go through four teaching methods put forth by Lahdes (1997) as they were presented in relation to turn-taking by Tainio (2007:35-37). They include *representative teaching* (esittävä opetus), *conversational teaching* (opetuskeskustelu), *group work* (ryhmätyöskentely) and *individual work* (yksityinen työ). Firstly, the most traditional form of teaching is representative teaching, where the teacher controls the on-going conversation in the classroom. The teacher usually stands in front of the class and occasionally presents questions to students related to the teaching topic. Turns are often allocated through raising one's hand. Representative teaching is best described with the turn-taking model by McHoul (1978). This particular teaching method is still popular, but less frequent than before. Secondly, we can point

out a method called conversational teaching, where the teacher is still in charge, but students have more power in turn-taking. For example, students can choose themselves or another student as the next speaker instead of waiting for the teacher to allocate the turn. In other words, the teacher allows the students to take turns more freely when compared to representative teaching. Thirdly, the turn-taking organisation changes if students are asked to work in groups. In group work students are allowed to talk freely with their group members about the appropriate topic, which means their turn-taking happens within the group and is most likely spontaneous. However, they can ask the teacher questions if necessary. Finally, students may be asked to work on their own on different tasks. Here, silence is expected and only the teacher is allowed to break the silence without asking for his/her turn to speak. The different methods of teaching presented here show that the turn-taking organisation of a modern classroom is multifaceted. Nevertheless, this is only one perspective and different findings on the unique turn-taking organisation of classrooms can also be found in the works of Thornborrow (2002) and Seedhouse (2004) for example.

2.3.2 Organisation of sequences defining classroom talk

As Hutchby and Wooffit (1998:38) put it “A key notion in CA is that [...] turns (at talking) are not just serially ordered (that is, coming one after another); they are sequentially ordered, which is to say that there are describable ways in which turns are linked together into definite sequences.” Conversation analysts have studied this order of turns at talk under the term sequence organisation.

The basic unit of sequence organisation is the *adjacency pair*. The term refers to a sequence that is constructed by paired utterances produced by two different speakers (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:295-296). The relationship between the turns is *normative*, since the first pair-part requires a response - the second pair-part (ten Have 2007:130), for example a question requires an answer and a greeting requires a reciprocal greeting. The second part thereby becomes *conditionally relevant*, a term introduced by Emanuel Schegloff, referring to the expectedness of the second part in an adjacency pair. If the second part of the pair is not produced, the absence of a response is clearly noticeable; unless a *sequence expansion* occurs, meaning for example a question followed by another question as a request of clarification (ten Have 2007:130-131). The adjacency pair is the most important basic sequence in conversation analysis (Schegloff and Sacks

1973), but when we look specifically at classroom talk, other sequences should also be considered.

The interaction between a teacher and students is often characterised by a specific sequence organisation called an *IRF sequence*, the letters meaning initiation-response-feedback (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). This tripartite sequence has also been referred to as the IRE (initiation-response-evaluation) (Mehan 1979) or QAC (question-answer-comment) structure (McHoul 1978). In other words, the traditional interaction in a classroom begins when the teacher asks a question. A student then answers the question and gets feedback or some kind of other response from the teacher. Musumeci (1996 as quoted by Walsh 2006: 5-6) suggests four reasons why these IRF patterns occur during lessons:

- 1) Teachers and students consider question and answer routines to be natural classroom behaviour.
- 2) Teachers want to please the students by giving feedback.
- 3) Regarding power relations the teacher controls the discussion.
- 4) IRF sequences advance the discourse effectively and take little time.

(Walsh 2006:5-6)

Overall, the pattern of teacher-led communication in a classroom has a clear structure, since teachers control turn-taking and the topics of conversation, whereas students merely take cues to answer the teachers' questions (Walsh 2006:5). However, due to the change in educational purposes, the nature of classroom talk has changed (Cazden 2001:31) and while the use of IRF sequences still exists, the structure of classroom talk is not as simple.

Although characterising traditional teaching, IRF sequences are nevertheless a great part of classroom talk, but not the only characterising organisation. In fact, Cazden (2001:30) notes that "the three-part sequence of teacher Initiation, student Response, and teacher Evaluation (IRE) or teacher feedback (IRF), may still be the most common classroom discourse pattern at all grade levels." However, it has been criticised in relation to pedagogical efficacy as "rigid, controlling and greatly limiting student participation in learning" (Mori and Zuengler 2008:18). Accordingly, the simplicity of the structure rarely applies to modern classroom discourse as the students of a classroom are now seen rather as a community than a group of individual learners (Cazden 2001:49). In modern classrooms interruptions and alterations in the nature of talk happen daily. In addition, the teacher talks significantly less and students are allowed to give longer, more detailed answers (Cazden 2001:51). IRF sequences are still

visible in classroom talk, but not in the oversimplified structure initially presented by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). Because of all its benefits (see the list by Musumeci in the previous paragraph), the basic idea of IRF sequences remains a valued approach in classrooms. However, classroom talk now offers more possibilities for students to contribute in conversations.

In consequence, different types of *classroom talks* (Markee and Kasper 2004) have been studied in addition to the IRF sequence. As we saw in relation to turn-taking, the teaching method that is used is connected to the turns of talk. This naturally also applies to the organisation of sequences. Like many other institutions, a classroom is a changing environment that appears very different if we compare the context now and a few decades ago. As a result, studies have moved on from looking at the traditional teacher-directed IRF model to describe a more “student-centered, task-based, group organised settings or even [...] a one-to-one-tutoring basis” (Wagner 2004:612). Interaction during task-based group work reveals how classroom interaction is not based solely on one speech exchange system like the IRF sequence, but on several different sequence organisations. This was also evident in the data for the present study and thus, should be considered. The “interrelated speech exchange systems” (Markee and Kasper 2004:492) that describe a more modern, non-traditional classroom talk are looked at more closely in the special issue *The Modern Language Journal* (2004) *Classroom talks*. In this issue, Markee for example, has studied classroom talks in ESL classes and I will now present his findings as an example of study on modern classroom interaction.

Markee (2000, 2004) has studied the structure of teacher-student interaction in non-traditional ESL lessons and found that the sequence organisation is still far from ordinary conversation, but also clearly different compared to traditional teacher-led lessons. Markee (2004) describes transitions between different speech exchange systems in classroom talk through *zones of interactional transition* (ZITs). One of these zones is the counter question sequence. According to Markee, even in task-based, small group instruction teachers want to maintain a certain control of the lesson and they often do this by presenting counter-questions. In group work, the roles of the typical IRF sequence are turned as a group member can ask the teacher a question, a teacher is expected to give an answer and the student might finally reply with a comment (Markee 2004:585). However, teachers typically add a counter question turn in the structure, before giving out the answer. For example, if a student asks the teacher “What does this

word mean?”, the teacher might reply “What do you think it means?” wanting the student to resolve the problem on their own. By using this counter question structure, teachers maintain control over the sequence of talk by selecting learners as next speakers who need to respond to the counter question. Also, through the counter question teachers regain their roles as commenters or feedback givers (Markee 2004:585). Other ZIT’s described by Markee include *misunderstandings of the function of teachers’ questions*, *off-task talk* and *tactical-fronting talk*. The findings of Markee clearly show how classroom interaction consists of multiple speech-exchange systems.

2.3.3 The organisation of repair in classroom talk

“An ‘organization of repair’ operates in conversation, addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding” (Schegloff et al. 1977:361). In other words, the term repair is used in conversation analysis to cover a significant range of different phenomena including everything from errors that have to do with turn-taking to different forms of “correction” (Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:57). Repair can be self-initiated by the speaker or other initiated by another speaker (Schegloff et al. 1977:361).

Repair has been categorised into four different types which depend on whether the repair of the trouble source is conducted by the speaker him/herself or by others. The following list by Hutchby and Wooffit (1998) explains the varieties of repair:

Self-initiated self-repair	Repair is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source.
Other-initiated self-repair	Repair is carried out by the speaker of the trouble source but initiated by the recipient.
Self-initiated other-repair	The speaker of a trouble source may try and get the recipient to repair the trouble – for instance if a name is proving troublesome to remember.
Other-initiated other-repair	The recipient of a trouble-source turn both initiates and carries out the repair. This is the closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’.

(Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:61)

From these categories self-initiated self-repair is the most preferred type of repair and other-initiated other-repair the least desired form both in normal conversation and classroom talk (Seedhouse 2004:35).

The types of repair used in a classroom can differ from those used in normal

conversations. According to McHoul (1990:353) certain repair types are more frequent in a classroom context than in an everyday conversation because of the asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and the students. McHoul (1990) studied Australian high school lessons and pointed out differences between repair types in a school environment compared to normal social interaction. He found that self-initiated self-repair, which is commonly used by both parties in an everyday conversation, was mostly used only by teachers in a classroom. Students did not tend to repair their own speech. Furthermore, McHoul found that types of other-initiated repair were more frequent compared to normal conversations. Other-initiated self-repair became evident as the teacher initiated repair on a student's answer, but the actual repair was carried out by the student. Other-initiated other repair was less frequent, but compared to everyday conversations acceptable and not considered at all unusual. Overall, McHoul's findings show multiple differences between the context of a classroom and ordinary conversation.

Nevertheless, it should be considered that much like in turn-taking, McHoul's observations were based on teacher-led lessons and do not apply to all classrooms. Different types of repairs used in a specific classroom can be dependent on the teaching method and as Macbeth (2004:714) points out, they are also age and culture bound. Thus, how we use repair in classrooms is not self-explanatory and varies in relation to multiple factors. McHoul's work on repair has also been criticised by Macbeth (2004:705): "conversational repair and classroom correction are better understood as distinctive, even cooperating organisation" and therefore, should not be compared. As we have earlier pointed out, not all classroom talk is pedagogical and various speech exchange systems are apparent in a modern classroom. Therefore, repair in classrooms does not always differ, but can also bear a resemblance to normal, everyday conversation.

3 HUMOUR IN INTERACTION

The concept of humour is multifaceted and as a result, the study of humour can be looked at from many different perspectives and a great deal of research has been done on the subject. In the present chapter the definition of humour is briefly discussed, followed by research on humour in conversation analysis and classrooms. More specifically, humour is discussed in relation to classroom climate and rapport, as well as

age. Finally, various types of humour related to the categories presented in the data analysis are discussed.

3.1 Defining humour

“Because of the multilayered nature of humor, no single humor theory has been completely satisfactory and thus clinched universal acceptance.” (Polimeni and Reiss 2006:349)

As the above quote explains, no one, universally accepted theory of humour exists. Instead there is a vast amount of different literature on the topic that is impossible to uncover here in its entirety. In general, humour can be described as a “universal human trait” and thus, responding to humour is a part of natural human behaviour (Raskin 1985:2). In other words, the use of humour is a biological attribute that we all possess (Polimeni and Reiss 2006:347). Thus, humour is by no means a new phenomenon and studying humour has already been an area of interest starting from the great names of Plato and Aristotle to Bergson and Freud (Chiaro 1996:1). In addition to the long history, the study of humour is a highly interdisciplinary field. The various disciplines that study humour include psychology, anthropology, sociology, literature, medicine, philosophy, philology, mathematics, education, semiotics and linguistics (Attardo 1994:15). While humour is described as a universal human trait, whether we find something funny or not is not as straightforward, but dependent on a variety of factors. Accordingly, humour seems to be an on-going area of research, where new aspects for study are infinite.

Overall, humour as a term is difficult to define, since it is an interactive and social phenomenon that is highly dependent on the social situation and the people involved in that situation. People tend to laugh more when they are with others than when they are alone, and the ones who laugh alone mostly do so in a situation that imitates a social experience, such as watching television or reading a book (Martin and Kuiper 1999; Morreall 1983; Provine and Fischer 1989). The nature of humour used also depends on the people and situation. A funeral for example is not considered an appropriate place to be humorous in comparison to a birthday party. Also, a humorous conversation between best friends at one of their homes would likely differ from that of a boss and an employee in a conference room. Consequently, the use of humour is also connected to one’s social status. A person with a higher status is more likely to use more humour than someone with a lower status (Robinson and Smith-Lovin 2001, as cited by Anttila

2008:52), such as the boss in comparison to the employee or a teacher in comparison to students. Overall, we seem to weigh the appropriateness of the use of humour according to different social situations and participants' roles and identities in that situation.

3.2 CA and humour

Humour in the field of conversation analysis has been an area of interest from the very beginning of CA studies. One of the founders of conversation analysis, Sacks (1974), analysed the organisation of a dirty joke in conversation and how it is built in story-form. Sacks suggested a sequence organisation for joke telling which included three "serially ordered and adjacently placed" sequences called *the preface*, *the telling* and *the response* (Sacks 1974:337). During the preface sequence, the joke is introduced by the teller of the joke, which is followed by the actual telling of the joke. The joke then gets a response from the hearer. This sequential order suggested by Sacks is based purely on canned jokes that are told in story-form, but as Attardo (1994:300) points out, CA originated from Sacks' work and it is therefore crucial to consider his "influential conception" of joking in conversation.

Another suggestion on the sequence organisation of humour has been introduced by Mulkay (1988) drawing on the research of Drew (1987). Drew looked specifically at teasing sequences in conversation and suggested that teases are "sequentially seconds" and that a teasing sequence is motivated by a *prior turn* from the one who is teased (Drew 1987:233). More importantly, he pointed out that the recipients of teasing often responded in a serious matter even when they knew the tease was intended as humorous (Drew 1987:29). Based on Drew's findings, Mulkay (1988) suggests a three-part structure of teasing sequences: "1) The first speaker (the teased one) presents a comment or action, which 2) motivates the second speaker (the teaser) to present a tease, to which 3) the first speaker replies with a serious response" (Mulkay 1988, as cited by Putkonen 2001:203). Although Sacks' suggestion presented earlier was based on joke telling in the form of a story, a similar structure can be identified in the teasing sequence as it includes three similar parts. Nevertheless, in Sacks' model the first two parts of a joking sequence are presented by the joker, whereas in the teasing sequence the teaser only presents the middle part (the tease), which is both motivated and responded by the one who is teased.

Saharinen (2007:268) describes the three-part teasing sequence (Drew 1987, Mulkay 1988) by comparing it to adjacency pairs and stating that the relationship between a motive and a teasing turn is not as strong as between the two parts of an adjacency pair. This is because a motive turn does not predict or require a tease (Saharinen 2007:268). The produced tease is merely using elements of the preceding turn through for example satirising or adding implicatures (Putkonen 2001:203). Similarly as the adjacency pair, the motive turn and the tease are likely to be produced in subsequent turns (Drew 1987:233-235). However, in a classroom environment teachers' teases can also be motivated by earlier sayings or actions, since the teacher repeatedly comments on students' behaviour because of her institutional role as an assessor (Saharinen 2007:268). Also, the final part of the sequence, the response, is not necessarily produced in a classroom environment due to the unique participation structure and turn-taking organisation (Saharinen 2007:268-269).

Although the present thesis does not concentrate only on teasing, but includes various types of humour, the three-part sequence organisation based on the work of Drew (1987) and Mulkay (1988) is used as a framework in the analysis of various humour sequences. Haapaniemi (2011) used a similar four-part-structure, based on the work of Saharinen (2007) in her study of conversational humour, and proved the sequence structure of teasing to be similar with other types of conversational humour in a classroom environment. Haapaniemi's findings motivated the present study to apply the original three-part-structure to the various extracts of humour. Thus, finding a motive, a tease or in this case any humorous turn, and a response was used as an analytical tool in the present thesis.

3.3 The study of humour in classrooms

Humour in connection to classrooms has been an area of interest around fifty years. Anttila (2008:5-6) states that the studies of humour in connection to school and learning began in the 1960's and the focus was mainly on how humour is connected to the learning process; then, in the 1980's the study of humour began to reach new perspectives, such as studying the effect of humour on motivation or the atmosphere of classrooms. Some studies have also looked at the possible negative effects of humour and in the last few decades, the effect of humour on teacher-student relationships has been a growing area of interest (Anttila 2008:6-7).

The most popular approach to the study of humour in a classroom is quantitative study (Anttila 2008: 7), which involves for example questionnaires that are usually filled by a great number of students and/or teachers. A quantitative study has been conducted by for example Neuliep (1991), who presented a questionnaire to 388 teachers, finding out the teachers' views on the use of classroom humour. He compared the use of humour between high school and college teachers and found differences between the two, which suggests that differences between the uses of humour with different age levels is a worthwhile issue to look into.

In contrast, qualitative studies of humour in classrooms are a more recent phenomenon and conducting interviews has been particularly favoured as a research method. In her study, Anttila (2008) for example used a questionnaire as well as conducted interviews when she looked at upper secondary school students and their views on humour and teachers as users of humour. She found that there are both positive and negative connotations with the use of humour by a teacher in a classroom. In contrast to these studies, the present study is purely qualitative based on CA analysis on different examples of humour. In addition, a teacher interview is included to get an insight on the teacher's views on her humour use.

Studying humour in classrooms through conversation analysis is quite a new area of research. Studies on CA and humour as well as studies on humour in classrooms are frequent, but a combination of all three aspects is a more recent one. Nevertheless, some studies with a focus on specific type of humour that have used conversation analysis as a tool can be found. For example, Saharinen (2007) has looked at teasing as a way to react to pupils' errors during Finnish and literature lessons in upper secondary school. She looked specifically at teacher humour and found the effects to be mostly positive, since pupils seemed to understand the teacher's non-serious intent and thus, teasing worked as an index of closeness.

The master's theses of Roininen (2010) and Haapaniemi (2011) also discuss humour in classrooms through CA analysis. Roininen (2010) looked at upper secondary school EFL lessons and discussed the functions of both teacher and student humour in a classroom. She found that when humour was produced by the teacher or jointly by the teacher and student(s) the effects of humour use were positive. However, when humour

was produced by a student, the effects were both positive and negative. She also had a focus on gender and found that male students were more likely to produce humour than female students. Also, Haapaniemi (2011) investigated the use of a specific type of humour, conversational joking, in CLIL language classrooms in upper secondary school and aimed to find out if joking had a specific sequential organisation, in what contexts joking appeared and what functions it had in those specific contexts. She found that joking is a sequentially organised phenomenon, but has multiple sequential variations. She observed that joking appeared mostly in off-task talk and provided opportunities for students to take turns more freely in conversation as opposed to a serious frame.

3.4 Effects of humour on classroom atmosphere and rapport

Most research suggests that using humour in classrooms has a positive influence on the classroom atmosphere. This is not surprising as generally we find humour to be something positive and scientific research has shown humour to relieve stress, reduce negative emotions and even improve one's physical and mental health (McGhee 2010). In the field of studying classrooms, several studies have proven "teachers' use of humor effective as a means of establishing rapport and developing open, supportive communication climates" (Stuart and Rosenfeld 1994:98). In other words, humour is seen positively both in relation to the atmosphere of the classroom and the teacher-student relationship. Humour provides teachers with "an opportunity to enhance positive interaction in the pedagogical relationship" between the teacher and the students (Spåre 2008). One might consider humour as a mere tool for creating amusement for a short amount of time, but in classrooms it can serve a greater purpose by creating a positive learning environment and enhancing the social relationships between the teacher and his/her students. When used appropriately, the positive outcomes of humour in classrooms are thus beyond brief amusement.

However, because of the multifaceted nature of humour it can also have negative effects on the classroom climate, as well as the teacher-student relationship. Teachers should possess emotional intelligence and before using humour take into consideration how the class or an individual student will react to different kinds of humour (Spåre 2008). As a result of poor consideration, teacher humour might not be understood by the students as funny or amusing, but interpreted as threatening. The study of Anttila (2008) discussed both positive and negative student perceptions of teacher humour and students in her

research experienced that negative teacher humour included demeaning, mocking, humiliations and joking or laughing on someone's expense (Anttila 2008:162). As a result of negative humour, students felt irritated, inferior to other students and even depressed (Anttila 2008:196). Anttila's research reveals that when teacher humour is perceived negatively, it can cause serious negative emotions in students. Whether the target of teacher humour is the whole group or an individual student, these emotions are likely to affect negatively on the atmosphere of the classroom and the teacher-student relationships. Furthermore, they might affect the motivation level of students in connection to learning.

In addition to negative teacher humour, negative effects of student humour are also apparent in classrooms. The use of humour between students might lead to similar negative emotions that were mentioned in Anttila's study. However, when teachers as professionals use humour in classrooms they are unlikely to use humour intentionally in a negative manner, whereas the use of negative humour between students can of course be unintentional, but is often also intentional. The intentional use of negative humour against a student suggests bullying. According to Klein and Kuiper (2006:387) "aggressive humor may often be used against peer victimised children, as one means of maintaining their lowered status within the peer group" and that the "use of aggressive humor could also serve to enhance the bully's morale and entertain the group, thereby maintaining group solidarity." The use of negative or aggressive student humour in classrooms is a serious matter, which demands teachers' attention. Although research on different negative effects of humour in classrooms is far less substantial than the positive, the issue of negative humour, initiated by both teacher and the students, should be taken into consideration.

3.5 Humour in childhood and adolescence

Humour has been studied recently in connection to issues such as gender (e.g. Finney 1994, Holmes 2006, Schnurr and Holmes 2009) and culture (e.g. Kazarian and Martin 2006, Martin and Sullivan 2013), but the connection between humour and a person's age has not attracted as much attention. Nevertheless, some researchers have suggested that our age is connected to what we find amusing. The understanding and use of humour during childhood and adolescence is briefly considered here according to the age of the students involved in the present study, who are 11-12-year-old children and

15-16-year-old teenagers.

How humour works with children has acquired most attention in the field of psychology in relation to cognition. McGhee (1986:28) acknowledges that “the developmental changes in children’s humour reflect underlying cognitive developmental changes.” In other words, when we develop new cognitive skills, as a result we are able to comprehend, appreciate and most likely produce new forms of humour. Studies that look at the development of humour in childhood start with infants by questioning when the capability of experiencing humour appears and continues on to later childhood. One breaking point is after the age of six when simple forms of irony begin to be understood by children (Norrick and Chiaro 2009:XII) and the ability to comprehend riddles and joking that involves double meanings becomes apparent (McGhee 1986:44-45). However, as children age, the enjoyment of these types of jokes seems to decrease (Simons et al. 1986:61). Because of these clear cognitive changes, children seem to be the focus in studying humour in connection to aging, while humour use with other age groups gets less attention.

Simons et al. (1986:66) point out that in adolescence what is seen as humorous is connected to “the child’s ongoing attempts to master current developmental tasks.” Accordingly, what one found to be humorous at a younger age is no longer amusing, but other types of humour begin to be appreciated. However, what kind of humour is appreciated and used during teenage years has not been a popular area of study. As Erickson and Feldstein (2007:266) note “there is limited empirical literature related to adolescents’ use of humor and no standardized humor measures for this population.” The reason might be found in the complexity of adolescent behaviour, as during teenage years different physical changes occur and sexual maturity begins to be reached. What teenagers find funny is linked to their “developmental maturity”: jokes that do not reach the maturity level can be perceived as boring; on the other hand, jokes that are too mature can be found threatening (Simons et al. 1986:66). Sanford and Eder (1984) have looked at adolescent humour in peer interaction in a middle school setting and observed lunch hours. They point out that with adolescents humour is a particularly important tool for socialisation, since it can be used very ambiguously and indirectly to deal with “sensitive topics or issues” such as sexuality or embarrassing behaviour (Sanford and Eder 1984:242-243). The social aspect of humour is also pointed out by McGhee (1979 as cited by Simons et al. 1986:60) who notes that the social factor of humour increases

with the maturity and sophistication level of the child.

In the present study the younger students observed were 11 to 12 year-olds, which means that the possible cognitive changes that affect their understanding and use of humour are not as clear-cut as they would be with younger children. The other group consisted of 15 to 16-year-olds, who fit the description of teenagers or adolescents. However, it is unlikely that jokes of sexual nature (such as the ones in Sanford and Eder's data) will occur in the context of a classroom where a teacher is present. Nevertheless, through the current chapter some insight to the kind of humour appreciated and used by children and teenagers in general can be achieved. However, one should remember that aging is not the only issue affecting humour, but in addition other factors such as individuality, time, social situation and emotions have an effect (Nahemov: 1986:4). These various changing factors complicate the study of humour and aging. In the present thesis the effect of age on humour is considered in depth and other influential factors are only taken into account if they become relevant in and through the unfolding interaction.

3.6 Defining various types of humour

Throughout the study of humour, categories of different types of humour have been explained. However, the categorising of humour types has been criticised, because of the difficulty of distinguishing between different forms of humour. For example, according to Norrick (1993, as cited by Norrick 2003:1338), forms of humour tend to "fade into each other in conversation", which makes it impossible to get a clear distinction between various humour types. Nevertheless, in the present study categories of humour are presented in order to distinguish what types of humour are most typical in a specific social situation of an EFL classroom. In the present chapter, I will briefly introduce the different types of humour identified from the data and explain them through examples of data. The different types of humour include irony, teasing, banter, language play and joking, and they will be introduced below in this order.

3.6.1 Irony

The term irony can refer to multiple issues, but here the term will be used only in reference to verbal irony, excluding for example situational irony. First of all, no one

clear definition of irony exists but some characteristics can be pointed out on the basis of previous research. Different forms of irony refer to the use of ambiguous or implicit utterances which typically involve double meanings (Pirainen-Marsh 2010), since when someone is being ironic they say the opposite of what is meant. In other words, there is a so called metamessage hidden in the speaker's remark (Brackman 1967, as cited by Haiman 1998:18). What makes the phenomenon so puzzling is that it is possible for one to be ironic or sarcastic without giving any signs of insincerity (Haiman 1998:18). Thus, unsuccessful use of irony is quite common and one often needs to point out their use of it afterwards to get their true message understood. Finally, it should be mentioned that the humorous intention of irony or sarcasm works best with a target who shares the same "knowledge of the world" or who is familiar with the "speaker's character and opinions" (Brackman 1967, as cited by Haiman 1998:18). In effect, a certain closeness between the one who uses irony in his/her speech and the target(s) is beneficial in terms of understanding that irony is used for humorous effect.

Furthermore, a subtype of irony referred to as sarcasm is often differentiated from the term irony; however, the differentiation of the two terms is not unproblematic. Multiple studies use the two terms as synonyms, while others attempt to point out their differences. According to Haiman (1998:20) sarcasm is "overt irony intentionally used by the speaker as a form of verbal aggression." In other words, sarcasm is more aggressive and more likely to hurt its target than other simple forms of irony. To avoid confusion, the present thesis will use the term irony to refer to all humour extracts which involve turns with ironic and/or sarcastic intent.

In the present data, nine examples of irony were detected, eight of them initiated by the teacher. Extract 1 takes place during a listening exercise and illustrates one instance of the teacher's way of using irony. The 9th grade students are listening to a chapter from their textbook, during which the teacher occasionally pauses the tape to ask questions about the chapter. The teacher asks a question about tropical forests and a few students, including Aisha, raise their hand. However, Mika self-selects himself as the next speaker and shouts out an answer (line 2). Aisha reacts by raising her voice and overlapping Mika's turn by asking why no one raises their hand to answer anymore. The teacher replies with irony in line 5.

Extract 1
(9th grade)

- 01 Teacher: miks ne on niin tärkeitä maapallolle.
 why are they so important to the world.
- 02 Mika: ne tuottaa happee ja (.) käyttää hiilidiok[sidia.]
 they produce oxygen and use carbon dioxide.
- 03 Aisha: [/MIKS]
 04 ei kukaan täällä enää viittaa. ((looks at the teacher))
 why doesn't anyone raise their hand here anymore.
- 05 Teacher: koska tääl on viitattu? ((looking directly at Aisha, raising her eyebrows))
 when have you raised your hands?
- 06 ((Aisha laughs loudly))
- 07 Mika: \$nii'i.\$
 I agree.

The teacher does not directly answer Aisha's question, but replies with another question, which is presented through irony. Her turn on line 5 implies that the students never raise their hand to answer questions, although it is obvious from the data that most students tend to raise their hand to answer during the lessons. Also, Aisha's question on lines 3-4 implies that students have earlier raised their hands to bid for a turn. Irony can also be detected from the teacher's direct gaze towards Aisha and raising of eyebrows. The teacher's question on line 5 does not seek an answer, but is used ironically to point out how infrequently some students raise their hand during lessons. The ironic turn is produced successfully as it gets a laughing response from Aisha. Also, Mika, who has earlier self-selected himself to answer the teacher's question, replies by agreeing with the teacher's ironic turn (line 7) and thus, suggesting his behaviour was acceptable. Overall, the current extract shows a clear example of irony, since the teacher's turn on line 5 is a rhetorical question which contains a metamessage, humoristically implying the students do not usually raise their hands to answer.

3.6.2 Teasing

Teasing is "intentional provocation accompanied by playful off-record markers that together comment on something relevant to the target" (Keltner et al. 2001:229). This definition by Keltner et al. intends to give a neutral view of teasing. Nevertheless, teasing can easily act both as a positive and a negative type of humour. The difference between what is considered to be good natured teasing and when teasing starts to

resemble bullying is difficult to differentiate (Keltner et al. 2001:229-248). One reason for this might be that teasing has a clear target (Lilja 2010:236), which means that it is directed at a certain individual and thus, is highly personal. Even when teasing is intended as positive, the recipient can choose to interpret the tease in a negative manner and be offended.

In the data gathered for the present study, teasing was a common type of humour in the classroom. Nine examples of teasing were found in the data and they were initiated by both the teacher and the students. The following example is from a 5th grade lesson and the teasing it illustrates is initiated by the teacher. The teacher asks how much time they have left before the class ends, and starts walking to the back of the class to see the classroom clock. Minna suggests she can check the time while taking out her mobile phone (line 3). The teacher then teases Minna by saying she found a good excuse to take out her phone (line 5).

Extract 2
(5th grade, group 2)

- 01 Teacher: okay. paljos meillä nyt on aikaa. ((gets up from her seat and walks
02 towards the back of the class to see the class clock))
okay. how much time do we have now.
- 03 Minna: >mää voin kattoo.< ((takes out her mobile phone))
I can take a look.
04 (2.3)
- 05 Teacher: sait hyvän tekosyn ottaa kännykän esille. ((looks at Minna and
06 then the clock on the wall))
you got the perfect excuse to take out your phone.
- 07 (1.2) (((Minna smiles, a few other girls around her also smile. All students
08 are looking towards Minna.))
- 09 Minna: \$kaheksan minuuttia.\$ ((puts the phone back to her pocket))
eight minutes.

There is a clock on the wall of the classroom that is visible to the students, but not the teacher, which is why the teacher asks the time and starts walking to the back of the class to see the clock. Minna is thus able to see the clock and has no reason to take out her phone to check time. Nevertheless, she does check her phone (line 3). The teacher most likely recognises that Minna is ignoring the class clock that is visible to her and teases her about using a phone during class (line 5). The teacher does not accept the use of phones during her classes, but as Minna's intention is to answer the teacher's question by checking the time, the teacher treats her actions humorously through teasing

instead of asking Minna to put her phone away. Minna responds to the teacher's remark by smiling and then laughingly answers that they have eight minutes of time left (line 9). She immediately puts her phone back to her pocket and the teacher suggests an assignment (not shown in the transcript). As Minna puts her phone away, there is no reason for the teacher to further notify about the use of phones during class and the lesson can continue normally. The current extract shows a simple, good natured tease on line 5, which has a clear target. It is motivated by Minna's preceding turn and action, which is against the school rules (using a phone during class). Thus, the teacher's tease is connected to the school environment and hierarchical roles of a student and a teacher.

3.6.3 Banter

Banter is a term for a more specific type of teasing where the teasing happens back and forth. It might be called "a match of verbal ping-pong played by the two (or more) interlocutors within a jocular mode" (Dynel 2008:243-244). Mostly in teasing the recipient does not "play along" (Drew 1987:219), but in banter the target is expected to participate in the bantering, which usually starts by focusing on some habit or characteristic of the recipient (Plester and Sayers 2007:159). The banter stops when one of the participants "runs out of ideas to outdo the other" (Dynel 2008:244). According to Plester and Sayers (2007:158) "the intention of banter is to create and reinforce relationship through social acceptance-friendship strategies." However, if the intention of banter fails and the recipient does not respond, then banter can easily have negative effects (Plester and Sayers 2007:159). One might say that when unsuccessful, banter turns into negative teasing.

In the present data, banter was evident only between students and particularly students who sat next to each other or close to one another and seemed to be friends. Five examples of banter were found in the data. The following example occurred during a 9th grade lesson, as the students were expected to work on an exercise independently. Mika and Lasse, who sat next to each other and seemed to be close friends, began to engage in banter, which was interrupted by the teacher (line 6). After the interruption Mika and Lasse started whispering, and parts of their speech could not be heard. However, enough was preserved to analyse the excerpt as banter.

Extract 3
(9th grade)

- 01 Mika: oon kyl selkeesti fiksumpi ku sä. ((looks at Lasse’s workbook))
I’m clearly smarter than you.
- 02 Lasse: et sä oo mikää fiksu, esität vaa. ((pokes Mika with his elbow))
you’re not smart, it’s just an act.
- 03 Mika: \$SIIS mä havaitsen nyt (.) sellasta kateuden tuulta pohjoisesta päin.\$
04 ((looks at the teacher))
like I’m detecting now a wind of jealousy from the north.
- 05 Lasse: \$m(h)iks pohjosesta. pohjosesta ei puhalla kyl tällä hetkellä mikään tuuli.\$
why from north. there is no wind coming from the north now.
- 06 Teacher: NONII Mika ja Lasse, sopikaa riitanne siellä.
ok Mika and Lasse, stop your argument and make peace.
- 07 Mika: sovitaan riitamme. ((reaches out his hand to Lasse for a handshake))
let’s make peace.
- 08 ((Lasse looks at Mika’s hand in disgust and moves further))
- 09 Lasse: *jos et ota sitä sun kättä siitä ni ei ainakaan. tai ehkä mä (--)* ((making
10 exaggerated angry facial expressions))
if you don’t remove your hand then we won’t. or maybe I.
- 11 Mika: *\$nii (--)\$*((raising his eyebrows, looking annoyed))
yeah.
- 12 Lasse: *sä oot tollane kauhee selittelijä. voisit ees yrittää käyttäytyä.* ((leaning
13 towards Mika, squinting his eyes))
you’re always making excuses. you could at least try to behave.

The banter extract begins when Mika leans towards Lasse to look at his workbook and something Mika sees in the workbook motivates him to present the first tease. Mika teases Lasse by claiming to be smarter than him, mocking Lasse’s intelligence (line 1). Lasse responds with another tease, saying Mika’s smartness is “just an act” and thus, their conversation proceeds as banter, where interaction plays an important role as each tease motivates the next. In lines 3-4 the effect of a classroom environment becomes evident as Mika seeks recognition from the teacher by looking at her while producing his turn. The teacher intervenes in the discussion and asks Mika and Lasse to “make peace” (line 6). The teacher might be motivated to intervene because of Mika’s preceding turn and gaze, but also, the fact that Mika and Lasse speak very loudly and are disturbing other students from focusing on their work.

Mika reacts to the teacher’s turn slightly humorously by reaching out his hand to Lasse for a peace offering (line 7). Lasse refuses the gesture and reacts strongly by moving

further from Mika and looking at Mika's hand in disgust. He then continues with the banter, lowering his voice to avoid attention from the teacher but exaggerating angry facial expressions (lines 9-10). The facial expressions shown in the extract reveal that both Lasse and Mika are producing their turns in humour mode. However, after a few turns the bantering stops as Lasse presents a final tease (lines 12-13) and Mika no longer replies, but starts focusing on the exercise they are expected to do. As Dynel (2008:244) suggests, banter often stops when one of the participants "runs out of ideas". However, here the classroom environment is also a factor, since after the teacher intervenes the conversation between Mika and Lasse, they lower their voices and only a few turns are produced before they both start focusing on the exercise they are supposed to do. Overall, the present extract is a clear example of banter, since teases are consecutively produced by two people. The smiles and humorous facial expressions of Mika and Lasse reveal their discussion to be produced in humour mode.

3.6.4 Language play

Language play can be defined in various ways. In linguistic terms it refers to "the conscious repetition or modification of linguistic forms, such as lexemes or syntactic patterns" (Belz 2002:16). However, in relation to interaction, Lilja (2010:236) defines language play as paying particular attention to a certain feature of language and then targeting the feature humorously. In the present data, interaction and humour are key words and thus, the term language play is presented through the latter definition. Also, language play is a particularly interesting area of study in language classrooms, since playing with words and their meanings can be a very typical type of interaction for students in this specific context (Pitkänen-Huhta 2003:245). Language play has a significant role in classrooms and particularly in language learning, since it can increase the awareness and knowledge of different structures of a language (Lilja 2010:265) and as a result, enhance language learning.

In the present data only student initiated language play was observed. Overall, six examples of language play were evident. The following example is from a 9th grade lesson, where the teacher is going through the vocabulary of a specific chapter and asking students for translations. Overlapping the teacher's speech, Mika and Lasse are talking privately to one another about the vocabulary. Mika pays attention to the literal Finnish translation of the word *greenhouse effect* (line 1) and Lasse points out the

multiple meanings of the word *guinea pig*, in addition to their textbook translation “a test subject” (line 2). As the teacher is trying to speak to the whole class, she shouts to Mika and Lasse to get them to quiet down, but after Mika explains their topic of conversation the teacher compliments him.

Extract 4
(9th grade)

- 01 Mika: outo toi greenhouse effect. (.) vihreä talo efekti. \$he he.\$
that word greenhouse effect is weird. “vihreä talo efekti” (literal translation).
- 02 Lasse: niinpä. (0.8) guinea pig on kans outo ku se on myös marsu. (.) ja miks siinä
03 on se <guinea>, \$eiks guinea oo maa.\$
I know. guinea pig is also weird cause it refers to a guinea pig (the animal). and why is there guinea in it, isn't guinea a country.
- 04 Teacher: Mika ja Lasse hei=
Mika and Lasse hey.
- 05 Mika: =meillä oli aiheeseen liittyvää.
we had something relating to the topic.
- 06 Teacher: no::, mihinkäs tulokseen te nyt tulitte.
well, what conclusion did you reach.
- 07 Mika: kasvihuoneilmiö eli greenhouse effect. (.) eiks se oo niinku vihreä talo
08 efekti.
greenhouse effect. isnt that like “vihreä talo efekti” (literal translation).
- 09 Teacher: /kyllä. (1.2) juuri tämä on hyvä juttu Mika, et kaikki tällaset muistisäännöt
10 ja hassut lauseet tai käännökset ja vihreä talo efektit. teidän pitää käyttää ne
11 hyödyksi että omaksuisitte mahdollisimman paljon sanastoo.
yes. this is a good thing Mika, that you use all these types of memory rules and funny clauses or translations and “vihreä talo efektit” (literal translation) you need to use these to your advantage, so you can acquire the vocabulary as well as possible.

The current example shows how direct translations from L2 to L1 and multiple meanings of words can work as learning tools when Mika and Lasse humorously target words. Mika and Lasse find the words amusing, but the teacher considers their observations as enhancing learning. As the teacher implies on lines 9-11, paying attention to the humorous forms and features of language enhances memorising English words and clauses and through that they become easier to learn. From all the different categories of humour, language play seems the most direct way to enhance learning when we discuss EFL lessons in particular, since language play has a clear connection to language teaching and learning, while other types of humour are more connected to the social aspect of humour. The current extract is a clear example of language play,

since Mika and Lasse pay close attention to two English word forms and target them humorously. Also, the significance to language learning is pointed out by the teacher.

3.6.5 Joking

Joking is the most abstract of the types of humour presented here. It can be divided in to two categories: **conversational jokes** and **canned jokes**. The term conversational joking could be used as an umbrella term for all the different types of humour presented here (irony, teasing, banter, language play), since it includes all different “forms and strategies” that result in laughter from the target(s) (Norrick 1993: 409). By contrast, a canned joke can be defined as “used before the time of the utterance in a form similar to that used by the speaker [...]” (Attardo 1994:295-296). In other words, a canned joke uses a familiar joke frame to create amusement. One clear example of canned joking is a knock-knock joke, where the target knows the intention of the speaker, since it is produced in a familiar frame. Canned jokes are used less freely than conversational jokes, since they are often considered to be inappropriate in formal contexts (Attardo 1994:297-298). With the term joking in the present study I will now on refer only to the more infrequent canned joking that uses familiar joke frames to create humour. In the present data, this type of joking was rare and only one example was detected from a 5th grade lesson; for the example see chapter 5.5. Before presenting a more detailed analysis of the different humour types that occurred in the data, I will introduce the goals of my research and the methods used to obtain the results.

4 THE PRESENT STUDY

Through video recording and a teacher interview, the present qualitative case study aims to get a deeper look into the use of humour in 5th grade and 9th grade EFL (English-as-foreign-language) classrooms taught by the same teacher. More information of the study is provided in the current chapter where I will present the research questions, followed by methods of data collection and description of data, which includes a description of the participants and lesson activities. The final section presents the analytic methods and procedure.

4.1 Research questions

The current study is interested in humour as an interactive phenomenon occurring in the specific social environment of EFL classrooms. The topic for the study was chosen before collecting the data with an interest to compare the use of humour in elementary and secondary school lessons. However, after collecting the data and starting the analysis, the research questions of the study were revised and more specific foci were chosen. As Lilja (2011:70) points out, specific research questions of a CA study can only be fully determined after the collection and initial analysis of the data. When recording authentic interaction one can never know the content of the material before the actual data collection. For example, the initial idea of the present study was to focus on the teacher's use of humour, but after collecting the data it became evident that many humour extracts were initiated by students. As a result, student initiated humour was also included in the study. Thus, the final research questions of the study are:

1. What different types of humour occur in EFL classrooms?
 - A. What types of teacher initiated humour can be detected?
 - B. What types of student initiated humour can be detected?
2. Are there differences in the quantity or content of humour used in 5th grade elementary school lessons compared to 9th grade secondary school lessons?
3. How does the use of humour affect the atmosphere of the classroom?
4. How do the teacher's views on humour use connect with her actual practices during the lessons?

Because humour is such a multifaceted concept, the study begun with looking broadly at different types of humour that were found in the data. The purpose was to find out what kind of humour could be detected by observing the lessons. The examples of different types of humour included for example irony and teasing. Next, both teacher and student initiated humour was looked at in each lesson to detect possible differences between student and teacher initiated humour use. The study then moved on to compare differences in both quantity and content between the use of humour in elementary school and secondary school. That is, whether 5th graders produced different kind of humour than 9th graders and more importantly, whether the teacher used humour differently with the two age groups. Also, the possible effect of humour on the atmosphere of the classroom was considered – whether it creates expected amusement

or negative reactions, such as a student being offended. Finally, the use of humour during the different lessons was looked at in relation to the teacher's interview answers and whether her views on humour corresponded to the lesson observations.

4.2 Methods of data collection

Two research methods were used in the present study: Conversation analysis (which was further explained in chapter 2) for the recorded lessons and content analysis for the thematic teacher interview. Conversation analysis was chosen as a method, since it seemed ideal for studying the interactional phenomenon of humour in classrooms. CA has an emic interest in "the procedural infrastructure of situated action" (ten Have 2007:35), which allows a deeper look not only to the language use, but how sequences of interaction are constructed in a specific language classroom. In other words, the results of the current study are based on an analysis of the interaction and activities of the participants. Different categories of humour are analysed based on the participants' verbal and nonverbal actions, which reveal how the specific sequences of humour develop in interaction in the specific context of a language classroom. In addition to the detailed conversation analytic view, a thematic interview was conducted after the recordings. It gave information on the teacher's views of humour and allowed the comparison of those views to the actual practices used during the different lessons. The interview was analysed using content analysis, since the focus shifted to what is said instead of to how it is produced. Overall, the use of the two methods helped gain a detailed view of how humour presented itself during specific lessons and how it was viewed by the teacher of those lessons.

Both audio and video recording are used to collect data for CA analysis, but when compared audio recordings are very limited and do not show any nonverbal characteristics (Hutchby and Wooffit 1998:73). Also, Nikula and Kääntä (2011:58) acknowledge that in addition to speech it is very important to pay attention to nonverbal actions in classroom interaction. The physical activities of the participants, such as nodding or which student the teacher is looking at during interaction, play a significant role in how classroom interaction works. Thus, I chose to video record the lessons since it allowed me to take into account the participants' nonverbal interaction and material activity that would not be seen if one simply used an audio recorder. Two video cameras were used with each group, one at the front of the classroom and one at the

back to get clear material and to make sure that all students could be seen and their voices could be heard in the video. Thus, speakers were easy to identify based on the recordings. Also, video recording made the data re-accessible, which helped identify specific instances that the participants found humorous and more importantly, enabled detailed conversation analytical study of the phenomenon.

However, the idea to video record natural authentic interaction is not straightforward. A term called *observer's paradox* (Labov 1972) or later referred to as the *observer's effect* has been used to describe the effect of the researcher on the environment: "There is always an observer's effect, and it is essential to realize that: you are never observing an event as if you were not there. You are there, and that makes it a different event." (Blommaert 2010:27). As a researcher I take no part in the lesson, but am only there to observe. Nonetheless, as Blommaert notes, the teacher and students are aware of my presence and the video cameras recording around them, since these are not part of their normal lessons. During the recordings of the present data some students glanced at the camera every now and then or did funny faces knowing that they were recorded. The teacher also acknowledged being recorded and made explicit remarks of the cameras, one of which can be seen in extract 14 in the section of language play. However, everyone seemed to relax and forget the presence of the cameras at some point. The topic of the current study was not revealed to the participants until after the lesson recordings to prevent any influence on the material. However, this might have had a negative effect as well: The teacher admitted during the interview that she was trying to "act serious for once" during the recorded lessons and wished she had used more humour now that she knew my focus. Overall, the participants' awareness of being recorded is worthwhile to keep in mind when doing fieldwork and observing interactions such as in a CA study, where the focus is on authentic interaction.

In addition to observing and video recording lessons, the teacher was asked to participate in a thematic interview to provide information of her thoughts on the use of humour in teaching and specifically in her lessons. A thematic interview falls between structured and open interviews, where questions are asked through different topics (Hirsjärvi, Remes and Sajavaara 2004:195). As Hirsjärvi and Hurme (1980:56) note, a thematic interview allows the interviewer to further continue and deepen the conversation with the interviewee through the different topics that are chosen. Thus, for the current qualitative study this type of interview seemed appropriate. Prior to the

interview different examples of humour were identified and transcribed from the recorded data and research questions of the study were updated. The reason for conducting the thematic interview after an initial analysis was to get a clear view of what kind of humorous instances the data comprised and thus, be able to prepare appropriate topics and interview questions to discuss with the teacher. (Interview questions can be found in Appendix 3.) The interview was done in Finnish to create a natural speech environment and to get sufficient information. Also, an audio recorder was used during the interview to record the conversation instead of relying strictly on notes. Through the recording I was able to do a specific transcription of the interview, which was vital when analysing the data.

4.3 Description of data

The data collected for the present study comprised of four 45 minute EFL lessons, two 5th grade elementary school lessons and two 9th grade secondary school lessons. The 5th grade was divided into two separate groups, which means that eventually three different groups were observed. The language used in both EFL lessons was mostly the teacher's and students' L1, Finnish. English can mainly be described as the subject of study instead of being used as a language of instruction. In addition to the recordings, a 25-minute thematic interview was conducted with the teacher of the lessons. The two school grades, 5th and 9th, were chosen according to the teacher's schedule. Also, high interactivity of the lessons was ensured, since in order to conduct a CA study a certain amount of interaction is required to obtain appropriate data. All lessons were observed and video recorded in the spring of 2013 in a coeducational school in Finland and the interview with the teacher was conducted two months after the recordings. Next, I will explain how participants for the present study were acquired and what the number and gender distribution of each group was. The classroom activities of different EFL lessons are also described.

4.3.1 Participants

The teacher and students who agreed to take part in the current study were found through sending e-mails to the headmasters of several coeducational schools in central and southern Finland which have both elementary and secondary school students and teach grades 1-9. I asked the headmasters of the schools if they had any English teachers

teaching both elementary and secondary school students and to forward my message to those teachers. Finally, an EFL teacher contacted me from central Finland and agreed to take part in my study. I set a date to collect the data, after which necessary consents from the headmaster, teacher and all students, including their guardians, to take part in the study were acquired (see Appendix 1). Signed informed consent forms from all participants and the headmaster ensured that the ethical requirements of a study involving under aged children were fulfilled. Before collecting the data, the participants were told that the focus of the study they took part in was on classroom interaction; however, the specific topic of the study (humour) was not revealed before the video recordings were made to avoid any possible effect on the interaction.

Originally the plan was to observe two groups (one elementary and one secondary), but due to a late realisation that one class was divided into two, three groups were observed. The 5th graders I observed were part of the same class, which was divided into two different English groups. In the first group there were 11 students, but four students did not have the necessary consents and were left out from the video recording. Accordingly, seven students were recorded: four girls and three boys. In the second group of 5th graders there were 12 students, but two students did not want to take part in the study and were left out of the material. Thus, in the second group ten students were recorded: six girls and four boys. The 9th grade that was observed included 19 students, excluding three students who did not wish to be recorded. Accordingly, 16 students were recorded: five girls and eleven boys. All lessons were taught by the same teacher, a 57-year-old woman who had around 20 years of experience in teaching Swedish and English. Table 1 is presented for clarification:

TABLE 1. The student participants of the current study.
(All taught by the same female teacher.)

Class	5th grade (group 1)	5th grade (group 2)	9th grade
Number of students (recorded)	7	10	16
Girls	4	6	5
Boys	3	4	11

The 5th grade students were 11 to 12-year-olds and the 9th grade students 15 to 16-year-olds. The students in all groups were mostly Finnish including a few immigrants. In order to protect the identities of the participants, the names of students were altered and

the teacher was referred to as “Teacher” to separate her clearly from the students. The students who declined to take part in the study were positioned at the back-end corner of the classroom and were not filmed, and their turns at talk captured by the cameras were not included in transcripts.

4.3.2 Lesson activities

Due to the interactive approach of the study, prior to data collection the teacher was asked to confirm that the lessons that I would observe and record would be mostly teacher-led, since in teacher-led lessons the conversations happen mostly between the teacher and the class instead of between students for example. In other words, teacher-led whole class activities ensured that there was as much interaction between the teacher and students as possible. Teacher-led work was a significant part of the lesson structures, but other types of activities were also apparent in both 5th grade and 9th grade lessons.

The 5th grade observed was divided into two different groups and the content of the two lessons was highly similar as the same topics were covered with both groups. Both lessons had teacher-led activities, pair/group work and individual work. Teacher-led activities included plenary teaching, checking homework, doing and checking various exercises including a listening comprehension task and discussions related to teaching, but also social chat. Pair/group work was used when playing an interactive question and answer game in the textbook. Students also worked individually on different exercises during the lesson while the teacher circled around the classroom answering possible questions.

In the 9th grade lessons similar classroom activities were observed comprising of teacher-led work, group work and individual work. Checking of homework, going through vocabulary and listening to a chapter from the textbook while asking questions were the main teacher-led activities during the lessons. In group work the students wrote summaries on different parts of the chapter and later shared them with the whole class. Also, various exercises were done individually while the teacher was pacing around the classroom providing help if needed. In addition to different teaching-related activities, social chat had a significant role in the 9th grade lessons both during and in-between the lesson activities. The students were eager to move away from the teaching

related topics and to get engaged in social chat with other students, but also with the teacher.

4.4 Data analysis

As described above, most of the data of the present thesis consist of video recorded lessons. After the lessons were recorded, the material was fully transcribed and reviewed multiple times to detect different examples of humour. Once all instances of humour had been identified from the data, they were then further analysed, compared and finally divided into the different humour categories, such as irony and teasing. Humour categories were pointed out at this late stage, since as Neuliep (1991:345) suggests, coming up with categories before the data collection could have made some of the examples "unclassifiable", which is not profitable. It can lead to marking items as "other" or not getting enough data (ibid.). However, even when done after data collection, the categorisation of humour examples was somewhat problematic.

Distinguishing between different humour types is sometimes difficult, since the qualities of different humour types can overlap (Norrick 1993, as cited by Norrick 2003:1338). In the current thesis, definitions of humour categories presented earlier in chapter 3.6 were used to help differentiate between the various terms. Overall, 29 examples of humour under the categories of irony, teasing, banter, language play and joking were found in the data. To show both grades' distribution between humour types and whether humour was initiated by the students or the teacher, tables 2 and 3 are presented below:

TABLE 2. The different types of humour detected during 5th grade lessons.

	Irony	Teasing	Banter	Language play	Joking
Student initiated	-	2	2	2	1
Teacher initiated	1	4	-	-	-
TOTAL	1	6	2	2	1

TABLE 3. The different types of humour detected during 9th grade lessons.

	Irony	Teasing	Banter	Language play	Joking
Student initiated	1	3	3	4	-
Teacher initiated	7	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	8	3	3	4	-

From the different humour categories, examples of language play and joking were the easiest to detect, because of their clear, simple definitions. Most overlap could be seen between the categories of irony, teasing and banter, since all share similar qualities. Examples of irony are often presented in a teasing manner, which means they can be identified as ironic teases and thus, belonging to two categories. Also, banter belongs under the umbrella term of teasing and in addition, it can occasionally be ironic. In the current thesis, differentiating between the terms was done on the basis of the most evident character or trait of the extract. In other words, examples with clear ironic intent, saying the opposite of what one means, were presented under irony and examples with clear banter qualities, back-and-forth teasing, were presented under banter. Finally, the more neutral examples of teases were analysed as teasing. However, to avoid confusion, clear overlaps with another category of humour in specific extracts are pointed out in the analysis section.

After examples of various types of humour were differentiated, 15 most descriptive extracts were included in the present thesis: four to help define the categories of humour and 11 for further analysis. Detailed transcripts of each extract, using the transcription conventions of CA (see Appendix 2) were written down, showing information of talk such as overlapping turns, laughter, changes in voice, but also nonverbal qualities of interaction. The final extracts that were included in the thesis were chosen on the basis of the most typical and interesting examples, but exceptions were also pointed out. Each extract was reviewed multiple times to enable a detailed analysis, since each viewing of the extract tended to reveal new aspects for analysis.

Prior to the analysis of the extracts of humour, a language issue was considered. As L1 was the language of instruction during all the observed lessons, the final extracts included in the analysis section were translated into English. However, the translations are idiomatic and do not include the transcription conventions of conversation analysis included in the original transcripts. As ten Have (2007:110) points out, it is most important to provide the reader with as much information on the original talk as possible. Translations are only subsidiary and when the two language systems used differ greatly, such as Finnish and English, it can be intensely difficult and time consuming to provide a “morpheme-by morpheme gloss” equivalent to the original

interaction (ten Have 2007:110). Thus, the current thesis provides only free translations of the humour extracts.

In the analysis of humour extracts, close attention was paid to the construction of humour sequences in order to point out who initiated humour and to analyse the different types of humour used. Principles of CA were applied in the analysis and the different organisation structures including turn-taking, sequence organisation and repair organisation were taken into consideration. Also, a three-part sequence structure suggested in the works of Drew (1987) and Mulkay (1988) was used as an analytical tool to point out possible motives and responses, to identify humorous turns in the extracts and help construct a coherent analysis. Although the initial use of this framework was limited to teasing, it was proved in the work of Haapaniemi (2011) that the sequence structure is also applicable to other types of conversational humour. Thus, it was used in the present thesis in the form of *motive - humorous turn - response*. Defining this tree-part sequence structure within each humour extract was used to get a clearer view of how humour is built in interaction in the specific context of a language classroom.

In addition to the video recorded lessons, the data of the current thesis included a 25-minute audio recorded interview with the teacher. Similar to the lessons, the interview was fully transcribed before its content was analysed. However, qualitative content analysis was applied as a method instead of conversation analysis, since the emphasis in the interview was in the teacher's opinions and comparing them to the observations, instead of how she presented her views. According to Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009:103) content analysis aims to give a condensed, general description of the studied phenomenon. Three types of content analysis have been differentiated by Eskola (2001:135-140): data-based, theory-guided and theory-based (Finn. aineistolähtöinen, teoriaohjaava ja teorialähtöinen analyysi). In the present study, theory-guided analysis was chosen as the analytic method for the interview. This approach relies mostly on information preserved from the data, but previous research can be used to guide the process of analysis (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009:96-97). The method is appropriate for the teacher interview, since the questions are more or less connected to the previously acquired content of the recorded lessons. Excerpts of the interview are included in chapter 6 and analysed in relation to the teacher's perceptions of humour and how they connect with the lesson recordings. Before discussing the interview, the analysis of the

different humour excerpts acquired from the data is presented.

5 TYPES OF STUDENT AND TEACHER HUMOUR IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL LESSONS

The current chapter presents the different types of humour that occurred in the classroom data starting from the most frequent categories of teasing and irony, to the less frequent banter and language play and finally, the rare use of canned joking. Each category of humour is briefly explained before presenting the examples of data (for more specific explanations see chapter 3.6). The chosen data extracts were found to be most descriptive of different humour categories. Through these extracts both teacher and student initiated humour examples are explained and described in all the categories when applicable, followed by an analysis of the particular humour use. A three-part sequential structure initially limited to teasing (Drew 1987, Mulkay 1988), but here applied to all types of humour is used as an analytical tool whenever possible to differentiate a three-part sequence structure of a motive, a humorous turn and a response in the extracts.

5.1 The use of irony in teaching

Irony and sarcasm refer to saying the opposite of what is meant; however, the target should understand the intention of insincerity in order to receive a successful response (Brackman 1967, as cited by Haiman 1998:18). One example of student initiated irony and eight examples of teacher initiated irony were identified from the 9th grade lessons (see table 3). Only one example of irony was apparent in the 5th grade lessons, which was teacher initiated and not understood by all the students.

Extract 5 is from a 9th grade lesson that includes teacher initiated irony. The school has a policy of reusing their textbooks, which means the students who start 9th grade the following year will get the same books that are now used by this class. Before this excerpt the teacher has told the students to work individually on an exercise. Nadia explains to Aisha how after they have checked their homework she has erased the right answers from her textbook and intentionally replaced them with wrong answers. Aisha finds this humorous and begins to explain Nadia's behaviour to the teacher (line 1). The

teacher replies ironically by telling Nadia she is a “wonderful person” for acting the way she did; thus, giving her a compliment she does not deserve.

Extract 5
(9th grade)

- 01 Aisha: >\$arvaa mitä toi oli tehny.\$< ((looks at the teacher. Nadia laughs)))
guess what she did.
02 (1.2)
- 03 Aisha: >\$sillä oli kirjassa kaikki oikeet vastaukset. (.) sit ku se oli vastannu sulle,
04 se oli pyyhkiny ja pistäny noihin väärät vastaukset [siihen tilalle.]\$<
she had all the right answers in her book. after she answered you she
erased them and wrote wrong answers.
- 05 Nadia: [\$no en mä] halunnu et
06 ne vastaa oikein. he he.\$ ((looks at the teacher))
well I didn't want them to answer correctly. he he.
- 07 ((the teacher smiles slightly at Nadia while nodding her head and raising
08 her eyebrows))
- 09 Teacher: \$sä oot kyllä (.) /hie:no ihminen.\$ ((browsing through a textbook))
aren't you a wonderful person.
- 10 Nadia: \$he he. e(h)n ees oo.\$ ((looks at her desk))
he he. I'm not really.
11 (2.4)
- 12 Teacher: <seuraavan vuoden ysit> (.) ketäs ne on. ((looks at Nadia and Aisha))
next year's ninth graders, who are they.
- 13 Aisha: >eiks ne oo ne< (1.1) \$Ahmed Ahne.\$ ((looks at Nadia))
aren't they the. Ahmed Ahne.
- 14 Teacher: \$Ahmed Ahne ja kumppanit. SITTEN NÄKEE VÄÄRÄT VASTAUKSET
15 SIELTÄ JA VASTAILEE VÄÄRIN.\$ ((looks at Nadia and Aisha))
Ahmed Ahne and his crew. they see the wrong answers from your book
and answer incorrectly.
16 ((Aisha and Nadia laugh))

In this extract Nadia's actions are explained by Aisha on lines 1-4 and Nadia's turn *no en mä halunnu et ne vastaa oikein*. (“well I didn't want them to answer correctly.”) on lines 5-6 both act as motive for the teacher's ironic reaction. Nadia replacing her correct answers in the textbook with wrong ones in an attempt to trick next year's students is not something that deserves a compliment and Nadia's actions are unlikely to be truthfully appreciated by the teacher. Thus, the teacher's turn on line 9 that refers to Nadia as “a wonderful person” is presented ironically. In other words, the teacher means the opposite of what she is saying and instead of stating her opinion directly, she uses a humorous response. Nadia recognises the teacher's humorous intent, which is revealed

by her laughing response. Accordingly, the humour sequence is built through the various turns and reactions of the participants.

As Putkonen (2001:201-202) points out, there are various signals that allow us to detect humour in speech, including the most obvious smiles and laughter, but also other contextual clues. Although Putkonen's study focuses on teasing, similar clues are evident in irony and thus, can be found in the current extract. On lines 7-8, the teacher reacts by slightly smiling towards Nadia while nodding her head and raising her eyebrows. This facial expression is significant, since it shows how the teacher does not approve what Nadia has done, but yet she is amused by her actions. When the teacher reacts verbally she is still smiling and her tone of voice and the sentence structure of her turn *sä oot kyllä hieno ihminen*. on line 9 also indicate the use of irony. Later on lines 12 and 14-15 the teacher further explains that Nadia's actions will lead to the future 9th graders to answer incorrectly, which means she fully recognises Nadia's intention to mislead the students, but instead of directly scolding Nadia, the teacher has reacted ironically.

The response that the teacher's ironic turn gets from Nadia reveals the successful use of irony. By laughing Nadia clearly recognises the teacher's turn as irony, but interestingly she also reacts by verbally denying the teacher's ironic compliment by producing a literal response to it on line 10. This could easily be interpreted as a misunderstanding of the irony if the response was produced seriously. However, Nadia produces her turn laughingly, which indicates she is aware of the irony and her response is not serious but humoristic. In the extract above, irony is used successfully and gets an appropriate response; however this is not always the case. As will be seen from the following examples, the use of irony does not necessarily get a clear response and the intent is not always understood by the target.

In the current data, irony was mostly initiated by the teacher; however, one example of student initiated irony was detected in the beginning of a 9th grade lesson as homework was being checked. Being the only example of student initiated irony in the data, it is interesting how the target in the extract is not the teacher, but another student. Before the turns presented here, the teacher has asked students to take out their workbooks and show her that they have done their homework. Aisha responds by saying she is not sure whether she remembered to do hers. While the teacher circulates the class checking the

homework, Aisha looks for the right page in her workbook and as she realises she has done her homework, she seeks for the teacher's attention and yells out to her (line 1). Mika, who is sitting behind Aisha, ironically comments how excellent work Aisha has done. The teacher compliments Aisha (line 5) and she replies by a thank you. They both seem to ignore Mika. Mika produces another ironic remark on line 7.

Extract 6
(9th grade)

- 01 Aisha: OPE KATO. oon mäa sittenki tehny. ((holds out her workbook to the
02 teacher))
teacher look, I've done it after all.
- 03 Mika: aivan /erinomaista. ((a high pitched voice, leaning towards Aisha))
that's excellent.
- 04 (1.8) ((the teacher walks up to Aisha))
- 05 Teacher: hy:vä. ((looks at Aisha's workbook and taps her on the shoulder)
good.
- 06 Aisha: \$kiitos ope.\$ ((claps her hands))
thank you teacher.
- 07 Mika: aika fiksua.
that's quite clever.

In this extract Aisha and the teacher interact in a two-party conversation. While the teacher is going around the class Aisha self-selects herself as the speaker and shouts out to the teacher seeking her attention and pointing out she has done her homework unlike she had earlier suspected. Before the teacher has time to walk up to Aisha and respond, Mika interferes by making an ironic remark on line 3. Mika's ironic turn is motivated by Aisha's turn on line 1, where she seeks recognition from the teacher. Aisha wants attention and a possible compliment from the teacher for doing her homework and being a good student. Mika reacts to this by giving Aisha an ironic compliment on line 3. It is evident that Mika does not mean what he is saying: although Mika shows no signs of smile or laughter, he changes his voice to a more high-pitched one, indicating that the turn is non-serious. He seems to mimic the role of a teacher, commenting on Aisha's performance before the real teacher has a chance to react to Aisha's turn. This is called fictional referencing (Finn. kuvitteellinen referointi) which can often be interpreted as ironic (Putkonen 2001:215) and so it also appears in the current example. Produced in the form of a compliment, Mika's turn suggests that he is repositioning himself as the teacher. This phenomenon referred to as subteaching is produced in the current example

for humorous intent, but is also common in more serious pupil-run group-work (Tholander and Aronsson 2003).

Mika's ironic comment gets no clear response from Aisha or the teacher. The teacher simply responds to Aisha by complimenting her on doing her homework (line 5) and in return Aisha thanks the teacher and shows her enthusiasm by clapping her hands (line 6). However, one might suggest that Aisha thanking the teacher by name and the exaggerated hand clapping could act as a part of the ignoring response she intends to convey to Mika. Mika continues with another ironic comment *aika fiksu*, on line 7 with a seeming intention to ridicule Aisha and get her attention. It is not clear from the excerpt whether Mika's ironic comment still refers to the homework and how Aisha was "clever" to do it or to Aisha's reaction to the teacher's compliment, looking "clever" while clapping her hands. In the latter option, Aisha's turn on line 6 would act both as a response to Mika's first ironic turn and a motive for Mika's second ironic turn. However, there is no direct response to either of Mika's turns as both Aisha and the teacher never gaze at Mika or visibly direct their turns at him.

Both of the previous extracts of irony were observed in the 9th grade lessons and it seemed that in comparison the use of irony was far less common during the 5th grade lessons. Only one example of irony could be detected from the 5th grade lessons, which was initiated by the teacher and not understood by all students. In this extract the teacher wishes to move from a teacher-led activity to independent work and she suggests that they do some exercises from the workbook, because that is what the students "always want to do" (lines 1-2). Lauri's reaction on line 3 and Daniel's subsequent turn on line 4 reveal the teacher's ironic intent.

Extract 7 **(5th grade, group 1)**

- | | | |
|----|----------|---|
| 01 | Teacher: | ja sitten katotaas ja sitten voitaa tehdä sitä mitä te aina haluatte tehdä eli tehtäväkirjaa. ((browsing her workbook)) |
| 02 | | and then let's see and we could do what you always want to do. so the workbook. |
| 03 | Lauri: | >MITENNII.< ((raising his eyebrows))
what do you mean. |
| 04 | Daniel: | *se oli läpällä.* ((leans towards Lauri))
she was joking. |
| 05 | | (1.3) |

- 06 Teacher: mitä? ((doesn't hear what was said))
what?
- 07 Lauri: *ei mitään.*
nothing.

As an observer I am not familiar with the 5th grade I observed and as a result, I cannot know whether the students in this class enjoy working independently or not. Thus, on its own, the teacher's turn on lines 1-2 could be analysed as sincere. There are no humour signals that might be detected from the teacher's actions and no apparent motive for producing an ironic turn. However, Lauri's quick reaction to the teacher's turn (line 3), where he questions the teacher's comment suggests that independent work is not something that all the students enjoy and that the teacher was most likely being ironic. Lauri's reaction also reveals that he fails to recognise the teacher's turn as ironic. However, Daniel, who is sitting next to Lauri, recognises the teacher's turn as irony and on line 4 whispers to Lauri that the teacher was making a joke: *se oli läpällä*. ("she was joking"). The teacher is focused on finding appropriate exercises from the workbook and does not hear the boys' turns. She soon initiates repair (line 6), but Lauri refuses to repeat his initial reaction (line 7). Lauri's refusal is connected to the information he got from Daniel, as Lauri has realised the teacher was being ironic – she knows that doing exercises from the workbook is not the students' favourite activity, but humorously suggests the opposite.

This example shows how difficult irony can be to detect for the target, but also for an observer. As Haiman (1998:18) points out, it is possible for a person to be ironic or sarcastic without giving any signs of insincerity and this is the case with this extract. Lauri's facial expression and his verbal reaction on line 3 show that he is confused why the teacher would think they enjoy doing workbook exercises. Lauri does not detect the teacher's turn as ironic, but instead interprets it literally and questions the teacher's turn. Also, to an observer, who is not familiar with the class it would be impossible to analyse the teacher's comment as irony without Lauri's and Daniel's turns on lines 3 and 4, as the teacher's turn does not show any humour signals.

In the current extract it is evident that the teacher's use of irony is understood by Daniel, but not by Lauri. The most likely explanation to the misunderstanding is the lack of humour signals from the teacher. In addition, it might be argued that age is a factor, since in the present data irony was only used once and rather poorly during the 5th grade

lessons compared to the 9th grade examples, where irony got an understanding response from the students. On the other hand, there are instances, such as extract 6, where irony gets no clear response, which makes it impossible to analyse how successful its use is or how well it is understood by the target(s).

Overall, irony was used nine times in the present data, mostly by the teacher and only once by a student, as demonstrated by extract 6. The teacher's use of irony was particularly frequent on the 9th grade lessons, used as a response to the students' verbal and nonverbal actions that the teacher did not approve (such as not raising hands to answer in extract 1 or intentionally writing down the wrong answers in extract 5). This corresponds to previous findings, which suggest that irony is often used in a classroom environment to convey criticism or disapproval for inappropriate student actions (Piiirainen-Marsh 2010). The one example of student irony detected in the 9th grade lessons was targeted at another student with the intention of ridicule (extract 6). In the 5th grade lessons only one example of irony was detected, which was produced by the teacher without a motive and lacking any humour signals. Thus, it led to a misunderstanding by at least one of the students, who expressed his confusion verbally. On the basis of these examples, the age of students could be argued as one factor influencing the quantity and content of irony observed during the 9th grade lessons opposed to the 5th grade lessons. However, it should also be considered that the 5th grade lessons consisted of two small groups that were calmer than the larger group of 9th graders who had a double period of English with a less strict lesson plan. This is a significant factor as the students' actions and sayings motivated the teacher's irony during the 9th grade lessons.

5.2 Students and the teacher as teasers

Teasing can be described as playful mocking (Drew 1987:219), which always has a target (Lilja 2010:236). With irony, teasing was the most frequent type of humour and nine examples were found in the data. Most examples of teasing were apparent in the 5th grade lessons, where both student and teacher initiated teasing was observed. In the 9th grade lessons, only a few examples of student initiated teasing were found and no teacher initiated teasing was observed. In consequence, one example of teacher initiated teasing from the 5th grade lessons (extract 8) and two examples of student initiated teasing from both grades are now presented (extracts 9 and 10).

In extract 8 the lesson is about to end and the teacher suggests students finish the exercise in their workbook that they have been doing. Jussi self-selects himself as the next speaker on line 2 and asks what he should do if he has done the exercise already. The teacher does not have any additional homework, but on lines 3-4 she teasingly suggests that Jussi can do the next page on the workbook.

Extract 8
(5th grade, group 2)

- 01 Teacher: hei nyt määhän voisin (.) tehdä se sivu loppuun kotona.
hey now I could. please finish that page at home.
- 02 Jussi: mitä jos teki jo? ((looks at the teacher))
what if I finished it already?
- 03 Teacher: no:. (.) \$tee sit vaikka se seuraavakin sivu.\$ ((looks at Jussi and raises her
04 eyebrows))
well you can finish the next page then.
- 05 Jussi: \$EEIII. opeeee.\$ ((raises his hands to the air))
NOOO. teacher.
- 06 Teacher: \$he he.\$
07 Jussi: \$ai onko pakko?\$
really. do I have to?
- 08 Teacher: \$s(h)ää kysyt.\$
you asked.
- 09 Jussi: \$no emmä tee sitä.\$
well I'm not gonna do it
- 10 Teacher: \$etkö? he he.\$
no?
- 11 Jussi: \$e:i. ei se oo meillä vielä.\$
no. we don't have it yet.

In the current extract the teacher is giving out an exercise for homework that Jussi has already done (line 1). When Jussi reacts by asking what he should do as he has finished the exercise (line 2), the teacher responds with a teasing turn by saying he could finish the next page (lines 3-4). In addition to being a tease, the teacher's response could be analysed as slightly ironic or playful, since the teacher suggests something she does not literally mean or at least she does not suggest the additional homework as something compulsory. This is evident from the teacher's nonverbal actions as she smiles directly at Jussi while raising her eyebrows. Also, the use of the word *vaikka*, suggests that Jussi could do the next page, but implies that it is not necessary. Finally, the stretched

discourse particle *no* (“well”) at the beginning of the clause on line 3 implies the teacher has not planned on giving more homework and the suggestion for additional homework is improvised. Jussi’s preceding question acts as motive for the teacher’s tease. Instead of replying in a serious manner, the teacher reacts to the question by initiating humour.

The teacher’s tease gets a humorous response as Jussi recognises the teacher’s comment as non-serious and acts out desperation in a loud voice, raising his hands in the air while smiling (line 5). The teacher responds by laughing at Jussi’s exaggerated reaction (line 6). Interestingly, Jussi still checks his humorous interpretation by asking whether the teacher was serious and he should actually do the next page of the work book (line 7). Jussi seems uncertain of the seriousness of the teacher’s response. The teacher continues to respond humorously on line 8, not answering Jussi’s question directly, but pointing out laughingly *sää kysyit*. (“you asked.”). Jussi recognises the teacher’s turn as a tease as he answers with a smile and states he is not doing the next page at home (line 9). The teacher presents one more tease by laughingly asking Jussi *etkö?* (“no?”), to which Jussi replies *ei. ei se oo meillä vielä*. (“no. we don’t have it yet.”).

A similar ambiguity of the teacher’s meaning that is seen here, was presented in extract 7, where another 5th grade student did not detect the teacher’s use of irony. It seems that teacher initiated irony and teasing are not as easily understood by the 5th grade students as they seem to be by the 9th grade students. However, one should remember that in the present extract the topic of conversation is homework and it is understandable that Jussi wants to be sure he does all the homework that the teacher expects from him and more importantly, that he does no extra work. Thus, Jussi seeks clarification.

A very different example of teasing can be seen in the following extract of student initiated teasing during the same 5th grade lesson. The teasing is targeted to another student. Before this extract begins the teacher is checking whether students have done their homework and asks some of the students to write one of their clauses on the blackboard while she is circulating in the class. Jussi is asked to go to the blackboard and write down a clause. He gets up from his seat, walks to the blackboard and picks up a chalk. The action motivates a tease presented by Sauli (line 1). While Jussi is writing, Sauli and Dmitry, who both sit at the front row, tease Jussi on his pace and handwriting. Olli, who is sitting in between Sauli and Dmitry, contributes to the teasing by smiling and laughing.

Extract 9
(5th grade, group 2)

- 01 Sauli: \$Jussi selvällä käsialalla sit et mä saan selvää.\$
with clear handwriting so it's readable Jussi.
- 02 16.5 ((Dmitry and Olli whisper to one another))
- 03 Sauli: hyvä Jussi.
good Jussi.
- 04 Dmitry: \$Jussi, vähän kestää.\$
Jussi you're taking a long time.
- 05 (1.2)
- 06 Sauli: hyvä vaan.
you're doing good.
- 07 Jussi: hhhh >no ei tää mikää nopeuskilv- kilpailu oo.<= ((facing the blackboard))
well this isn't a competition of how fast you can write.
- 08 Dmitry: =jussi (.) vähän nopeemmin.
a bit faster Jussi.
- 09 Dmitry: \$m(h)ikä toi on?\$ he he. is. ((points at the blackboard, leans towards Olli))
what's that? he he. is.
- 10 (0.8) ((Jussi turns and looks at Dmitry, then Sauli))
- 11 Jussi: \$mitä.\$
what.
- 12 (2.2) ((Dmitry laughs loudly))
- 13 Jussi: /\$m(h)itä ny.\$
what is it.
- 14 (0.9) ((the boys laugh))
- 15 Dmitry: \$ei m(h)itää. kirjota.\$ he he. ((Jussi turns back to the blackboard))
16 ai[ka menee.]
nothing. just write. he he. time is running.
- 17 Sauli: [NO KATO] kuinka pienellä toi is sana erottuu tuolta.
well look how small that "is" word is.
- 18 ((Dmitry laughs loudly, Olli and Sauli smile))
19 ((Jussi turns back towards the class, looks at the teacher))
- 20 Jussi: OPE. onko tää lause oikein. ((the clause is not finished, Jussi has only
21 written "Hannah is" on the blackboard. The teacher is helping another
22 student and does not hear Jussi's question))
teacher. is this clause correct.
- 23 Dmitry: ON. ei se väärin oo. ((shakes his head))
YES. it's not wrong.
- 24 Sauli: ihan oikein.

it's correct.

- 25 (5.3) ((Jussi looks at the boys, then turns back towards the blackboard and
26 continues writing. Dmitry laughs loudly, Olli and Sauli smile))
- 27 Jussi: älä nyt kikata siinä. ((facing the blackboard, writing))
stop giggling.
28 (18.6)
- 29 Sauli: Jussi, se on äidinkielen tunneilla missä pitää kirjoittaa käsialalla.
30 ((Jussi is writing with *käsiala*)
Jussi, it's in Finnish classes where you need to write with *käsiala*.
- 31 Dmitry: \$Jussi m(h)ikä toi on.\$ he he. is. is. kato ny. ((leans towards Olli))
Jussi what is that. he he. is. is. look at that.
- 32 (6.4) ((other students come to the blackboard to write their clauses, the
33 teacher also goes to the front of the class))
- 34 Sauli: hyvä Jussi. toimii.
well done Jussi. that works.
35 (23.2)
- 36 Sauli: Jussi yks virhe.
Jussi just one mistake.
- 37 Jussi: OPE ONKO TOI OIK[EIN?
38 ((the teacher is helping someone, she does not hear Jussi))
teacher is that correct?
- 39 Sauli: [PISTE] PERÄÄN.
add a dot.
40 ((Jussi adds a dot to the clause))
- 41 ((Dmitry gets up from his seat and walks to the blackboard next to Jussi))
42 Dmitry: joo on oikein. mä nau- mä nauroin tohon is. kun sä kirjoitit tohon is niin
43 pienellä.
yeah it's correct I was just 1- I was laughing about the is. when you
wrote the "is". it was so small.
- 44 Jussi: is. onko toi oikein. ((points at his clause, looks at the teacher))
is that correct.
- 45 Dmitry: on.
yes.
- 46 Teacher: on on. erinomaista. ((walking to the front of the classroom))
yes yes. excellent work.
- 47 Dmitry: hienoa Jussi. ((taps Jussi's shoulder and returns to his seat))
well done Jussi.
- 48 ((Jussi walks past Sauli. Sauli looks at Jussi and holds out his hand))
49 Sauli: *hei, Jussi anteeks.* ((holds out his hand for a high-five, Jussi responds))
hey Jussi I'm sorry.

The current example is interesting, as it involves teasing between the students, which does not involve the teacher. Reason for the lack of response from the teacher is that she was circulating the class checking students' homework and thereby did not pay attention to the events at the front of the class. It seems that in this long teasing sequence Sauli and Dmitry are attempting banter, but as they get more or less neutral responses from Jussi their attempt fails. Thus, their humour can be categorised as teasing, where Sauli and Dmitry are the teasers and Jussi is the target. The teasing is good natured, as both Sauli and Dmitry also compliment Jussi and apologise later for their humorous comments. Also, they explain the reason for laughing – the small size of the written word “is”. As this conversation is focused on the interaction of students it shows nicely how social relationships are built through the use of humour in a classroom.

As Saharinen (2007:268) points out, the motive turn for a tease can also be an action instead of speech. In this extract there is no spoken motive turn, but instead an action which motivates the teasing. Jussi is told to write a clause on the blackboard and thus, he becomes the centre of attention. Jussi walking up to the blackboard and preparing to write works as motive for the first tease. At this point, Jussi's writing cannot be analysed as motive, since the initial tease produced by Sauli (line 1) happens before Jussi has even started writing. However, later on Jussi's pace and writing style further motivate the teasing. Also, the two teasers seem to motivate each other's teases. The sequence consists of multiple teasing turns which are all produced by Sauli and Dmitry while Jussi is writing on the blackboard.

The initial tease is produced by Sauli, who implies that Jussi should write with clear handwriting and make his text readable (line 1). The tease gets no response from Jussi. As Jussi begins writing, Sauli presents a praise on line 3, telling Jussi that he is doing a good job. In fact, he does this on multiple occasions in addition to his teasing remarks (lines 3, 6 and 34). The compliments are presented seriously and they show that in addition to the role of a teaser Sauli is also supportive of his classmate and his teasing is good natured. In contrast, Dmitry who also begins to tease Sauli, does not compliment him until the end of the teasing sequence (line 47).

Sauli's initial compliment draws Dmitry's attention to the blackboard and Jussi's writing. On line 4 Dmitry presents a tease implying that Jussi should write faster.

Motive for this teasing turn is both in Sauli's preceding turn and Jussi's slow pace. Jussi presents a response to Dmitry's tease, while writing on the blackboard: *no ei tää mikää nopeuskilv- kilpailu oo.* ("well this isn't a competition of how fast you can write."). The exhale and tone of voice suggests that Jussi's response is serious; however, he is facing the blackboard, so the expression on his face cannot be analysed. Dmitry immediately presents another tease on line 8, telling Jussi to write faster and after Jussi has written another word "is", Dmitry starts teasing Jussi about the small size of the word (line 9). Jussi now turns around and smilingly initiates repair (lines 10-11), but only gets smiles and laughter as a response. Jussi initiates repair again, but now does it while laughing (line 13). Dmitry laughingly refuses to answer, continuing to tease Jussi (lines 15-16). Sauli joins the tease on line 17, by pointing out Jussi's "mistake". However, as Jussi has turned back towards the blackboard he does not seem to hear Sauli's comment. As Sauli and Daniel jointly tease Jussi, and Daniel refuses to answer Jussi's repairs, Jussi begins to get insecure of his writing. He turns back around and starts seeking recognition from the teacher even before he has finished writing his clause.

When Jussi seeks confirmation from the teacher, the teasing stops for a brief moment. Dmitry turns serious and reassures Jussi his clause is written correctly (line 23). Sauli does this too. However, as Jussi turns, Dmitry soon begins to laugh again. Jussi responds on line 27, while facing the blackboard, but again his tone of voice suggests his response is serious: *älä nyt kikata siinä.* The teasing stops again for a short moment as Dmitry and Sauli quiet down. However, soon Sauli continues the teasing as he concentrates on Jussi's writing style. Jussi is using a particular writing style *käsiala* while he is on the blackboard. *Käsiala* is a specific writing style which is taught to children in Finnish classes, but the use of it is voluntary during other subject lessons. Accordingly, Sauli points out to Jussi on line 29 that only on their Finnish classes they need to use good handwriting. He says this humorously with a slightly higher tone, emphasising the words *pitää kirjoittaa käsialalla.* ("need to write with *käsiala*."). He is most likely suggesting that Jussi is acting like they are on Finnish class, being very thorough with his writing and as it is an English lesson he could write more freely. Before Sauli presents this tease, Dmitry is talking to Olli, but Sauli's tease motivates him to join the teasing. Dmitry points out the small size of the word "is" again to Jussi and starts laughing on line 31. Jussi does not respond to either of the teases but is concentrating on writing.

The teacher asks other students to go to the blackboard to write up their clauses, and two girls join Jussi on the blackboard. Sauli compliments Jussi on line 34 as he is writing the last word of the clause. However, as Jussi finishes, Sauli soon presents a final tease saying that Jussi's clause has one mistake (line 36). Jussi ignores Sauli's turn and loudly asks the teacher whether his clause is correct (line 37). The teacher still does not hear him. Overlapping Jussi's question to the teacher, Sauli clarifies he is missing a dot at the end of the clause (line 39). Jussi responds by adding a dot to his clause. Also, Dmitry walks up to Jussi and explains his amusement and reassures Jussi that his clause is correct (lines 41-43). Nevertheless, Jussi is still insecure of his clause and seeks recognition from the teacher. On line 46 he finally gets a response as the teacher is walking to the front of the classroom and verifies Jussi's clause to be correct.

The ending of the teasing sequence clearly shows that the teasing produced by Sauli and Dmitry was good natured. Firstly, Sauli praises Jussi several times while teasing him (lines 3, 6 and 34). Secondly, towards the end of the sequence Dmitry goes up to Jussi to explain his behaviour (lines 41-43) and after Jussi gets approval from the teacher, Dmitry compliments him on his writing verbally but also nonverbally by tapping him on the shoulder (line 47). Nevertheless, Jussi does not respond to Dmitry, but simply walks past him. This might suggest that Jussi was slightly offended by Dmitry's teasing; however, it cannot be presumed. When Jussi returns to his seat, he walks past Sauli, who also verbally apologises to Jussi and holds out his hand to exchange a high-five (lines 48-49). Jussi responds to Sauli by smiling and high-fiving him, which suggests he was not offended by his teasing.

In the extract, Jussi presents a number of different responses to Sauli's and Dmitry's ongoing teases. He responds to most of the teases seriously, concentrating on his writing and seeking recognition from the teacher on whether his clause is correct. He seeks recognition from the teacher repeatedly (lines 20, 37, 44) even before he has finished writing. The teacher only responds to Jussi at the end of the sequence as she does not hear Jussi until then. However, both Dmitry and Sauli try to convince Jussi he has written the clause correctly each time he asks. Jussi ignores them and tries to get an answer from the teacher instead. Throughout the teasing sequence Jussi is unable to recognise why he is being teased and thus, the teasing makes him insecure of his writing. Also, it seems that through seeking recognition from the teacher Jussi is able to

ignore the teases presented by Sauli and Dmitry. Furthermore, Dmitry and Sauli are likely to present less teases when the teacher focuses her attention on Jussi.

As was pointed out earlier, no teasing was initiated by the teacher in the 9th grade lessons and only student teasing occurred. The following extract presents a 9th grade student initiated tease which is targeted at the teacher. In the extract, the teacher is having problems in getting the students to listen to her. Before the beginning of the extract the teacher has told the students twice to open their textbooks, so they could listen to a chapter on the CD player. However, the students are engaging in social chat and there is a great deal of noise, so the teacher raises her voice to be heard (line 1).

Extract 10
(9th grade)

- 01 Teacher: HEI. (2.5) kuulittekohan te nyt yhtään kun minä sanoin että kappale
02 kolmetoista tekstikirjasta.
hey. did you hear me at all, I said chapter thirteen from your textbooks.
- 03 (1.2) ((Nadia and Aisha are whispering with one another at the front row,
04 the teacher looks at them))
- 05 Teacher: Nadia. ((looks at Nadia))
06 Nadia: mitä? ((looks at the teacher))
what?
- 07 Teacher: /MI::TÄ? ((looks at Nadia))
what?
- 08 Nadia: /täh?
huh?
- 09 Teacher: sanoin jo kaksi kertaa että kappale kolmetoista. ((looks at Nadia))
I told you two times already. chapter thirteen.
- 10 Nadia: jaaa. ((starts browsing through her textbook))
ahh.
- 11 Aisha: voi ei. ((also browsing through her textbook, is unable to find the chapter))
oh no.
- 12 Tero: mikä kappale? ((looking at the teacher))
what chapter?
- 13 Teacher: kak- (.) kolmetoista. ((finding the right chapter on the cd player))
tw- thirteen.
- 14 Aisha: \$s(h)ä olit sanomassa kakstoista. he he.\$
you almost said twelve. he he.
- 15 (1.6) ((the teacher looks at Aisha))
- 16 Teacher: nii. (0.8) oikeestaan meinasin sanoo kaks koska mä laitoin tähän

graders the teasing is produced more neutrally. Also, if student initiated irony and teasing are compared, both 5th and 9th grade students used teasing more frequently than irony. This might suggest that it is less threatening for students to present teases than ironic remarks to the teacher.

The extracts of teasing presented here show that teasing can consist of one simple tease or multiple teasing turns. When a student teased the teacher, the teases consisted of only one or two teasing turns. Similarly, when a teacher teased a student the teasing was moderately brief. In contrast, when students teased each other the teasing turns were often multiple, as was seen in extract 9. The hierarchical relationship of a student and a teacher differs from that of two children or teenagers of the same age and seems to affect how teasing is used to build different social relationships in a classroom.

5.3 Student teasing developing into banter

Banter is a specific subtype of teasing, where two or more people rapidly produce consecutive teases (Dynel 2008:243-244). Thus, a humorous response from the target is required for teasing to develop into banter. When successful, this humorous mocking debate can enhance social relationships (Plester and Sayers 2007:158). Examples of banter were found from both the 5th grade and 9th grade lessons. However, in all the five examples found in the data, the teacher was never the initiator or the target of banter, but all banter was student initiated and happened between students.

The following extract is highly connected to extract 9, as it happens immediately after in the same 5th grade classroom. The students are writing clauses on the blackboard while the teacher paces around the classroom checking students' homework. After Jussi has written a clause on the blackboard and returned to his seat, he begins to tease Laura on her handwriting in the same manner he was teased earlier by Sauli and Dmitry in extract 9. Earlier Jussi was the teased one, but he now restates his role as a teaser and picks Laura as a target. However, the nature of this example is highly different compared to extract 9, since Laura begins to respond to Jussi's teases with teases of her own and thus, the teasing develops into banter.

Extract 11
(5th grade, group 2)

- 01 Jussi: HEI. kato ny tota kirjotusta.
 hey look at that writing will you.
- 02 (1.3) ((Dmitry, Olli and Sauli look at the blackboard and smile))
- 03 Laura: \$IHAN SAMA.\$ ((turns and looks at Jussi))
 whatever.
- 04 ((two other girls on the blackboard laugh))
- 05 Jussi: \$aika skidisti toi sana, ei tosta saa mitään selvää.\$
 that word is so small. you can't see what that is.
- 06 Laura: \$H(h)ANKI SILMÄLASIT. (0.2) who cares.\$
 get some glasses. who cares.
- 07 Jussi: ISO ÄM.(.) >muuta mä en nääkään.<
 big letter m. and that's all I can see.
- 08 (0.5)
- 09 Jussi: <my mom is.> ((reading from the blackboard, squinting his eyes))
- 10 ((Laura walks away from the blackboard, stops in front of Jussi and
 11 makes an angry face while holding her hand on the hip. Then she returns to
 12 her seat. Jussi keeps reading the clause.))
- 13 Jussi: l::oving. m:ikä? ((squinting his eyes))
 loving. what?
- 14 Laura: /HILJAA. ((in a high tone))
 shut up.
- 15 ((Laura walks towards Jussi, looks at him and then the blackboard))
- 16 Laura: \$mä en tykkää ku tää menee ai::na näin.\$ ((returns to her seat))
 I don't like it how it always goes like this.

As the current example happens immediately after Jussi has been teased on his handwriting and has returned to his seat from the blackboard, it is evident that Jussi actively changes his role from being teased to being the teaser. Thus, he is not only motivated to tease Laura because of her small handwriting, but his first comment of the banter extract is occasioned by the preceding teasing segment where he was the target (extract 9). Thus, two different actions act as motive for Jussi's first tease. Laura's response to Jussi's first turn is to "talk back".

Laura's response to the first tease on line 3 is defensive as she turns to face Jussi and shouts *ihan sama*. ("whatever."). Jussi presents another teasing turn by commenting on Laura's small handwriting (line 5). Laura responds by telling Jussi to "get some glasses" (line 6), so he could see better to the blackboard, humorously suggesting there

is a problem with Jussi's vision instead of her writing. On line 7 Jussi expresses what little he can read from the blackboard: "big letter m. and that's all I can see". He continues by attempting to read Laura's handwriting while squinting his eyes (line 9). The turn-by-turn teases reveal the nature of the conversation to be banter. In banter the students motivate one another to produce teasing turns and the conversation is similar to a debate, since teases are produced very quickly one after another and the teasing turn produced affects the next turn (Dynel 2008:243). In other words, teases often act as both motives and responses. Also, instead of one teased target, in banter both students become targets of teases.

The banter continues after Laura has finished writing her clause on the blackboard. Laura presents her next tease nonverbally by walking up to Jussi, putting her hand on her hip and making an angry face at him (lines 10-11). Laura's hand gesture is a typical feminine response and used with the angry facial expression it creates an emphasised meaning which nonverbally tells Jussi to stop criticising her. Jussi no longer directly comments on Laura's writing, but tries to irritate Laura by squinting his eyes in an attempt to read the clause she wrote out loud (line 13). Laura shouts at Jussi to "shut up" (line 14), walks up to him again, looks at Jussi and then the blackboard, as if to check whether her clause is readable from where Jussi sits. Jussi no longer produces teasing turns and the banter comes to an end. The last turn on line 16, where Laura states *mä en tykkää ku tää menee aina näin*. ("I don't like it how it always goes like this.") seems to refer to her handwriting not being visible or looking good enough on the blackboard. With this turn Laura seems to admit her handwriting to be quite small and also, that she has had problems with writing on the blackboard before, her text not being visible to the class. Laura's last turn is interesting, since she produces the final turn of banter already on line 14, where she tells Jussi to "shut up" and Jussi no longer replies with a tease, which marks the end of banter. Nevertheless, Laura admits her mistake.

Examples of banter were also detected in the 9th grade lessons. Before the following extract the class has been listening to a chapter which mentions accidents at nuclear power stations being an environmental risk. Relating to the topic, the teacher asks whether students know what anniversary was held the day before (line 1). Mika knows the teacher is referring to the nuclear accident in Fukushima and replies. The teacher's reaction to Mika's right answer on line 4 *kylläpäsinä olet nyt viisaalla tuulella tänään*.

(‘aren’t you on a clever mood today.’) refers to Mika’s behaviour earlier on the lesson as he has been eager to answer the teacher’s questions and discuss issues relating to the chapter. The teacher is positively surprised of Mika’s knowledge on the topic and begins to compliment him. Lasse, sitting next to Mika, and Nadia and Aisha, sitting in front of Mika, do not agree with the teacher when she calls Mika smart and adultlike, which creates banter between the students.

Extract 12 (9th grade)

- 01 Teacher: hei, tiettekös mikäs vuospäivä eilen oli.
hey, do you know what anniversary was yesterday.
- 02 Mika: Japanin tsunamista tuli kaksi vuotta ja silloin Fukushimaan tuli (1.2) se (.)
03 reaktori, tai se (2.0) vaurioitui pahasti. ((looks at the teacher))
the tsunami in Japan was two years ago and that was when Fukushima
came. or the reactor, it was damaged severely.
- 04 Teacher: kyllä. ((surprised tone)) kylläpä sinä olet nyt viisaalla tuulella tänään.
05 ((looks at Mika))
yes. aren’t you on a clever mood today.
- 06 Lasse: >SE VAAN KATTOO UUTISIA.< ((looks at the teacher))
he just watches the news.
07 (1.6)
- 08 Mika: mä pysyn ajan tasalla. ((looks at Lasse))
I’m keeping up.
- 09 Teacher: noni, se on hyvä. ((complimenting Mika))
okay. that’s good.
- 10 Lasse: *\$kun sulla ei oo muut elämää. he he.\$*
because you have no other life. he he.
- 11 Mika: \$N(H)IMENOMAAN se on elämää.\$
that’s exactly what life is.
- 12 Teacher: LASSE. ((scolding tone)) (2.4) kyllä kannattaa muidenkin hieman (.)
13 aikuismaisemmin ruveta suhtautumaan elämään ja katsoa joskus uutisia
14 vaikka. ((looks at Lasse))
everyone else should also take a more adult approach towards life and
watch the news every now and then or something.
- 15 Mika: NII, mm. ((looks at Lasse and raises his eyebrows))
yeah.
16 (1.9)
- 17 Aisha: mua ärsyttää ku sä kehuu Mikaa. ((looks at the teacher))
I’m annoyed that you compliment Mika.
18 ((the teacher looks surprised))
- 19 Mika: ÄRSYTTÄÄ. SEN TAKIA ET SÄ [OOT KATEELLINEN].
annoyed because you’re jealous.

- 20 Aisha: [kehu vaik Nadiaa välillä.]
21 ((looks at the teacher))
you could compliment Nadia for a change.
- 22 Mika: ei se oo (1.3) sua ei ärsytä (.) sä oot vaan kateellinen.
it's not. you're not annoyed you're just jealous.
- 23 Aisha: ei mua ärsytä[kään (-)] ((facing the other way from Mika))
yeah I'm not annoyed.
- 24 Mika: [MYÖNNÄ.] ((leaning towards his desk))
admit it.
- 25 Aisha: \$s(h)ä oot vaan ÄR[SYTTÄVÄ.]\$ ((turns around to face Mika))
you're just annoying.
- 26 Mika: [MYÖNNÄ.]
admit it.
- 27 Teacher: se on niin mukavaa kun joku puhuu ja käyttäytyy aikuismaisesti ja,
it's so nice when someone speaks and acts like an adult and
- 28 Lasse: niinku toi vai.= ((points at Mika and looks at the teacher with a shocked
29 expression))
you mean like him.
- 30 Teacher: =seu[raa maailman tapahtumia.]
keeps up with the happenings in the world.
- 31 Mika: [SIINÄKIN yks kateellinen] taas. ((points at Lasse))
there's another jealous one.
- 32 Lasse: MÄ EN OO KATEELLINEN. mä oon realisti. (1.2) \$t(h)oiko
33 aikuismainen? he he.\$ ((points at Mika and looks at the teacher with a
34 confused expression))
I'm not jealous, I'm a realist. he is supposed to be adultlike?
- 35 Nadia: \$AI M(h)ika vai.\$ ((looking at the teacher))
you mean Mika.
- 36 Aisha: \$he he. aika [liioteltua\$] ((looks at Mika))
that's a bit exaggerated.
- 37 Mika: [VOINKS mä] nostaa kunnialoukkauksen syytteen tästä.
38 ((looking at the teacher))
can I sue them for defamation.
- 39 Lasse: ÄÄÄ. ((looking frustrated))
argh.
- 40 Mika: \$nää on molemmat kuitenkin jo viistoista.\$ ((points at Aisha and Nadia))
41 (0.6) toi on jo kuustoista. ((looks at the teacher, points at Lasse))
they're both fifteen. actually that one is sixteen.
- 42 (1.2)
- 43 Lasse: \$TOI. mul[la on nimikin.]\$ ((acts surprised, pokes at Mika with his pencil))
that one. I have a name.

- 44 Mika: [SIINÄ oikeudellisessa] iässä. joutuu vastaan omista teoistaan.
in the righteous age. they need to take responsibility for
their own actions.
- 45 Teacher: nii'i ((looks at Mika))
that's right.
- 46 Mika: \$käräjillä nähään.\$
see you in court.
- 47 ((Lasse and the teacher laugh loudly. The teacher pushes play on the cd player
48 and they continue to listen to the chapter))

This extract can be defined as an example of banter between students, since Mika is an initial target of teasing (line 10), but begins to defend himself and blames the teasers Lasse and Aisha for jealousy from line 19 onwards. The teacher is also involved in the conversation, but she is not a target of the banter and she does not produce banter. Nevertheless, the teacher's complimenting turns, in addition to Mika's turns, act as motives for both Lasse and Aisha to engage in banter against Mika.

At the beginning of the extract, Mika's correct answer and the teacher's surprised reaction motivate Lasse's turn on line 6, where he points out that Mika only knew the answer to the teacher's question because "he just watches the news". The turn is not a clear tease, but one is soon presented on line 10, where Lasse implies Mika to "have no other life" than watching the news. Mika begins to defend himself. Also, on lines 12-14 the teacher shouts out Lasse's name in a scolding tone and stands up for Mika by suggesting that others should also act more adultlike and watch the news. With her comment, the teacher attempts to end the banter between Lasse and Mika. However, the banter continues as Aisha enters the conversation by expressing her irritation of the teacher's continuing compliments towards Mika (line 17). Aisha's turn is directed to the teacher and the teacher responds with a surprised look while Mika reacts immediately to Aisha's turn by blaming her of jealousy (line 19). Aisha replies to Mika by saying she is not annoyed but finds Mika annoying (lines 23 and 25) while Mika is shouting "admit it" (lines 24 and 26). The banter reaches a new level as Mika and Aisha raise their voices and there is more and more overlapping of talk.

The banter between Aisha and Mika is interrupted by the teacher, who presents a delayed reply to Aisha's preceding turn (line 27). The teacher's expression on lines 27 and 30 is interesting, since the clause *se on niin mukavaa kun joku puhuu ja käyttäytyy*

aikuismaisesti ja seuraa maailman tapahtumia. (“it’s so nice when someone speaks and acts like an adult and keeps up with the happenings in the world”) is only indirectly referring to Mika by using the word *joku* (“someone”). Earlier the teacher has complimented Mika directly, but now she presents a compliment implicitly and thus, implies it is not Mika, but his behaviour that she has been complimenting. The teacher’s comment also implies that adultlike behaviour is rare in the classroom, which suggests that she is indirectly teasing the other students while complementing Mika’s behaviour. However, the teacher’s turn is interrupted by Lasse who initiates repair on line 28, asking the teacher a direct question while looking shocked and pointing at Mika: *niinku toi vai.* (“you mean like him.”). Mika reacts by blaming Lasse of jealousy, which Lasse denies and again initiates repair on the teacher’s compliment (lines 32-34). Nadia indirectly joins the banter by also initiating repair to the teacher: *ai Mika vai.* (line 35). Aisha also joins the banter on line 36 by pointing out that the teacher’s compliment was exaggerated.

The bantering reaches its end through humorous exaggeration as Mika begins to ask the teacher whether he could sue Lasse, Aisha and Nadia for their behaviour (lines 37-44). As Mika presents his idea, Lasse expresses his frustration by yelling (line 39). Also, on line 42 Lasse marks Mika’s use of the word *toi* (“that guy”) when Mika refers to him. Lasse acts offended and reminds Mika that he has a name. Interestingly Lasse has no problem using the same word to refer to Mika earlier on line 28, which reveals his reaction to be exaggerated and part of the banter. Furthermore, Margutti (2007:626-630) has found that these type of third person reference forms are often used to target a co-participant in the event of teasing, which explains Mika and Lasse’s choice of words. Mika does not reply to Lasse’s turn, but raises his voice and overlaps his talk by continuing his own turn. The banter comes to an end as the teacher playfully agrees with Mika’s thoughts of suing (line 45) and Mika presents his final humorous turn *käräjillä nähään.* (“see you in court.”), which gets a laughing response both from Lasse and the teacher. The teacher pushes play on the CD player and the listening of the chapter continues.

In this extract of banter the teacher is involved, which allows the opportunity to analyse how her role differs from the students. As an authority of the class, the teacher reacts to Lasse’s first tease and scolds him for it. However, the banter continues and the teacher does not take actively part in the students’ humorous debate. The teacher most likely

recognises that the banter is performed in good nature and thus, she merely follows the students' discussion. Nevertheless, the students involve the teacher in their debate as the teacher's compliments act as motive for the banter. Mika, Lasse, Aisha and Nadia all seek recognition from the teacher in the form of questions. The teacher attempts to act more neutral as she begins by complementing Mika directly, but moves on to more indirect compliments, moving the focus from Mika to other students (lines 12-14) and to the general behaviour she appreciates. Overall, the teacher's higher status seems to stop the teacher from further engaging in student banter. Only one of the teacher's turns on lines 27 and 30 might be analysed as very subtle and indirect teasing. By saying "it's so nice when someone speaks and acts like an adult and keeps up with the happenings in the world" the teacher conveys a double message by indirectly criticising other students' behaviour. In addition to this indirect tease, the teacher produces only one laughing response at the end of the sequence (line 47). Overall, the teacher's comments and reactions are more neutral in comparison to students' bantering.

The different examples of banter that occurred in the data were all initiated by students and targeted at other students, which implies banter to be a natural act between both 5th grade and 9th grade students, but not between the students and the teacher. The reason for this is most likely the seemingly close relationships between the students who took part in banter and targeted one another, if we compare it to the hierarchical teacher-student relationship. Plester and Sayers (2007) studied banter in a workplace and found that the higher the status, the less banter was used because of a risk to offend co-workers. The teacher is likely to avoid banter for the same reason, not wanting to be hurtful to the students. Banter involves mocking through reference to highly personal traits from both parties (Plester and Sayers 2007:159) and thus, the teacher could easily be found criticising or even threatening instead of amusing by the students if she engaged in banter. Nevertheless, the teacher is likely to act as an authority figure in banter between students (see extracts 3 and 12), particularly if she finds banter to be aggressive or to disturb the lesson it is her responsibility to participate in the conversation and get the students to calm down.

5.4 Language play in EFL classroom talk

Language play in EFL classrooms can be seen as a pedagogical tool which both motivates and facilitates learning (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005:170). It can refer to both

serious and non-serious use of language play (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005:188), but in the present data I will only discuss the cases where students or the teacher pay attention to language forms and target them in a humoristic manner. The use of language play was detected in both elementary and secondary school lessons, but in all the six examples gathered from the data, language play was initiated by students and never by the teacher. This is connected to Pitkänen-Huhta's findings, as she points out that language play is most often produced specifically by students and it works as a "sideline" to the teacher's more dominant talk (Pitkänen-Huhta 2003:245). However, some of the extracts of language play in the present data show that the students' use of language play is appreciated by the teacher and seen as a learning experience.

The following example is from a 5th grade lesson. The teacher interrupts a game the students have been playing in pairs or groups of three and asks whether everyone got a chance to practice. Some of the students answer corroboratively, but others do not seem to hear the teacher. The teacher states that she will ask the students a few more questions, and the students begin to pay attention to what is said (lines 1-3). The students produce their turns in unison, but very quietly. Maria is the only one to produce an audible answer to one of the teacher's questions and her response is humoristic.

Extract 13
(5th grade, group 1)

- 01 Teacher: eli määs teen pari kysymystä vielä lisää.
ok so I'm going to ask you a few more questions.
- 02 Matti: HÄ? ((looks at the teacher))
what?
- 03 (2.1) ((the students quiet down and look at the teacher))
- 04 Teacher: a:re you (.) smiling?
05 Students: [*no I'm not*]
06 [*yes, I am*]
07 Teacher: are you sitting?
08 Students: *yes, I am.*
09 Teacher: do you like cats?
10 Maria: yes:: (.) *\$I don't. he he.\$* ((looks at Julia))
11 ((Julia gazes at Maria and smiles))
12 ((the teacher continues asking questions))

The students are asked questions, which they are expected to answer with *Yes, I do/No, I don't* or *Yes, I am/No, I'm not* -structures that are written on the blackboard. The same structures were used earlier during the game they were playing and the teacher is checking the students' knowledge through teacher-led follow-up questions. When the

teacher asks the whole class *do you like cats?* (line 9), Maria is the only one who answers with a clear audible turn. This might be because of the change in question and answer structure (*I do/don't* instead of *I am/I'm not*) or because the students' opinion is asked and they are unable to answer immediately. Nevertheless, Maria starts by answering clearly, but begins to stretch her voice after she realises no one else is answering. Maria then lowers her voice and finishes her answer humorously producing language play. It seems that as Maria detects she is the only one clearly answering the teacher's question, she alters her response to create humour through a paradoxical response. Thus, her turn on line 10 is directly motivated by the teacher's question, but the lack of response from other students seems to act as motive for the language play she produces in the middle of her emerging turn.

In her humorous turn, Maria consciously plays with the language form of the answer by using *yes* and *I don't* in the same clause, creating the paradoxical answer *yes I don't*. Her answer can be recognised as non-serious, since she immediately laughs at her own response and by looking at Julia invites her to laugh with her. As Haakana (1996:151) points out, laughter can act as both a response and an invitation to get another person/people to laugh and accordingly, Maria uses laughter for the latter purpose. The language play produced by Maria gets no response from the teacher, which could be due to the inability to hear her answer as she lowers her voice noticeably in the middle of the turn. Only Julia, who is sitting next to Maria, responds to Maria's turn with a shy gaze and a smile on line 11. Despite the minimal response she gets, Maria has consciously manipulated the form of her answer and thus, the current extract can be classified as an example of language play.

Another example of language play was detected during the 9th grade lessons when the class was discussing the vocabulary of a particular chapter in their textbook and the teacher was asking whether they had questions about any of the words. In the following extract, Mika raises his hand and after the teacher selects him as the next speaker on line 2, he asks about the word *guinea pig*, which results in a discussion on the multiple meanings of the word.

Extract 14
(9th grade)

01 ((Mika raises his hand))
02 Teacher: Mika. ((looks at Mika))

- 03 Mika: miks koe-eläin on guinea pig? ((looks at the teacher))
 why is a guinea pig (a test subject) “a guinea pig” (the rodent)?
 04 (2.6)
- 05 Teacher: </hy:vä kysymys.> ((looks at Mika))
 that’s a good question.
- 06 Mika: \$mut eiks pig oo niinku possu. he he.\$ ((looks at the teacher))
 isn’t “a pig” like a pig (the animal).
- 07 Teacher: kyllä.= ((looks at Mika))
 yes
- 08 Lasse: =EI ku guinea pig on marsu. ((looks at Mika and then the teacher))
 no “a guinea pig” is a guinea pig (the rodent).
- 09 Teacher: se on marsu joo, mut sitä käytetään myöskin nimityksenä: (.) koe-
 10 eläimestä. ((looks at Lasse))
 yes it’s a guinea pig (the rodent), but it is also used to refer to a guinea
 pig (a test subject).
- 11 Mika: \$jos norsu on koe-eläimenä >niin miks se on niinku marsu<\$? ((looks at the
 12 teacher))
 if an elephant is a guinea pig (a test subject) then why is it called a
 guinea pig (the rodent)?
- 13 (1.4) ((some students laugh))
- 14 Teacher: ei ehkä siinä, mutta jos sanotaan vaikka jotain ihmistä käytettiin (.) koe-
 15 eläimenä niin /sitten. he was used as a guinea pig.
 well not like that, but if you say a human is used as a guinea pig (a test
 subject). then you can say that. “he was used as a guinea pig”
 16 (1.2)
- 17 Teacher: \$te ootte nyt tavallaan niitä guinea piggejä tuon Sannan tutkimuksessa.\$
 18 ((points at one of the cameras))
 it’s kind of like you are the “guinea pigs” in Sanna’s research.
- 19 (3.1) ((students laugh))
- 20 Mika: \$vastustetaan eläinkokeita.\$
 we are against animal testing.
- 21 Teacher: \$te ootte marsuja. he he.\$
 you’re guinea pigs (the rodent). he he.

In this example, the word *guinea pig* in the vocabulary acts as motive for the produced language play, because of its multiple meanings. Mika pays attention to the word form, and asks the teacher about the translation in their book (line 3). The teacher does not respond immediately, but reacts by telling Mika he presented a good question (line 5). Mika pays attention to the last part of the word *pig* and asks the teacher *mut eiks pig oo niinku possu*. The teacher agrees, but Lasse reacts to Mika’s turn seriously by noting that the whole word *guinea pig* refers to the rodent. The teacher responds seriously on

lines 9-10, recognising Lasse's answer as a correct observation, but explaining that the word has another meaning referring to a test subject, which is the translation in their book.

Although the different meanings of the words have been explained, Mika still finds the word puzzling and on line 11 he smilingly asks the teacher if an elephant is used as a test subject how it can be called a guinea pig (the rodent). Some students respond to Mika's question by laughing. Again the teacher produces a serious response and explains that the term more likely refers to people as test subjects and gives an example sentence (lines 14-15). A non-serious response is also produced as the teacher relates the term to context and implies that the students could be called guinea pigs in the study I was conducting at that time (lines 17-18). Mika humorously replies the students to be against animal testing. The teacher produces another humorous turn as she brings about the other meaning of *guinea pig* and calls the students guinea pigs in the rodent meaning of the word.

This example shows how student initiated language play can get both a serious pedagogical response and a humorous response from the teacher. As the role of the teacher is primarily to educate and thus, make sure the students understand different word forms and their meanings, the teacher begins by responding to the students' questions and observations seriously. However, on lines 17-18 the teacher produces a humorous turn, when she provides an example referring to the ongoing research. The turn gets a laughing response and Mika also responds humorously by comparing the research to animal testing on line 20. Another humorous turn is produced by the teacher, as she refers to students as *guinea pigs* (the rodent). Although the teacher recognises that Mika is amused by the word *guinea pig* starting from line 6, she targets the word humorously only after producing serious responses to make sure the word is understood.

The examples of language play in the present data show that playing with language can appear in one simple turn, without creating a significant response, but it can also lead to insights which the teacher can target as learning experiences. Extract 13 from the 5th grade lesson shows conscious playing with a known language form, which is not further discussed, but merely creates amusement in Maria, who produces the humorous turn and Julia, who is sitting next to her. The 9th grade examples are quite different. The language play in extracts 4 and 14 creates an opportunity for students to memorise vocabulary. This is recognised by the teacher, who responds seriously and treats

language play as a learning experience. Thus, it is interesting how in the 9th grade extracts the teacher recognises the benefits of playing with language, but nevertheless, no examples of teacher initiated language play were observed in the present data.

The types of language play observed in elementary and secondary school lessons differed, but here age is not necessarily a key factor. The use of language play is most often text-related (Pitkänen-Huhta 2003:245) and this can also be seen from the present data. In the 9th grade lessons there was a focus on textbook vocabulary, which influenced a further focus on word forms. Also, the two 9th graders Mika and Lasse were particularly interested in words/vocabulary. In the 5th grade there was no similar focus and accordingly, language play was only produced occasionally and got no further attention from the teacher.

5.5 The rare example of a canned joke

Joking is the most broadly defined form of humour in the present study, since it can refer to everything which causes amusement (Norrick 1993: 409). However, in the present thesis the term only refers to forms of canned joking which use familiar joke frames to create amusement (Attardo 1994:295-296). Only one clear example on the category of canned joking was found in the data and the joke presented did not result in laughter as intended.

The extract is from a 5th grade lesson and involves student initiated joking. It is the beginning of class and the teacher is engaging in social chat with the students. The extract begins with a two-party conversation as Lauri is explaining to the teacher about someone he knows, who has travelled to several countries. On line 7 Lauri explicitly invites Daniel to join the conversation by asking him a question. Daniel does not answer; however, he soon interrupts the teacher's turn by producing a joke in relation to the conversation (lines 10-11). Daniel's joke does not get an appropriate response as the teacher does not hear or understand the joke and it gets no reaction from other students.

Extract 15 (5th grade, group 1)

- 01 Lauri: se on melkeen käyny kaikissa Euroopan maissa.
he's been to almost every European country.
- 02 Teacher: o::ho.
wow.

- 03 Lauri: se ei oo käynny kai kolmess tai neljässä.
he hasn't been to like three or four.
- 04 (2.6) ((the teacher browses through her papers, then looks at Lauri who nods
05 towards the teacher))
- 06 Teacher: oho.
wow.
- 07 Lauri: M::oldova. (.) San Marino ja *mikä se kolmas oli.* ((looks at Daniel))
Moldova. San Marino and what was the third one.
- 08 (1.7) ((the teacher is still browsing through papers))
- 09 Teacher: eikse tee mitää muuta ku (.) kiertää kaik[kee eri] maita.=
doesn't he do anything else except travel to different countries.
- 10 Daniel: [se on]
he is
- 11 Daniel: =SE ON Euroopan Anthony Bourdain. \$he he.\$ ((looks at the teacher))
he is the Anthony Bourdain of Europe.
- 12 Teacher: /mi::kä? ((looks at Daniel and leans toward her desk))
what?
- 13 Daniel: ei mikään.= ((looks at the teacher))
nothing.
- 14 Teacher: =Euroopan? ((looks at Daniel))
Europe's?
15 (1.2)
- 16 Daniel: *ei mikää* ((looks at his desk))
nothing.
- 17 Teacher: jaa.
okay.
- 18 ((Jarno looks at Daniel and smiles. Daniel leans towards Jarno and whispers
19 something inaudible, they both laugh))

The joke turn on lines 10 and 11 is produced by Daniel and thus, the extract is a clear example of student initiated humour. In addition, it can be categorised as canned joking, since it presents a familiar frame for a joke. In the joke frame “He/she/it is like the – of –“, we use for example a known person, mostly a public figure, to refer to the qualities of a less known person. One might say for example “She is like the Michael Jackson of salsa dancing”, referring to a person’s great dancing skills, which is likely to be understood since most people know Michael Jackson and that he was famous for his dancing skills. In Daniel’s turn, a reference is made to the American television personality Anthony Bourdain, who is known for his travel and food show, to refer to Lauri’s acquaintance whose several travel experiences are discussed.

The conversation preceding the joke between Lauri and the teacher works as a motive for Daniel's joke. Thus, the motive is presented in five separate turns at the beginning of the excerpt on lines 1-7. However, especially Lauri's turn on line 7 motivates Daniel, as he asks Daniel a question *mikä se kolmas oli*. ("what was the third one.") when trying to remember all the countries his acquaintance has not yet been to. Here Lauri is explicitly inviting Daniel to join the conversation and thus motivating Daniel's turn. Although Daniel does not reply to Lauri's question, he soon interrupts the teacher's turn with the joking turn.

The joking turn begins by overlapping talk as Daniel's comment overlaps the teacher's response to Lauri on line 10. However, Daniel pauses and waits for the teacher to finish her sentence. Raising his voice, most likely to seek attention, Daniel presents his joke in one turn on line 11. The joke is a remark about the person Lauri and the teacher are talking about, saying that he is like "the Anthony Bourdain of Europe". Daniel points out that since the person being talked about has been to so many countries, he could be called the Anthony Bourdain of Europe. This is clearly performed as a joke, since Daniel laughs after producing his comment, thereby inviting other students and the teacher to laugh with him.

However, the joke lacks an appropriate response of laughter due to misunderstanding and/or hearing by the teacher and misunderstanding, hearing or simply not finding the joke funny by students. The teacher seems not to hear or recognise the name Anthony Bourdain as she initiates repair on line 12. The repair is presented in a specific language form *mikä?* (what – a person, an animal or a thing) instead of using the more open form of repair initiation *mitä?* (what did you say?), which suggests the teacher has heard part of Daniel's turn and most likely knows he has pronounced a name. Also, it should be noted that at this point the teacher's position and tone of voice change radically. During the two-party conversation with Lauri, the teacher is sitting at her desk, browsing through papers and answering to Lauri quietly after short pauses. As Daniel interrupts their conversation (lines 10-11), the teacher leans towards her desk and raises her voice to answer, showing more interest in what is said. The teacher has most likely recognised from Daniel's laughter that he intended to say something humorous. She makes an effort to get Daniel to repeat his joke, which might conclude in the appropriate laughing response from the teacher if the name Anthony Bourdain was recognised. However, the

undivided attention from the teacher seems to result in Daniel's refusal to repeat his joke.

Daniel has become the centre of attention in the classroom as the teacher has focused her attention on him and initiated repair on his joke on line 12. Also, no laughter or other response to the joke is put forward by the students. Thus, Daniel refuses to repeat the joke to the teacher by saying *ei mikään*. ("nothing"). The teacher initiates repair again on line 14 by using a partial repeat, *Euroopan?* ("Europe's?"). She is asking Daniel to finish her sentence, since she initially heard the first part of his utterance. Again, Daniel refuses to repeat the name. After the teacher gives up and stops asking, Jarno, sitting next to Daniel, smiles directly at Daniel. As a result, Daniel whispers an inaudible remark to his friend Jarno and they both laugh (lines 18-19). The nonverbal response from Jarno is ambivalent and could relate to multiple issues, and as Daniel's turn is inaudible, their actions cannot be further analysed.

Overall, in the present data, canned jokes in classroom interaction were rare at least in teacher-student conversations. The above excerpt was the only example of canned joking found in the present data and eventually it was not successful as a joke, lacking an appropriate response. The lack of canned jokes in the present data might be explained by the classroom hierarchy and the higher status of the teacher – here the teacher seems to avoid canned jokes and students rarely produce jokes or at least ones that are targeted at the authority of the class. Overall, there is a certain type of formality expected in teacher and student conversations and as Attardo (1994: 297-298) points out, canned jokes are not used as freely in formal situations, as they are not considered appropriate.

6 THE INTERVIEW: THE TEACHER'S VIEWS AND THEIR CONNECTION TO THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

In addition to the recorded lessons, the 57-year-old woman teacher of the lessons was interviewed two months after the video recordings to compare her views to the empirical findings. She had a long history with both of the classes that were observed as she had taught English to the 9th graders for six years and to most of the 5th graders for two years. The interview questions (see Appendix 3) were based on the research questions and initial findings of the analysis of classroom interaction. In this chapter I

will present the teacher's views of humour in relation to three topics that are closely connected to the research questions of the current study. First, I will discuss the teacher's perceptions of student and teacher initiated humour in her lessons. Next, I will point out whether the teacher finds humour to have positive and/or negative effects to classroom atmosphere. Finally, I will discuss how the teacher thinks elementary and secondary school lessons differ particularly in humour use. With each topic the teacher's views are compared to initial findings of the analysis to point out possible similarities and/or differences between the two types of data.

Firstly, a surprising element in the recorded lessons was that student initiated humour was more frequent than teacher initiated humour. Previous research in humour use in classrooms suggests that humour is initiated mostly by the teacher, due to the hierarchical relationship of the teacher and students (Saharinen 2007:263-264). Thus, the initial focus of the current study was teacher humour. This focus shifted after the collection of the data as student initiated humour was included in the study to give a more general view of humour use in the observed lessons and to be able to include more humour types in the findings. In the interview the teacher was asked about student and teacher initiated humour. The high quantity of student humour in the data was found to be connected to the teacher's perceptions of how humour should be portrayed in a classroom:

“no ihannetilanne olis et se lähtis sieltä oppilaista se ajatus (huumori) mutta eihän se aina oo mahdollista jos oppilaat on väsyneitä ja kyllästyneitä [...] et kyllä se täytyy opettajan yrittää välillä keksiä joku millä saa niitten huomion kiintyyn.”

“well ideally it (humour) would be put forth by the students, but it's not always possible if the students are tired and bored [...] so sometimes the teacher does have to come up with something to get the students' attention.”

The teacher's comment above reveals that she finds it ideal when students initiate humour during lessons. However, she mentions that this is not always possible and the teacher should also engage in humour to get the students' attention. In another comment the teacher emphasised how her conscious use of humour during lessons is in fact used to seek the students' attention and get them focused on their work. However, the teacher expressed how she, most of all, values humour to be built through natural interaction instead of forced jokes, since intentionally trying to be funny is unlikely found amusing. A similar view was presented in Anttila's study (2008:168), where upper secondary school students pointed out that teacher's prepared, pretentious and forced jokes were

not funny. Accordingly, the teacher of the current study admits a great deal of the humour she uses during lessons is not planned, but produced spontaneously in relation to context in particular sequences of interaction. The teacher's views of how she uses humour during lessons connect to the data findings, since the teacher only produced humour in the form of irony and teases which were motivated by the unfolding interaction. Almost every example of teacher humour in the data was a reaction to a student's turn or action. Only extract 7, the one example of irony found in the 5th grade lessons, seemed to be produced to get the student's attention after ending a previous task and beginning a new one.

Secondly, when discussing humour in relation to the atmosphere of the classroom, the teacher found humour to have mostly positive effects in her lessons. She found that humour enhances the relationship between the teacher and her students. According to her, there is a clear connection with the history of the teacher and the class and how much humour is used by both the teacher and students during the lessons. She found that the best type of humour is in fact, connected to the teacher-class relationship:

"[...] just se tilanne mikä on mun mielestä on paras että syntyy semmonen luokan tai sen opettajan ja opetusryhmän kanssa syntyy se oma huumori"

"[...] I think the best situation is when the class or the teacher and the group of students create their own humour."

However, the teacher was also aware of the negative aspects of humour, how student humour in particular can turn into a form of bullying and how it is her responsibility to take action in those situations:

"niin siinähan (humorin käytössä) voi tulla hirveen helposti niitä ylilyöntejä. et joku oppilas sanoo jollekin toiselle oppilaalle tai opettajalle jotain ikävää. et siihen pitää sit hirveen tarkkana olla ja puuttua."

"yeah (in humour use) the line can be crossed easily. that some student says something mean to another student or the teacher. one has to pay attention in these situations and intervene."

In addition, the teacher pointed out that negative humour can be hard to detect as students may use words that have hidden meanings to ridicule one another and thus, the teacher is often unable to detect the connection of humour to bullying. Accordingly, if seemingly neutral humour sequences occur between students, not involving the teacher, the teacher says she does not intervene:

“en mä siihen (oppilaiden keskinäiseen huumorin käyttöön) puutu jos se tapahtuu semmosessa tilanteessa et sitä työtä tehdään kuitenkin koko ajan ja ne puhuu jotain omia juttujaan nii mitäs väliä sillä on.”

“I won't intervene in that (humour use between students) if it happens in a situation where the work is getting done then what does it matter.”

The teacher's views are visible in the interactional data, as she rarely intervened in any of the students' private discussions unless she found the interaction particularly aggressive or disturbing the lesson. Intervening was most common in examples of banter, where students ridiculed each other through alternate teases and voices were raised. The teacher intervened banter mostly because it raised the activity and noise level of the class and thus, begun to disturb the current lesson activities. The content of the humour sequences was not further targeted.

Finally, when asked about the differences between elementary school teaching and secondary school teaching, the teacher did not feel her teaching differed much between the two age groups and only mentioned that in secondary school more attention needs to be paid to discipline and the noise level of the class. However, differences specifically in humour use between the two age groups got the teacher to ponder the specific humour type of sarcasm. She was likely referring to other forms of irony as well when she admitted that she tends to use sarcasm in her teaching:

“esimerkiks kolmasluokkalaiset ei ymmärrä vielä sarkasmia. eikä neljäsluokkalaisetkaan oikeen. et pitää olla niinku konkretian tasolla ettei. eikä ne ymmärrä sitä jos mä sanon jotain mitä mä en tarkota. koska semmonen tyyli mulla on et saatan sanoa ihan päinvastasta mitä tarkoitan niin sit mun täytyy miettiä et hei ei noi ymmärrä.[...] mut sitten viidennellä jo ne rupee ymmärtämään. mut pikkasen täytyy silti olla varovainen sillai et ne (alakoululaiset) kaipaa vähän selkeämpää viestintää (kuin yläkoululaiset)”

“third graders for example don't understand sarcasm yet. and even fourth graders. so you have to be concrete so. and they don't understand if I say something opposite of what I mean. because I have this way of saying something completely opposite of what I mean, so I have to think to myself that hey they don't understand. [...] but then on the fifth grade they begin to understand. but still I have to be a little bit careful because they (elementary students) need slightly clearer communication (than secondary students).”

The sarcastic characteristic of the teacher was clearly shown in the data; however, there was a clear difference between the 5th grade and 9th grade lessons. As the teacher admits during the interview, one needs to be more articulate with elementary school children. Accordingly, the teacher used only one ironic remark during the 5th grade lessons as opposed to the seven examples of irony produced during the 9th grade lessons. More importantly, the one example of irony in the 5th grade lesson was not understood by all

students and created confusion. Thus, it could be interpreted that in the current data, age is a factor in the use of irony or at least teacher irony.

The teacher also thought that students' criticism towards the teacher's humour grows with age and the humour used by adults or the humour appearing in textbooks is not found as amusing as in elementary school. Furthermore, the teacher pointed out that secondary school students often develop their own "inside" humour which cannot be understood by others. However, no particular difference was found in the elementary student's and secondary student's reaction to teacher humour in the observed lessons, which might be explained by the small amount of data gathered for the present study. Also, it should be noted that the students' reactions were individual as some laughed, while others only smiled or produced no apparent reaction to the humour examples.

Overall, discussing the teacher's views of humour and the use of humour in her lessons it was evident that she valued the role of humour in teaching and had her own views of how humour works in a classroom environment, most of which connected with the initial findings of the analysis of classroom interaction. The teacher considered classroom humour to be based on the history and the relationship of the teacher and the class or students she is teaching, which was evident in many of her comments. She found that the differences in her and the students' use of humour between different classes was not particularly age-connected, but more related to how well she knows the students and how well they know her:

"en näkis niinkään et se ikä eikä mikään (vaikuttaa huumorin käyttöön) vaan se kuinka hyvin mä tunnen ne. ja kuinka hyvin ne tuntee mut. että kyllähän mun tarttee olla joittenkin uusien seiskojen kanssa paljon uskottavampi opettaja ku mitä mä voin näitten ysien kanssa olla että. jotka osaa jo. just viime tunnilla naurettiin ko ne osaa jo lukea mun ajatukset, ne tietää mitä mä seuraavaks aion sanoo. he he."

"I wouldn't see it (humour use) as age-related but how well I know them (students). and how well they know me. I mean of course I have to be a more credible teacher with for example new seventh graders than I can be with these ninth graders. who know. like on the previous lesson we laughed about the fact that they can read my thoughts, they know what I'm going to say next. he he."

Similar to the findings of Saharinen (2007) who looked specifically at teasing, the teacher of the current study found humour to work as an index of closeness between her and the students. In summary, the humour used between the teacher and her students tends to reveal how long or short amount of time the participants have known each other and how close their relationship is.

7 DISCUSSION

In the current study, humour was examined through different types of humour that were identified from the data: irony, teasing, banter, language play and joking. Through these categories the current study aimed to examine both teacher and student initiated humour, differences in the humour use of 5th grade elementary and 9th grade secondary school lessons and the effect of humour on classroom atmosphere. Several assumptions were made about the possible outcome of the study before collecting the data. Firstly, it was expected that teacher initiated humour would be more frequent in the data, because of the hierarchical roles of the participants. In addition, due to the different communication cultures of children and teenagers, it was expected that their use in humour would portray clear differences between the two age groups. Finally, the effects of humour on the atmosphere of the class was expected to be mostly positive. The accuracy of these assumptions and detailed answers to the research questions of the current study will be discussed in the following.

7.1 Comparison of humour use in elementary and secondary school

Simon et al. (1986: 53) point out that the humour people use and appreciate changes as they get older, which inspired the idea for the current study to compare the use of humour in elementary school and secondary school lessons. The difference in communication cultures between children and teenagers is evident, but the aim of the study was to find out the ways in which the age difference manifests in the teacher's and students' use and appreciation of humour in the specific context of a second language classroom. Overall, the differences in humour use between the two observed age groups, 11 to 12-year-olds and 15 to 16-year-olds, were quite minor. However, the differences that could be pointed out presented some interesting information on the teacher's and students' use of humour in a classroom environment. I will now present the most prominent differences found between the two grades by going through each humour type.

Irony appeared repeatedly in the observations, but showed differences in both quantity and quality between the 5th and 9th grade lessons. Only one example of irony was found in the 5th grade lessons as opposed to the eight examples of irony detected in the 9th grade lessons. All examples except one were produced by the teacher and the one

example of student initiated irony in 9th grade was targeted at another student. In addition to the difference in quantity between the two school grades, the use of irony and the reactions to it differed between the age groups. In the 5th grade lesson the ironic remark was produced by the teacher after completing a previous task and was most likely meant to get the students' attention. Also, it was not understood by all students, which created confusion. In contrast, the 9th grade examples of irony were produced as reactions to the students' turns or actions, mostly criticising students' behaviour, which is a common motive for the use of irony in a classroom (Piiirainen-Marsh 2010). In addition, the reactions to teacher irony revealed that the 9th grade students understood the humoristic intention. The findings suggest that irony is more often used and more likely understood as a way to create humour in secondary school when compared to elementary school. However, the use of irony and sarcasm is also tied to the teacher's views of personal humour use as she pointed out in the interview that she tends to use this type of humour, but the use of it is more careful with elementary school students to avoid confusion. The understanding of irony and sarcasm starts already at the age of six, but grows with age (McGhee 1986:44-45). Although the younger students were 11 to 12-year-olds and the age difference between them and the 9th graders was only four years, there was a clear difference in the use of and reaction(s) to irony in the observed lessons.

Examples of irony were often similar to teases in the data and accordingly, a connection between the two categories of humour could be pointed out. Compared to the one example of irony in the 5th grade lessons, six examples of teasing were found in the same lessons, four initiated by the teacher. The 9th grade lessons revealed half the amount: three examples which all were student initiated. In connection to the use of irony, it seems that the teacher preferred to use teasing over irony with the 5th graders and irony over teasing with the 9th graders. Accordingly, the teacher mentioned in the interview that she uses sarcasm more carefully with elementary students. Furthermore, as her careful and almost non-existent use of irony with the 5th graders was also found in the data, it is possible to conclude that teasing seems to be a more neutral substitute for the teacher to engage in humour with younger students. Overall, teasing is a less face-threatening way for the teacher to use humour with elementary students, since it is less likely to be misinterpreted. In addition, teasing was used by both 5th graders and 9th graders to target the teacher, unlike irony which was only once used by a student during the 9th grade lessons and even then to target another student and not the teacher. This

might suggest teasing is also a less face-threatening way for the students to approach the teacher if compared to irony. By engaging in humour through teasing instead of irony, the students can ensure their message is understood by the teacher.

Banter and language play presented no significant differences between the two age groups. Banter was evident in both 5th grade and 9th grade lessons and all examples happened between students. The teacher did not engage in banter because of her higher status in the classrooms; her role was merely to observe and intervene if she found it necessary. The banter extracts were similar as students engaging in banter always seemed to be close friends. All examples of banter were produced by students who sat close to each other and engaged in conversation more than once during the lessons. Moreover, all banter was produced in good nature, clear signs of humour were produced during the interactions and the actions did not seem to result in offending anyone. Instead they were used to build the students' social relationships, which according to Plester and Sayers (2007:158) is the intended result of bantering. Language play was also evident in both 5th and 9th grade lessons and all examples were student initiated. Language play was more evident in the 9th grade lessons, but the reason lay in the content of the lesson and not the age of the students: One focus of the 9th grade lessons was vocabulary and this created discussion on word forms. Thus, the 9th grade examples of language play were acknowledged by the teacher as learning experiences. In contrast, the 5th grade examples of humour were only occasionally produced and did not get further attention from the teacher.

Finally, joking or more specifically canned joking was a very rare category of humour, as only one example was produced in the data. On the basis of one joke it is not possible to compare joking between the two age groups, but the example should be pointed out as an exception. The use of canned jokes in teacher-student interaction is likely rare because of the hierarchical roles of the teacher and her students, since joking is regarded as inappropriate in formal situations (Attardo 1994:297-298). Also, possible prepared jokes by the teacher are often not appreciated by students (Anttila 2008). However, the use of jokes seems to be appreciated in interactions between students, since they interact more freely with one another. This is evident, for example in the study of Sanford and Eder (1984) who observed teenagers' lunchroom interaction. A less strict environment of a lunchroom allowed a view of sustained interaction between friends without the presence of a teacher and accordingly, many examples of canned jokes were observed.

Although quite minor, the findings showed interesting differences of humour use in the observed elementary and secondary school lessons. The most prominent differences were found in the humour types of irony and teasing. However, as Nahemov (1986:4) points out, it is not only age, but many other aspects that affect humour use, including sense of humour, individuality, time, social situation and emotions. This was evident in the findings of the current study and made the differentiation of humour use between age groups difficult. How humour was used between a teacher and her students in the present data was clearly more than age-related and influenced by other factors including the institutional context of the classroom and more specifically the context of the lessons, the teacher's personal style of teaching and sense of humour, the students' sense of humour and the history and closeness between the teacher and her students.

7.2 Positive and negative effects of humour on classroom atmosphere

In addition to comparing how humour differed in elementary and secondary school lessons, the study aimed to find out the effect of humour use on the classroom atmosphere. In other words, whether humour created positive reactions and possibly enhanced learning or resulted in negativity, such as students getting offended or even getting bullied. Due to the limitations of the study no student interviews were included in the thesis and the answer presented here will be based only on data observations.

Based on the data, most of the examples of humour were found to have a positive effect on the classroom atmosphere. The positive effect was evident from the reactions to humour use, which included smiling, laughing and other humorous responses such as exaggerated postures or facial expressions. Furthermore, nonverbal actions were particularly significant in detecting that the participants were acting in humour mode. This connects to research findings which show that in addition to various linguistic and material activities, the teacher's and students' embodied interaction is a significant factor in the study of classroom interaction (Kääntä 2011:147). In the current data, changes in body position, gaze and particularly various types of facial expression such as squinting of eyes or looking at a co-participant in disgust provided new information on how humour was produced and what the reaction that followed was. In addition to the basic humour signals, including laughter and change of voice, these contextual clues are the key in finding out whether the participants are acting in serious or non-serious

mode (Haakana 1996:149-156). Overall, it was easier to detect the positive than the negative effects of humour use, since negative emotions were not expressed as strongly by the participants. One explanation for the lack of showing negative emotions could be the institutional context of a classroom and the hierarchical roles of the participants.

The humour type irony appeared mostly as a teacher characteristic, which seemed to be appreciated by 9th grade students based on their response to the teacher's ironic remarks. However, the one example of student irony detected in the 9th grade lessons (extract 6) did not get a similar reaction. Targeted at another student with the intention of ridicule, the student's ironic turns that were produced in a more negative tone were clearly different compared to the teacher's playful irony. The irony was ignored by the target, which does not allow a further analysis on whether the target was offended. However, based on the evidently close relationship between the students, the irony was most likely produced in good nature. Several other humour sequences in the data were produced by or at least involved the same participants (see e.g. extract 12). Furthermore, in this example the high pitched voice used while producing the ironic remark indicated a clear humorous intent. Finally, the ironic turn produced by the teacher during a 5th grade lesson (extract 7) did not create a successful response, but confused some of the students. One of the students expressed his confusion verbally and thereby risked appearing to others as stupid (Pirainen-Marsh 2010). However, here the effect was not directly negative, as the misunderstanding was discreetly clarified by another student and the boy who expressed his confusion only briefly became a target of unwanted attention.

Teasing had a positive effect on the atmosphere in most of the examples detected in the data, but a few examples should be looked at more closely to discuss possible negativity created by the humour sequences. Firstly, extract 9 presented a teasing sequence where Jussi was targeted by two boys as he was writing on the blackboard. The teasing was produced in good nature, but Jussi's reactions showed that unlike Sauli and Dmitry he was not completely in the humour mode during the long interaction. The continued teasing lead to Jussi being insecure of his writing and seeking the teacher's attention. Also, after Jussi had finished writing he gave no verbal response to the boys' apologies, which might suggest he was offended. As a response he actively changed his role from being teased to a teaser by immediately engaging in banter with Laura (extract 11), which seemed to act as a defence mechanism. Secondly, extract 10 shows an example of

student teasing through malicious pleasure targeted at the teacher. Preceding the tease the teacher was trying to get the students' attention and seemed fed up with all the noise. Accordingly, the tease got a serious response and was portrayed more negatively by the teacher. These examples show how the length of the teasing sequence and the preceding events can affect the response to the teasing and whether it is perceived as positive or negative. However, it should be noted that teasing can be a particularly difficult humour type to analyse in terms of its positive and negative effects, since even when the humorous intention is appreciated by the target teases often receive serious po-faced responses (Drew 1987:219-253).

In general, the use of banter can be viewed as positive, since when the participants are aware of the humorous intent, it serves to enhance social relationships (Plester and Sayers 2007:158). However, in the classroom environment the effects of banter presented as more negative, since banter often occurs only between students and is not related to the subject of teaching, but is built in sequences of off-task talk. This can intrude the lesson activities by creating unwanted noise particularly if students get excited and begin to raise their voices. The teacher who taught the observed lessons was very allowing when banter occurred and only intervened when she found the banter to cause unwanted noise and disturb other students' work or when the banter was the focus of the whole class and she was addressed during the sequence (extracts 3 and 12). The teacher seemed to intervene sequences of banter mostly to point out boundaries to students between acceptable classroom behaviour and "crossing the line". Intervening of banter was most often not connected to the context of the humour sequence, but to the teacher expressing her authority and calming down the students. The findings connect with the teacher's views on intervening student humour which were presented in the interview (chapter 6). In summary, banter in the specific context of a classroom had also negative effects even when the initial participants were in humour mode.

Language play in the current data influenced the atmosphere of the class positively, since it led to amusement, but also deeper pedagogical discussions between the teacher and her students. In the 9th grade lessons word play was evident when different word forms were discussed by students in relation to studying the vocabulary and targeted by the teacher as learning experiences. In the 5th grade lessons examples of language play were not discussed further, because of their infrequent use and since they were not further regarded as learning experiences. However, the 5th grade students' unusual uses

of language forms were targeted humorously and created amusement in both the students and the teacher (teacher's amusement was not shown in the final extracts presented in the analysis section). In summary, the use of language play in the current data appeared to have a positive effect from creating amusement to pedagogical discussions and learning experiences. One reason for the positivity of language play seems to be the lack of a human target. In language play the target of humour is a language form which often appears in a literal source such as the students' textbook (Pitkänen-Huhta 2003:245). Accordingly, language play enables the participants to have a more neutral conversation where the use of humour is less personal and the speakers are less likely to get offended.

Overall, positive effects of humour in the observed lessons were found more prominent than the negative ones. Most signs of negativity were observed in humour between students including a long extract of teasing (extract 9) and examples of banter that were found to disturb the ongoing lesson activities (extracts 3 and 12). This connects with the findings of Roininen (2010) who discovered more negativity in student humour when compared to teacher humour. However, the negative aspects of student humour in the current data were mostly unrelated to the content of the humour sequences and connected to the humour use creating noise and disturbing the current lesson activities and thus, requiring the teacher to intervene. Still, most examples in the data presented as positive; they lead to smiles and/or laughter and through that seemed to create a more open and supportive classroom climate. For example, the category of language play was found extremely positive as playing with different words and language forms led not only to amusement, but also seemed to enhance the students' language knowledge and accordingly, improve their language learning. However, the positive effect of other humour categories should not be underestimated, since all types of humour are important in building teacher-student relationships and creating an open classroom environment (Stuart and Rosenfeld 1994:98). Moreover, the teacher pointed out in the interview that humour is an important part in establishing a specific relationship with each group or class, since groups (including the teacher) often develop their own type of humour through the years they spend together as a class.

Finally, it should be noted that differentiating the positive and negative effects of humour on classroom atmosphere was not completely straightforward on the basis of observations. Through observing it is impossible to know the participants' genuine

feelings about the use of humour and especially negative feelings often stay hidden. Anttila's study (2008) on upper secondary school students' perceptions of humour, which included interviews, shows that some students might laugh at the teacher's humour even when they are not amused. Thus, by laughing students might portray politeness and respect to the teacher instead of their genuine reactions, which is impossible to detect through mere observations. Accordingly, the answer to the question *How does the use of humour affect the atmosphere of the classroom?* would have been more reliable if student interviews had been included as a part of the data.

8 CONCLUSION

In the current comparative case study I observed the use of both teacher and student initiated humour in 5th grade and 9th grade EFL lessons taught by the same teacher. A thematic interview with the teacher was also conducted. It was presumed that as teachers always have a personal style of teaching, following just one teacher and how she acts with students of different ages, a more clear view of possible differences in humour use between the two grades could be pointed out. Also, conducting an interview with the teacher and asking her views on using humour in the EFL classroom provided an opportunity to compare her opinions of how she thinks humour features in her lessons to the actual practices observed during the lessons. As a case study the current thesis aimed to gain a deeper view of a specific case – how humour was used by this particular teacher and her students that represented two different age groups, 11 to 12-year-olds and 15 to 16-year-olds.

In relation to the differences between the two age groups, the results showed that irony and teasing were used most differently between 5th grade and 9th grade lessons. Irony was used more by the teacher, particularly in the 9th grade lessons. Results matched the teacher's views as she pointed out that one should be more careful with the use of sarcasm in elementary school as the level of understanding irony and sarcasm only grows with age. Accordingly, the teacher used a more neutral humour type, teasing, repeatedly in the 5th grade lessons. Other categories of humour were similar with both groups and differences were seen as connected to something other than age. For example, language play was more frequent in the 9th grade lessons because of the lessons' focus on vocabulary. Overall, the findings of the current study revealed interesting differences in the humour use between two age groups, but also showed how

it is difficult to rely only on age as a separate factor effecting the use of humour. The study provided an in-depth view of humour use in two school grades taught by the same teacher and presented important findings to the field of research, since it gave detailed information on specific target groups that have not been studied before.

The effect of humour on the classroom atmosphere was another interest of the current study and the results showed mostly positive effects. A few examples in the data showed signs of negativity, but mostly in relation to unwanted noise and disturbance of lesson activities rather than the actual content of the humour sequences. Furthermore, analysing humour as negative was complex as the current study had to rely strictly on observations. The extracts could only be confirmed as negative by the participants themselves, but due to the limitations of the present study, no student interviews were included here. The negative effect of humour use is difficult for an observer and even for the teacher to confirm unless there are clear signs which reveal a change from humour mode to serious mode including serious emotional responses such as crying. However, without visible clues one cannot be sure about students' genuine feelings when someone or something is humorously targeted during a lesson. In fact, the teacher pointed out during the interview that a teacher's job can sometimes resemble the work of a detective when one should recognise when humour turns into bullying as opposed to good natured humour.

Viewed critically, the current study had some weaknesses and limitations. Firstly, the comparison of humour between two age groups was not straightforward as other effects on humour use had to be considered including the lesson context and individual use and reactions to humour. Also, due to the limited data only a few clear differences could be pointed out. Secondly, the effect of humour on the classroom atmosphere was difficult to detect through mere observation, since negative feelings were expressed less clearly by the teacher and students compared to positive feelings and reactions. Finally, the interview could have provided more valuable information on specific humour sequences if more time had been used to analyse the data before conducting the interview. However, the interview nevertheless provided vital additional information and was a beneficial add to the current study. In a strictly conversation analytic study all findings are based on observations and thus, on the understandings of participants' display of each other's actions, but by adding the teacher interview as another method of study it was possible to analyse the findings in relation to the teacher's views of humour.

Finally, some suggestions for further study could be made. Considering how the teacher of the current study emphasised the importance of teacher-student history and relationship, it would be interesting for future researchers to compare how a teacher and his/her students use humour when they are only getting to know each other as opposed to when they have worked with one another for a long time and have had a chance to establish their relationships. Also, for a longitudinal study it would be interesting to look at how the use of humour between a teacher and a new class/group of students develops through years of teaching. Another interesting research topic would be to look at even younger students' or nursery children's use of humour, since they experience more difficulties in understanding and producing for example the forms of irony. Finally, in terms of the positive and negative effects of humour to classroom atmosphere it would be worthwhile to conduct a study that included student interviews to find out the possible underlying negative effects of classroom humour.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anttila, T. (2008). Lukiolaisten käsityksiä huumorista ja kokemuksia opettajista huumorin käyttäjinä. *Joensuun yliopiston kasvatustieteellisiä julkaisuja 126*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin-New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Belz, J. (2002). Second language play as a representation of the multicompetent self in foreign language study. *Journal of Language: Identity, and Education* 1(1), 13-39. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2277dc9b-efad-4f24-886c-a0779384280b%40sessionmgr110andvid=6andhid=128>
- Blommaert, J. and Dong, J. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse. The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cekaite, A. and Aronsson, K. (2005) Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics* 26 (2), 169-191. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=2277dc9b-efad-4f24-886c-a0779384280b%40sessionmgr110andvid=9andhid=128>
- Chiaro, D. (1996). *The language of jokes: Analysing verbal play*. London: Routledge.
- Drew, P. (1987). Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics* 25, 219-253.
- Dynel, M. (2008). No aggression, only teasing: The pragmatics of teasing and banter. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 4.2, 241-261. <http://versita.metapress.com/content/a56111728n33188q/fulltext.pdf>
- Dynel, M. (2009). Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humor. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3 (5), 1284-1299.
- Erickson, S. J. and Feldstein, S. W. (2007). Adolescent humor and its relationship to coping, defense strategies, psychological distress, and well-being. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development* 37 (3), 255-271. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=2277dc9b-efad-4f24-886c-a0779384280b%40sessionmgr110andvid=16andhid=128>
- Eskola, J. (2001). Laadullisen tutkimuksen juhannustaiat. Laadullisen aineiston analyysi vaihe vaiheelta. In J. Aaltola and R. Valli (eds.), *Ikkunoita tutkimusmetodeihin II, näkökumia aloittelevalle tutkijalle tutkimuksen teoreettisiin lähtökohtiin ja analyysimenetelmiin*, 133-157.

- Finney, G. (ed.) (1994). *Look who's laughing. Gender and comedy. Studies in humor and gender, volume I*. Pennsylvania: Gordon and Breach.
- Haakana, M. (1996). Huumori ja vakava keskustelun kategorioina. In A. Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja II*. Kieli 10, 141-172. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Haapaniemi, K. (2011). Conversational joking in the classroom. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/36937/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-2011111311677.pdf?sequence=1>
- Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk is cheap. Sarcasm, alienation, and the evolution of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hakulinen, A. (1998a). Johdanto. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskusteluanalyysin perusteet*. Tammer-Paino Oy: Tampere, 13-17.
- Hakulinen, A. (1998b). Vuorottelujäsennys. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskusteluanalyysin perusteet*. Tammer-Paino Oy: Tampere, 32-55.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide* (2nd edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversational analysis and institutional talk. In K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders (eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 103-147.
- Hirsjärvi, S. and Hurme, H. (1980). *Teemahaastattelu*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. and Sajavaara, P. (2004). *Tutki ja kirjoita* (10th edition). Helsinki: Tammi.
- Holmes, J. (2006). Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (1), 26-50.
http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0378216605001281/1-s2.0-S0378216605001281-main.pdf?_tid=1fd3f06c-8f09-11e3-8a55-00000aab0f02andacdnat=1391675690_0db74af4f1a78bef0c639729f7c793e7
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kazarian, S. S. and Martin, A. R. (2006). Humor styles, culture-related personality, well-being, and family adjustment among Armenians in Lebanon. *International Journal of Humor Research* 19 (4), 405-423.
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2277dc9b-efad-4f24-886c-a0779384280b%40sessionmgr110&vid=20&hid=128>

- Keltner, D., Capps, L., Kring, A. M., Young, R. C. and Heerey, E. A. (2001). Just teasing: A conceptual analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin* 127 (2), 229-248.
- Klein, D. N. and Kuiper, N. A. (2006). Humor styles, peer relationships and bullying in middle childhood. *International Journal of Humor Research* 19 (4), 383-404.
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2277dc9b-efad-4f24-886c-a0779384280b%40sessionmgr110&vid=24&hid=128>
- Kääntä, L. (2011). Katse, nyökkäys ja osoittava ele opettajan vuoronannoissa luokahuonevuorovaikutuksessa. In P. Haddington and L. Kääntä (eds.), *Kieli, keho ja vuorovaikutus. Multimodaalinen näkökulma sosiaaliseen toimintaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 122-151.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Lilja, N. (2010). *Ongelmista oppimiseen. Toisen aloittamat korjausjaksot kakkoskielisessä keskustelussa*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 146. University of Jyväskylä.
- Lilja, N. (2011). Keskustelunanalyysi ja kielenoppimisen tutkimus. In P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa. Tutkielman laatijan opas*. Tampere: Finn Lectura, 68–87.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society* 33 (5), 703-736.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/204592302/fulltextPDF?accountid=11774>
- Margutti, P. (2007). Two uses of third-person references in family gatherings displaying family ties: teasing and clarifications. *Discourse Studies* 19 (5), 623-651.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 583-596.
- Markee N. and Kasper G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 491-500.
- Martin, G. and Sullivan E. (2013). Sense of humor across cultures: A comparison of British, Australian and American Respondents. *North American Journal of Psychology* 15 (2), 375-384. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1353528182>
- Martin, R. A. and Kuiper, N. A. (1999). Daily occurrence of laughter: Relationships with age, gender, and type A personality. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 12 (4), 355–384.

- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society* 7, 183-213.
- McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society* 19, 349-377.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons. Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Mori, J. and Zuengler, J. (2008). Conversation analysis and talk-in-interaction in classrooms. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejia and N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Volume 3: Discourse and Education* (2nd edition). New York: Springer, 15-26.
- Morreall, J. (1983). *Taking laughter seriously*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Mulkay, M. (1988). *On humor: Its nature and its place in modern society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Määttä, K. and Uusiautti, S. (2012). Pedagogical authority and pedagogical love – connected or incompatible? *International Journal of Whole Schooling* 8(1), 21-39.
- Nahemov, L. (1986). Humor as a data base for the study of aging. In L. Nahemov, K. A. McCluskey-Fawcett and P. E. McGhee (eds.), *Humor and aging*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Neuliep, J. W. (1991). An examination of the content of high school teachers' humor in the classroom and the development of an inductively derived taxonomy of classroom humor. *Communication Education* 40 (4), 343-355.
<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e6fbef30-ea9b-4ab0-9362-d14fccacee88%40sessionmgr112&vid=5&hid=128>
- Nikula, T. and Kääntä, L. (2011). Luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksen tutkimus. In P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa. Tutkielman laatijan opas*. Tampere: Finn Lectura, 49-67.
- Norrick, N. R. (1993). *Conversational joking. Humor in everyday talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Norrick, N. R. (2003). Issues in conversational joking. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (9), 1333-1359.
http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0378216602001807/1-s2.0-S0378216602001807-main.pdf?_tid=016b9e02-8f10-11e3-92ce-00000aab0f26&acdnat=1391678645_d5fc872e57ab3b1c5bdf47862176db43

- Norrick, N. R. and Chiaro, D. (2009). *Humor in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Opetushallitus (2004). *Perusopetuksen Opetussuunnitelman Perusteet 2004*. Vammala: Vammalan kirjapaino.
- Peräkylä, A. (1998). Institutionaalinen keskustelu. In L. Tainio (ed.) *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Tammer-Paino Oy, 177-203.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2010). Irony and the moral order of secondary school classrooms. *Linguistics and Education* 22 (4), 364-382.
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=e94a118b-1a93-4d1a-98ba-ec1dc1cabe30%40sessionmgr114&vid=5&hid=128>
- Pitkänen-Huhta, A. (2003). *Texts and interaction. Literary practices in the EFL classroom*. Jyväskylä studies in languages 55. University of Jyväskylä.
- Plester, B. A. and Sayers, J. (2007). "Taking the piss": Functions of banter in the IT industry. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*. 20 (2), 157-187.
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e6fbef30-ea9b-4ab0-9362-d14fccacee88%40sessionmgr112&vid=9&hid=128>
- Polimeni, J. and Reiss, J. P. (2006). The first joke: Exploring the evolutionary origins of humor. *Evolutionary Psychology* 4, 347-366.
<http://www.epjournal.net/wp-content/uploads/ep04347366.pdf>
- Provine, R. R. and Fischer, K. R. (1989). Laughing, smiling and talking: Relation to sleeping and social context in humans. *Ethology* 83 (4), 295-305.
<http://psychology.umbc.edu/files/2013/10/Laughing-Smiling-and-Talking-Relation-to-Sleeping-and-social-context-in-humans-Robert-R.Provine.pdf>
- Putkonen, S. (2001). Kahden maailman välissä. Kiusoittelu ja siihen vastaaminen kolmen tytön kasvokkaiakeskustelussa. In M. Heinonen, P. Korhonen, M. Mäntylä, S. Putkonen and L. Tainio (eds.) *Keskustelun kuosit. Kielen opissa 6*. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja, 197-217.
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Pub. Co.
- Roininen, E. (2010). Humor in the classroom. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä. Department of Languages.
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/38142/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201207042000.pdf?sequence=1>

- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman and J. F. Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 337-353.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50 (4), 696-735.
[http://anthroweb.ucsd.edu/~jhaviland/AudVid/AudVidReadings/Simplest_Systematics_for_Turn-Taking_\(Language\).pdf](http://anthroweb.ucsd.edu/~jhaviland/AudVid/AudVidReadings/Simplest_Systematics_for_Turn-Taking_(Language).pdf)
- Saharinen, K. (2007). Huumoria koulussa – kiusoittelu opettajan keinona suhtautua oppilaan virheisiin. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 261-287.
- Sanford, S. and Eder, D. (1984). Adolescent humor during peer interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 47 (3), 235-243.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3033820.pdf?acceptTC=true&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>
- Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8, 289-327.
<http://www.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/schegloffOpeningUpClosings.pdf>
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53 (2), 361-382.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/413107.pdf?&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>
- Schnurr, S. and Holmes, J. (2009). Using humor to do masculinity at work. In N. R. Norrick and D. Chiaro (eds.), *Humor in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 101-123.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Simons, C. J. R., McCluskey-Fawcett, K. A. and Papini, D. R. (1986). Theoretical and functional perspectives on the development of humor during infancy, childhood and adolescence. In L. Nahemov, K. A. McCluskey-Fawcett and P. E. McGhee (eds.), *Humor and aging*. London: Academic Press Inc, 53-80.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spåre, P. (2008). Huumori saa luokan poreilemaan. *Opettaja –lehti* [online].
http://www.opettaja.fi/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/OPETTAJALEHTI_EPAPER_PG/2008_37/126296.htm (Accessed on 30.10.2013)

- Stuart, W. D. and Rosenfeld, L. B. (1994). Student perceptions of teacher humor and classroom climate. *Communication Research Reports* 11 (1), 87-97.
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e6fbef30-ea9b-4ab0-9362-d14fccacee88%40sessionmgr112&vid=18&hid=128>
- Tainio, L. (2007). Miten tutkia luokkahuoneen vuorovaikutusta keskusteluanalyysin keinoin? In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 15-58.
- Tholander, M. and Aronsson, K. (2003). Doing subteaching in school group work: Positionings, resistance and participation frameworks. *Language and Education: An International Journal* 17 (3), 208-234.
- Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power talk. Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2009). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi* (6th edition). Helsinki: Tammi.
- Vepsäläinen, M. (2007). Opettaja kysyy ja oppilas vastaa – vai toisinpäin? In L. Tainio (ed.), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 156-177.
- Wagner, J. (2004). The Classroom and Beyond. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4), 612-616. http://www.academia.edu/823117/The_classroom_and_beyond
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Consent form for parents (similar forms were also written for the headmaster and the teacher of the class)



Jyväskylässä

25.02.2013

Hei _____-luokan vanhemmat! Olen Sanna Paajoki, viidennen vuoden englannin opiskelija Jyväskylän Yliopistolta. Kerään graduun eli oppinäytetyöhön aineistoa luokahuonevuorovaikutuksesta videokuvamalla alakoulun, sekä yläkoulun englannin tunteja _____ koululla 12.3.2013. Jälkikasvunne on oppilaana näillä tunneilla ja tarvitsen siksi tutkimusluvan teiltä, jotta voin suorittaa tutkimukseni eettisin periaattein.

Toivoisin siis että tutustutte allaoleviin sopimusehtoihin ja allekirjoittaisitte suostumuksen tutkimukseeni. Koppioita dokumentista on kaksi, toisen saatte säilyttää itsellänne ja toinen tulisi palauttaa oppilaan mukana koululle. Videokuvaus suoritetaan tiistaina 12.3. englannin kaksoistunnilla, joten **suostumus tulisi palauttaa englannin opettaja _____ viimeistään perjantaina 8.3.** Kiitos yhteistyöstänne!

SOPIMUS TUTKIMUSAINIESTON KÄYTTÖOIKEUKSISTA

Tutkimushanke: Sanna Paajoen graduaineisto

Tässä sopimuksessa tutkimukseen osallistuvan alaikäisen henkilön huoltaja sekä tutkimushankkeen edustaja(t) sopivat kerättävän tutkimusaineiston käyttöoikeuksista. Allekirjoitetulla sopimuksella tutkimukseen osallistuvan henkilön huoltaja antaa suostumuksensa huollettavan henkilön osallistumisesta tutkimukseen ja luovuttaa tutkimushankkeelle alla eritellyt oikeudet tutkimusaineiston käytöstä.

Tutkimukseen osallistuvan alaikäisen henkilön huoltaja on lukenut, ymmärtänyt sekä hyväksynyt seuraavat kohdat

- Tutkimuksessa kerätty aineisto tulee ainoastaan yllämainitun tutkimushankkeen eli gradun käyttöön.
- Tutkimukseen osallistuminen perustuu vapaaehtoisuuteen.
- Tutkimushenkilöiden anonymiteetti turvataan tutkimuksen kirjallisissa raportoinnissa sekä tutkimusaineistosta ja tutkimuksen tuloksista puhuttaessa.
- Tutkimuksen tuloksia julkaistaan ja niistä raportoidaan tieteellisessä julkaisussa.
- Tutkimukseen osallistuvan henkilön huoltaja voi vetää huollettavansa pois tutkimuksesta kesken aineistonkeruun; lisäksi huoltajalla on täysi oikeus perua huollettavansa koskevan aineiston käyttöoikeus myös jälkikäteen.

- Tutkimukseen osallistuneen alaikäisen saavutettua täysi-ikäisyyden siirtyvät oikeudet tutkimuksesta vetäytymiselle ja aineiston käytön kieltämisestä suoraan hänelle

Tutkimuksen tekijä sitoutuu omalta osaltaan

- Käsittelemään tutkimusaineistoa sekä -tuloksia luottamuksellisesti
- Säilyttämään kerätyn tutkimusaineiston siten, että ulkopuolisilla ei ole siihen pääsyä
- Takaamaan tutkimukseen osallistuneiden anonymiteetin tutkimuksen kirjallisessa raportoinnissa sekä tutkimusaineistosta ja tutkimuksen tuloksista puhuttaessa
- Luopumaan aineiston käytöstä, jos tutkimukseen osallistujan huoltaja haluaa keskeyttää huollettavansa osallistumisen tutkimukseen, tai jos huoltaja jälkikäteen peruu käyttöoikeuden huollettavaansa koskevaan aineistoon
- Luopumaan aineiston käytöstä, jos alaikäisenä tutkimukseen huoltajansa suostumuksella osallistunut henkilö haluaa täysi-ikäisyyden saavutettuaan keskeyttää osallistumisensa tutkimukseen, tai kieltää häntä koskevan aineiston käytön

Tätä sopimusta on tehty kaksi (2) samanlaista kappaletta.

Täyttäkää allaolevat tiedot:

Annan suostumukseni tutkimukselle.

En tahdo lapseni osallistuvan tutkimukseen. (Kieltäytyneiden pulpetit järjestetään niin että he eivät tule kuvaan.)

Tutkimukseen osallistuvan alaikäisen nimi _____

Huoltajan allekirjoitus _____

Nimenselvennys _____

Yhteystiedot _____

Tutkimushankkeen puolesta _____

Sanna Paajoki
Opiskelija
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Yhteystiedot

Kielten laitos (P), PL 35
40014 Jyväskylän yliopisto
sanna.paajoki@jyu.fi
puh. +358 45

Appendix 2: Transcription conventions (<http://www.helsinki.fi/hum/skl/ca/merkit.pdf>)

LITTERAATIOMERKIT

1. Sävelkulku

prosodisen kokonaisuuden lopussa:

.	laskeva intonaatio
,	tasainen intonaatio
?	nouseva intonaatio

prosodisen kokonaisuuden sisällä tai alussa:

8 (tai /)	seuraava sana lausuttu ympäristöä korkeammalta
9 (tai \)	seuraava sana lausuttu ympäristöä matalammalta
<u>just</u>	painotus tai sävelkorkeuden nousu muualla kuin sanan lopussa

2. Päällekkäisyydet ja tauot

[päällekkäispuhunnan alku
]	päällekkäispuhunnan loppu
(.)	mikrotauko: 0.2 sekuntia tai vähemmän
(0.5)	mikrotaukoa pidempi tauko; pituus ilmoitettu sekunnin kymmenesosina
=	kaksi puhunnosta liittyy toisiinsa tauotta

3. Puhenoisuus ja äänen voimakkuus

>joo<	(sisäänpäin osoittavat nuolet) nopeutettu jakso
<joo>	(ulospäin osoittavat nuolet) hidastettu jakso
e::i	(kaksoispisteet) äänteen venytys
EjooE (tai *joo*)	ympäristöä vaimeampaa puhetta
JOO	(kapiteelit) äänen voimistaminen

4. Hengitys

.hhh	sisäänhengitys; yksi h-kirjain on 0.1 sekuntia
hhh	uloshengitys
.joo	(piste sanan edessä) sana lausuttu sisäänhengittäen

5. Nauru

he he	naurua
j(h)oo	suluissa oleva h sanan sisällä kuvaa uloshengitystä, useimmiten kyse on nauraen lausutusta sanasta
\$joo\$ (tai £joo£)	hymyillen sanottu sana tai jakso

6. Muuta

#joo#	nariseva ääni
-------	---------------

@joo@	äänen laadun muutos
jo-	(tavuviiva) sana jää kesken
t'ota	(rivinylinen pilkku) vokaalin kato
katos (lihavointi)	voimakkaasti äännetty klusiili
(joo)	sulkujen sisällä epäselvästi kuultu jakso tai puhuja
(-)	sana, josta ei ole saatu selvää
(--)	pidempi jakso, josta ei ole saatu selvää
((itkee))	kaksoissulkeiden sisällä litteroijan kommentteja ja selityksiä tilanteesta

Appendix 3: Interview questions

Yleisesti (alkulämmittelyksi ja perusinfon saamiseksi)

1. Kertoisitko aluksi minkä ikäinen opettaja olet, mitä aineita opetat ja kauan olet opettanut?
2. Entä kauan olet opettanut aiemmin kuvaamiani 5. ja 9. luokkia?

Huumori (yleisesti, luokkahuoneessa)

3. Käsite "huumori" on moniselitteinen, miten itse ymmärrät sen?
4. Entä miten eri tavoin huumorin käyttö mielestäsi voi ilmetä luokkahuone/opetustilanteessa jos puhutaan nimenomaan opettajan ja oppilaiden keskenäisestä vuorovaikutuksesta?
5. Voiko huumori mielestäsi toimia pedagogisena välineenä? Miten?
6. Mitä positiivisia vaikutuksia huumorilla voi olla? Entä voiko huumorin käytöllä olla myös negatiivisia vaikutuksia? Mitä?

Huumorin käyttö omassa opetuksessa

7. Koetko itse käyttäväsi huumoria opetuksessasi? Osaatko kuvailla miten vai onko huumorin käyttö mielestäsi osittain tai kokonaan tiedostamatonta?
8. Käytätkö mielestäsi huumoria kaikkien opettamiesi luokkien kanssa samalla tavalla (vai vaikuttaako huumorin käyttöön esimerkiksi oppilaiden määrä, ikäluokka tai kuinka kauan olet ryhmää opettanut/kuinka hyvin tunnet oppilaat)?
9. Liittyykö huumorin käyttö tunneillasi mielestäsi enemmän opetukseen/opetettavaan aineeseen vai ilmeneekö se enemmän oppiaineen ulkopuolisissa keskustelunaiheissa?

Huumorialoitteet (opettaja vs. oppilaat)

10. Onko huumori luokassa mielestäsi enemmän opettaja- vai oppilasaloitteista (opettajan ja oppilaiden välisissä tilanteissa/keskusteluissa)?
11. Miten oppilaat suhtautuvat mielestäsi opettajalähtöiseen huumoriin?
12. Miten huumorijaksot (esim. vitsailu) vaikuttavat mielestäsi luokan ilmapiiriin?
13. Entä miten suhtaudut oppilaiden keskeiseen huumoriin missä opettaja ei ole mukana?

Alakoulun ja yläkoulun erot

14. Jos sinun tulisi vertailla opetustasi alakoulun ja yläkoulun oppilaiden välillä, miten sanoisit että opettaminen eroaa ikäluokkien välillä? Mitkä ovat suurimmat erot?
15. Entä jos sinun tulisi miettiä huumorin käyttöä (sekä ope että oppilaat) näiden kahden välillä, eroaako se? Mikä siihen mielestäsi vaikuttaa?
16. Entä mitä mahdollisia eroja olet huomannut oppilaiden suhtautumisessa huumorin käyttöön? Uskotko että kokemukset eroavat eri ikäluokkien välillä vai vaikuttaako tähän jokin muu asia? Mikä?