

**UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ**

**GOOD ENGLISH TEACHING IN STUDENTS' TALK: A  
DISCOURSE-ANALYTIC STUDY**

**A Pro Gradu Thesis**

**by**

**Marika Löytynoja**

**Department of English  
2001**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA  
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Marika Löytynoja  
GOOD ENGLISH TEACHING IN STUDENTS' TALK: A DISCOURSE-  
ANALYTIC STUDY

Pro Gradu -tutkielma  
Englantilainen filologia  
Maaliskuu 2001

100 sivua + 4 liitettä

Oppilaiden opetuksesta tekemillä arvioilla on katsottu olevan merkitystä opetuksen laadun parantamisessa ja aiheesta onkin tehty paljon tutkimuksia, etenkin USA:ssa. Aikaisemmissa tutkimuksissa näiden arviointien on katsottu olevan staattisia kognitioita, mutta tässä tutkielmassa ne nähdään kielellisenä toimintana. Puhe siis rakentaa arvioita sen sijaan, että se olisi vain heijastusta ihmisen ajatuksista.

Tutkielman tarkoituksena onkin siis diskurssianalyysiä käyttäen tarkastella, kuinka ja millaisia kuvaavia termejä ja arviointikriteerejä käyttäen hyvä englannin kielen opetus rakentuu opiskelijoiden puheessa. Lisäksi tarkastellaan myös sitä, kuinka opiskelijat rakentavat oman käsityksensä hyvästä englannin kielen opetuksesta perustelluksi ja vakuuttavaksi, sekä myös sitä, kuinka vastakkaisia käsityksiä vastaavasti vähätellään ja kyseenalaistetaan. Tutkimusaineisto koostuu kahdesta litteroidusta parikeskustelusta, joissa toisessa keskustelelee kaksi yliopisto-opiskelijaa ja toisessa kaksi kauppaopisto-opiskelijaa. Aineisto on kerätty osana laajempaa tutkimusprojektia. Parikeskusteluissa opiskelijoilla oli ollut käytössään suuntaa antavia kysymyksiä hyvän englannin opetuksen mahdollisista osa-alueista, ja näistä lopullisen analyysin aineistoksi valikoituivat oppimistavoitteet, opetusmateriaalit, opetusmenetelmät ja työtavat sekä opettajan rooli ja tehtävät.

Analyysin tuloksena kävi ilmi, että parikeskustelut eivät eronneet suuresti toisistaan sen suhteen, millaisin piirtein hyvän englannin opetuksen em. osa-alueita oli kuvailtu ja arvioitu, mihin osaltaan vaikuttivat opiskelijoiden käytössä olleet suuntaa antavat kysymykset. Sen sijaan käsitysten perustelemisessa parit käyttivät hyvinkin erilaisia keinoja. Kauppaopisto-opiskelijoiden arviot olivat hyvin toteavia sävyiltään ja käsitys rakennettiin itsestään selväksi tosiasiaksi. Puhujat käyttivät persoonattomia ilmauksia peittääkseen mahdolliset itsekkäät intressit. Yliopisto-opiskelijat puolestaan ilmaisivat kantansa epäsuorasti, kertomusten kautta, jolloin johtopäätösten tekeminen jäi kuulijalle. Kertomusten todenpitävyys rakennettiin esimerkiksi runsailla yksityiskohtien käytöllä tai viittaamalla muiden yhtäpitäviin mielipiteisiin tapahtumien kulusta. Vastakkaisia mielipiteitä ei keskusteluihin osallistuneiden kesken juurikaan syntynyt.

Asiasanat: good English teaching, constructivism, categorizations, evaluative discourse, discourse analysis.

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS EFFECTIVE TEACHING: MAINSTREAM APPROACHES</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Mainstream definitions of attitudes and perceptions	8
2.2 Positivist position on student perceptions of effective teaching	13
2.2.1 Quantitative studies on students' perceptions of effective teaching	15
2.2.1.1 Construct validity: focus on instrumentation and rating outcomes	15
2.2.1.2 Validity of student ratings: biasing factors	18
2.2.1.3 Evaluation processes: the role of implicit theories	21
2.2.1.4 Criticism	22
2.3 Phenomenologic position on student perceptions of effective teaching	25
2.3.1 Qualitative studies on students' perceptions of effective teaching	27
2.3.2 Criticism	29
<b>3 DISCURSIVE APPROACH TO STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1 Philosophical background	33
3.2 Attitudes and perceptions as evaluative discourse	35
3.3 Discourse analysis in discursive social psychology	37
<b>4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THE PROCEDURE</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1 Research questions	41
4.2 Data	42
4.3 Analytic units	44
4.3.1 Action orientation	44

<b>4.3.2 Epistemologic orientation</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>4.3.2.1 Interest management devices</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>4.3.2.2 Externalizing devices</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4. Analysis</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>5 FINDINGS</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>5.1 Learning objectives</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>5.2 Learning materials and their contents</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.3 Teaching methods and classroom procedures</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>5.4 Teacher's roles and duties</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>6 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>6.1 Summary of the findings</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>6.1.1 How was good English teaching categorized?</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>6.1.2 How were the constructions made reasonable and justifiable?</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>6.1.3 How were possible counterpositions undermined?</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>6.2 Evaluation of the findings and the method</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>6.3 Suggestions for further research</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1. TRANSLATIONS FOR THE ORIENTATIVE QUESTIONS</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3. THE PAIR DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4. TRANSLATIONS FOR THE EXAMPLES</b>	<b>120</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In Finland, recent years have brought major changes to the administrative culture in education. The role of central administration has been weakened, while municipalities and schools have gained power in making decisions concerning schooling and education. Schools can, for example, plan their own curricula. The aim of this decentralization has been to improve the ability of schools to respond to the demands imposed by modern society (Oppilaitoksen arvioinnin ja kehittämisen käsikirja 1999).

Decentralization has also meant that all schools are responsible for evaluating the teaching they provide since they are no longer inspected by the national Board of Education (Perusopetuslaki 628/1998, Laki ammatillisesta koulutuksesta 630/1998). One of the aspects that schools are expected to evaluate is the curriculum and its ability to correspond not only with the society's demands, but also with the students' needs (Oppilaitoksen arvioinnin ja kehittämisen käsikirja 1999). The fact that schools have the freedom to specialize has, on the one hand, increased the number of subjects and courses that are offered. On the other hand, it has created a situation where schools are, in some cases, competing for students. This idea of students as clients is another recent development where ideas from commercial and industrial life are applied to education.

The aim of this study is to look into teaching from the student's, i.e. the client's point of view. Research in higher education has placed particular emphasis on student evaluations of teaching and there is a large body of literature on student ratings of teaching, particularly in the USA (Dunkin 1986:768), but most previous studies have a number of shortcomings. The bulk of previous research is quantitative (although more recently also qualitative studies have been conducted) and the data have usually been collected using questionnaires which impose on students a set of pre-selected questionnaire items and thus restrict the scope of possible responses. Besides, the results, that are given in the form of factor solutions, tell very little about the respondents' views. In order to avoid these

problems, an alternative approach was chosen for the present study and evaluations were taken to be linguistic constructions, not stable mental entities.

The study thus focuses on students' discussions of good English teaching. The data consist of two pair discussions involving two commercial college students and two university students, and the discussions were studied using discourse analysis (Potter and Wetherell 1987; Potter 1996). The analysis focused both on issues of construction, i.e. how was good English teaching constructed in the students' discourse and what were the terms in which it was evaluated, and on issues of facticity and justification, i.e. the linguistic resources the students used to make their accounts factual and convincing. Since the data consisted of pair discussions, the scope of questions was broadened to include also ironizing discourse, i.e. instances where counterpositions were undermined.

The study is organized as follows: Chapter 2 introduces a traditional definition of attitudes that has been applied to previous research on student evaluations of teaching. Chapter 2 also provides an outline of the two mainstream approaches and their theoretical and methodological backgrounds. These are illustrated with a review of previous research and their results. Chapter 3 introduces an alternative approach, discursive construction, and its philosophical background. In addition, the notions of attitude and perception are redefined and finally, the method, discourse analysis, is introduced. The research questions, the data, and the analysis are introduced in Chapter 4, while Chapter 5 reports the findings of the present study. The study is concluded in Chapter 6 with a summary and an evaluation of the findings and the methodology. Suggestions for further research are also made in Chapter 6.

## **2 STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS EFFECTIVE TEACHING: MAINSTREAM APPROACHES**

Although social scientific research is characterized by theoretical pluralism and the absence of a single dominant research paradigm, the set of alternatives within which researchers operate is still fairly limited (Shulman 1986:4-5). So far research has taken either a positivist position or a phenomenologic position. In the case of studies on student attitudes about, or perceptions of, effective instruction, the majority of studies have been conducted within the positivist paradigm, using quantitative methods, but more recently also qualitative studies have been conducted. They are nevertheless clearly outnumbered by quantitative studies.

Usually the attribute 'mainstream' is used in reference to positivist, quantitative inquiry, while the phenomenologic approach and qualitative methods are considered as "alternate" (e.g. Maykut and Morehouse 1994:5). In this study, however, both quantitative and qualitative research are considered 'mainstream'. There are three reasons for this. In spite of the ontological, epistemological, and methodological differences that (in theory) distinguish the two positions, researchers using qualitative approaches rarely mention the philosophical grounds on which the approach is based and salient differences are thus often reduced to the level of methodology. This is the case also with the qualitative research reviewed for the present study. The second reason why the two approaches are dealt with under the same heading is the fact that both have adopted a cognitivist definition of the object of inquiry - be it attitudes or perceptions. When defined in this manner, attitudes and perceptions are not directly observable and researchers need to rely on verbal data, assuming that language reflects these inner states and processes. The last reason to label both positivist and phenomenologic positions as 'mainstream' is the fact that a truly "alternate" paradigm, social constructionism, has emerged and will be brought forward in this study.

In addition to theoretical and methodological pluralism, conceptual diversity seems just as characteristic of studies on student ratings of effective teaching. In the next section, an attempt is made to define and to describe how cognitive

constructs (e.g. attitudes) and mental processes have been related to evaluations. The other sections of this chapter discuss the two mainstream approaches and their methodological preferences with a review of some of the studies conducted within these approaches.

## **2.1 Mainstream definitions of attitudes and perceptions**

In studies on student evaluations of effective teaching, concepts such as attitudes, perceptions, meanings and understandings are used almost interchangeably to represent student cognitions. Tackling this conceptual pluralism is further complicated by a lack of explicitly expressed definitions. In fact, most of the studies that were reviewed failed to give any definition of their object of inquiry (e.g. Abrami and Mizener 1985; Burdsal and Bardo 1986; Tollefson et al. 1989). It is thus wise to bear in mind that the definitions given here are not to be found in an explicit form in the following review of studies but rather represent the more general cognitivist tradition.

The notion of knowledge is taken here as a starting point in an attempt to define and to relate to one another some of the most central concepts. According to Bar-Tal and Kruglanski (1988:3), the label of knowledge can be attached to a host of social cognitive terms such as attitudes, perceptions, judgements, inferences, and values, to mention a few. These are all varieties of knowledge. The following discussion is mainly concerned with two themes: the content or the nature of knowledge and the process of knowledge formation. Finally, these themes will be illustrated by unravelling the concept of attitude.

Graumann (1988) defines knowledge and cognition by relating them to one another. He claims that knowledge has never been a technical term in psychology; still it has been considered almost synonymous with cognition, i.e. both have been viewed as hypothetical constructs that are contained in the mind. More recently, however, also the processes that precede the final "product", i.e. knowledge or cognition, have been taken into account. As a consequence of this turn from



cognition to information processing, the meaning of cognition moved away from knowledge and cognitions became to be considered as "mediators" or "mediating mechanisms" (Graumann 1988:23). This turn also changed the meaning of knowledge, because knowledge could no longer be viewed as a feature of the external world, but as a product of information processing that involves encoding, recording, storing, and retrieving of information. Even if the stimulus-information-processing model assumes output, Graumann (1988:24) maintains that to look for knowledge or cognition inside closed minds or systems is still a rule in mentalism and cognitivism.

Without discussing the issue any further, Graumann (1988:17) also brings up the question of the role of perception in cognition: is perception cognitive or an aspect of cognition? Baron (1988:48) claims that the distinction between perception and cognition has progressively weakened, and that cognitivism in particular has reduced perception to a pre-meaning stage of information processing. This is clearly the case in Oskamp's (1991:20) definition. He sees perception as the first stage of cognition, but he further defines it as "the reception and organization of sensory information". The definition thus includes cognitive activity. Perception is not merely receptive: the received information is also organized into meaningful categories. Baron (1988), however, argues that separate functions for perception and cognition should be restored.

In the framework proposed by Baron (1988), perception and cognition are viewed as qualitatively different strategies of knowing. Accordingly, the choice of strategy (perception or cognition) depends on the type of information that can be detected about the object. While in some cases perceptible information is sufficient enough and cognitive elaboration is not needed, in other cases both detection and construction of meaning (cognition) are required. Cognitive processes become more useful as the complexity of the object increases or if there is a need for verbal communication of the information. It could be argued, then, that in studies on students' perceptions of effective teaching the term cannot refer to direct perception alone because effective teaching is too complex an object to be evaluated without any cognitive constructs.

Let us now look at the concept of attitude as an example of one knowledge type. One of the most popular constructs of attitude is a three-component construct consisting of cognitive, evaluative/affective, and conative/behavioural components (McGuire 1985, Deprez and Persoons 1987, Ajzen 1988, Zanna and Rempel 1988). According to Zanna and Rempel (1988), there is general agreement that an attitude has at its base an element of evaluation, but there is more disagreement over how discriminative the role of cognition, affect, and behaviour is in an attitude. This is why the weight or the importance given to each of these components varies from one definition to another.

Deprez and Persoons (1987:125) view attitudes as "umbrella constructs that aim at the integration of psychological and sociological determinants of human behaviour". Perception, cognition and affect could thus be considered to be these determinants. Even though this definition emphasizes the behavioural aspect of attitudes, Deprez and Persoons maintain that an attitude is not behaviour, but a readiness to behave. Accordingly, the cognitive component of attitude comprises knowledge about an attitude object, and the knowledge, in turn, is composed of beliefs.

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980:63) name three types of beliefs and sources for beliefs. Descriptive beliefs are based on direct observation or experience; inferential beliefs are deduced from already existing beliefs, and informational beliefs are based on what e.g. the authorities say. So, referring back to Baron's framework of perception and cognition as qualitatively different strategies of knowing, descriptive beliefs rely more on perception while inferential and informational beliefs require processing at a more conceptual level.

On the other hand, while perception may suffice as a source for a belief, i.e. knowledge, Deprez and Persoons (1987:125) include in the cognitive component more than just perceptions:

the person assumes or "knows" that there is a relation between the object of his attitude and some other attribute, some other feature, some other object. The cognitive component thus comprises all characteristics, attributes, objects that are associated with the object in question.

This means first of all, that a person needs to know the object (e.g. through direct perception or experience), and secondly he needs to be able to attach features, attributes or other qualities to the object of thought in order to distinguish it from other objects. For example, in the case of teaching, in order for a student to be able to evaluate its effectiveness, he needs to have some idea or knowledge of what the features are that can be associated with effective teaching, what differentiates good teaching from poor or just ordinary teaching. This leads us to the second component, the evaluative one.

Deprez and Persoons (1987:126) consider the evaluative component to be a central part in the construct of attitude. This is the component that relates the knowledge or beliefs about the object of thought to emotional values. In brief, our evaluation of an object of thought is a combination of what we know and how we feel about an object.

Although Deprez and Persoons (1987:126) argue that the evaluative component is central, it is the third component, the conative one, that is most salient in their definition of an attitude as a determinant of behaviour. However, the cognitive and evaluative components are decisive determinants of the conative component, i.e. the beliefs and values in these two components are transformed into behavioural intentions. As was noted above, Deprez and Persoons (1987:127) maintain that attitude is not behaviour, but rather "instructions for behaviour in concrete situations". Even if it were assumed that people aim at realizing their behavioural intentions, they also need to consider whether or not such behaviour is acceptable, i.e. the two components are thought to elicit analogous behavioural intentions, but these intentions still need to be reconciled with the normative restrictions imposed by the context or the situation. This is the aspect that was referred to in the definition by Deprez and Persoons as sociological determinants of human behaviour.

McGuire (1985) has noted the profusion of definitions for attitudes on the one hand, and their implicitness in empirical studies on the other. This is why he has come up with two ways of defining an attitude. The first one, a "working definition", is the one often found explicitly expressed in empirical research and it

defines attitudes as "responses that locate 'objects of thought' on 'dimensions of judgement'" (McGuire 1985:239). Accordingly, objects of thought are foci of interest that can be concrete (e.g. a person), abstract and complex (e.g. humanity, evil) or even semantic compounds (e.g. the effectiveness of teaching). In order for a person to be able to distinguish objects of thought from one another, he locates them on a dimension of judgement. This means that a person gives the object *a meaning* that separates it from other objects. McGuire's "working definition" thus resembles the process described by Deprez and Persoons: attaching features and attributes to an object. In McGuire's (1985) definition it is the cognitive and the evaluative/affective components that carry more weight than the conative/behavioural component.

The second definition proposed by McGuire (1985:239), a "conceptual definition", views attitudes as "a mediating process grouping a set of objects of thought in a conceptual category that evokes a significant pattern of responses". In comparison with the working definition, there seems to be a certain circularity to this definition. According to McGuire, the response pattern consists of thoughts, feelings, and actions, i.e. the cognitive, evaluative and conative components, respectively. In the working definition, these responses serve as the criteria along which objects are located on a dimension of judgement, but here objects are grouped or categorized before a response is evoked. Thoughts and feelings have thus the double function of being both criteria and responses.

So far we have defined perceptions and attitudes as varieties of knowledge. Perceptual knowledge refers to information that can be detected from the environment in order to attach meanings to various objects. Different definitions (Graumann 1988; Baron 1988; Oskamp 1991) of perception disagree, however, over whether or not perception includes organizing this information or if perception alone is sufficient. Some attempts to distinguish between perception and cognition (Baron 1988) argue that perception is more automatic, more concrete, and produces more direct knowledge than cognition. Others (e.g. Oskamp 1991) view the two almost as different phases of one and the same process where

perception may include cognition or vice versa. The more complex the object, the more likely it is that the relative use of cognitive organization will increase.

Attitudes are a larger knowledge construct because they are usually considered to consist of three content categories: cognition, evaluation/affect, and conation. The first component contains a person's beliefs about an object, and beliefs, in turn, can be acquired either through perception alone or through cognitive processes, e.g. inference. Beliefs can also be verbally transmitted. The second component consists of evaluative responses and feelings toward an object, and the third component assumes a behavioural intention that is consistent with beliefs and feelings. There are nevertheless dissenting opinions about the discriminative nature of the three components. While it is generally accepted that attitudes are evaluative, the other components have often become redundant (McGuire 1985:242). Furthermore, the three-component model has been criticised for assuming the attitude-behaviour relation by definition (Zanna and Rempel 1988:316).

What all these definitions above have in common is that they assume a mind-reality (Graumann 1988) or mind-material (Gergen 1988) dualism: that there is the subject that can know, perceive or possess an attitude, and the object of these cognitive constructs or processes. Whatever information about the reality is perceived produces a mental representation of reality, e.g. an attitude or some other knowledge construct (Gergen 1988).

The following sections discuss in more detail how the two mainstream positions, positivism and phenomenology, deal with mind-reality dualism and the processes behind mental representations, as well as some of the studies conducted within the two positions on student perceptions of effective teaching.

## **2.2 Positivist position on student perceptions of effective teaching**

The positivist position and its ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions are closely connected with the natural sciences (see e.g.

Fenstermacher 1986, Bar-Tal and Bar-Tal 1988, Guba and Lincoln 1994, Maykut and Morehouse 1994, Hathaway 1995), but also traditional social psychology owes much of its foundations to positivism (Bar-Tal and Bar-Tal 1988). Ontologically, the positivist position assumes that although representations are (according to mind-reality dualism) separate from external reality, they are true because they are produced through automatic, rule-governed mechanisms that are not dependent on or influenced by the situation or the actors. In fact, most positivist studies on student perceptions of effective teaching are not so much concerned with these mechanisms as they are with the final product, i.e. the evaluations or judgements they produce. Since mental processes are considered law-governed they need not become the main aim of study, although the information processing model has now aroused some interest in the study of student attitudes and perceptions (e.g. Kishor 1995, Harrison et al 1996). Furthermore, knowledge is objective if it is independent of speculations: investigations must be carried out without the researcher influencing the objects of inquiry or being influenced by them. The aim of study is to produce time- and context free generalizations. Methodologically this means that facts must be collected through objective, quantified observations that are considered true only if a hypothesis is verified (Guba and Lincoln 1994; Maykut and Morehouse 1994; Hathaway 1995). But since perceptions and attitudes are defined as mental constructs and mechanisms, they cannot be directly observed. Other means of investigation have been developed.

Most studies on students perceptions of or attitudes toward effective teaching have resorted to questionnaires and scales. In these questionnaires, a number of items concerning features of effective teaching are rated on a Likert type scale ranging e.g. from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Questionnaires like ATET (Attitude Toward Effective Teaching scale; Tollefson et al. 1989), SPTE (Student Perceptions of Effective Teaching; Burdsal and Bardo 1986) and SEEQ (Student Evaluation of Educational Quality; Marsh 1982) are all of this type. Another type of questionnaire has been used to elicit numerical ratings (numerical rating is anchored to an adjectival evaluation, e.g. 1 = poor and 6 = excellent) of either actual instruction and teachers or hypothetical instructor

profiles. The idea of using scales like these is that verbal responses reflect student attitudes or perceptions of effective teaching. Thus, in the words of Hathaway (1995: 544) "...truth is defined as a correspondence between our words and [...] independently existing reality".

The following section introduces some of the research conducted within the positivist position on student attitudes towards effective teaching.

## **2.2.1 Quantitative studies on students' perceptions of effective teaching**

### **2.2.1.1 Construct validity: focus on instrumentation and rating outcomes**

A study by Burdsal and Bardo (1986) focused on the dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching quality. Over a period from fall 1977 to spring 1982, a total of 42,019 volunteers from various colleges participated. In their study, Burdsal and Bardo used an application of a SPTE (Student Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness) questionnaire that consisted of 11 demographic items and 39 questions that were aimed at evaluating aspects of teaching performance. All items were in Likert type format. The students also had the possibility to make open-ended comments.

The aim of analysis was to identify theoretically significant dimensions of teaching quality. The ratings on individual items were factor analysed and six first order factors were extracted: 1) Attitude toward students, 2) Work load, 3) Course value to students, 4) Course organization/structure, 5) Grading quality, and 6) Level of material. These six factors were further analysed revealing a division into two factors: one of general quality and one of difficulty. In the students' opinion, the most important factor in the general quality of teaching was course organization and structure, a factor that consisted of items related to general classroom management. On the other hand, when the students were asked what was the criterion they used when recommending a course to a friend, the usefulness of the course and its being interesting were considered important. In

evaluating the general quality of instruction, this was only the second most weighty factor. The instructor's attitude towards students was the next main factor defining the general quality. This factor consisted mainly of items relating to the instructor's personality: treatment of students, receptiveness, involvement in the subject matter and availability. The least important factor in students' opinion was the quality of grading, a factor that consisted, for example, of items such as adequate number and type of evaluation, fairness and the explicitness of grading procedures. The two final factors, work load and level of material constituted the second order factor of general difficulty. Difficulty and perceptions of quality were not interrelated.

Feldman's (1988) review of 31 quantitative studies summarizes the instructional characteristics that students (and faculty) found particularly important for good teaching. The aim of his review was to see to what extent the priorities of the faculty matched with those of the students', i.e. to see if students evaluated the quality of teaching with similar criteria as the faculty. In most of the studies, both students and faculty were asked to specify the attitudes, behaviours, and pedagogical practices they considered most important to good teaching or effective instruction. However, in some of the studies, effective teaching was specified in terms of student learning or teacher characteristics.

The final analysis included 18 studies that gave sufficient information about the rating criteria that were used and which could thus be coded into categories. The coding produced 22 categories of instructional characteristics, such as Teacher's enthusiasm, Teacher's knowledge of the subject, Clarity of course objectives and requirements, Perceived outcome or impact of instruction, and so forth. The five characteristics considered most important by students were the following: 1) Teacher's sensitivity to, and concern with class level and progress, 2) Teacher's preparation; organization of the course, 3) Teacher's knowledge of the subject, 4) Teacher's stimulation of interest in the course and in the subject matter, and 5) Teacher's enthusiasm. The least preferred characteristics were Teacher's productivity in research and related activities, and Teacher's encouragement of self-initiated learning.



Also Broder and Dorfman (1994) were concerned with identifying factors that students felt were important in rating teachers and courses and with weights assigned to different attributes in overall evaluations. Broder and Dorfman stated two hypothesis: 1) students would rate their educational experience by how much they learned, and 2) students would evaluate teaching on how much they enjoyed learning.

A total of 198 students at the University of Georgia filled in a modified version of a SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) questionnaire. The original questionnaire consisted of 34 questions (17 items on the teacher, 14 on the course, and 3 on the student), but questions that were considered redundant, were now eliminated. Each item was rated on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

In the case of instructor ratings, approximately 81 percent of the variation in ratings were associated with four instructor attributes: enthusiasm (24 percent), knowledge of subject (23 percent), tying information together (20 percent), and ability to stimulate thinking (14 percent). From these results Broder and Dorfman concluded that their second hypothesis was supported and that in addition to instructors' technical abilities, also interpersonal skills were valued. Courses were evaluated mainly in terms of three attributes: new knowledge (35 percent), tying information together (31 percent), and subject matter (25 percent). Broder and Dorfman's first hypothesis was also supported because knowledge related questions (subject matter, useful information, and knowledge gained) accounted for 64 percent of the variation explained in course ratings. The findings also suggested that the same standards (weights) were applied consistently from teacher to teacher and from course to course.

The objective of a study by Ryan and Harrison (1995) was to determine the relative importance of individual teaching factors in overall evaluations of teaching effectiveness in different instructional contexts.

The study was replicated in three different instructional settings and groups of subjects. The first group of subjects consisted of 82 accounting students (juniors and seniors), the second group consisted of 53 education graduate students, and the third group comprised 94 students in an introductory course on geology.

The students were asked to respond to 32 hypothetical instructor profiles. Each profile was a combination of 9 cue variables, i.e. factors of teaching effectiveness identified in the SEEQ (Student Evaluation of Educational Quality) questionnaire. These factors include: 1) Enthusiasm, 2) Individual rapport, 3) Learning, 4) Course difficulty, 5) Organization, 6) Breadth, 7) Group interaction, 8) Assignments, and 9) Examinations. Values of 0 (= low) or 1 (= high) were assigned to the SEEQ factors/cue variables. These profiles were then presented to students who were asked to assign an overall evaluation based on the combination of cue variables. Evaluations were assigned on a scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 9 (very good).

According to Ryan and Harrison, the SEEQ factors accounted for much of the variation in the global ratings. There was also a striking similarity among the orderings of the SEEQ weights across the three groups and instructional settings. In each context, the amount learned had the highest weight, followed by exam fairness and enthusiasm. Course difficulty had the lowest relationship to the overall evaluations in all three courses. However, the results also suggested that the instructional context influenced how much the students were concerned with the amount learned: those students who were on a lower-level course were less concerned with learning than advanced students.

### **2.2.1.2 Validity of student ratings: biasing factors**

Tollefson et al. (1989) studied the effect of perceived student/teacher attitude similarity and its influence on students' ratings of teaching effectiveness. The aim of their study was to find out if similarities in student/teacher attitudes caused biased ratings.

A sample of 225 undergraduate and graduate education students enrolled in 20 classes and taught by 11 different teachers took part in the study. Student/instructor attitude similarity was studied by administering two ATETs (Attitude Toward Effective Teaching Scale) that contained 21 attitude statements

and were responded on a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree - strongly disagree). ATET1 measured the students' personal attitudes while ATET2 measured their perceptions of their teacher's attitudes (the students were asked to respond to the scale as they believed their teachers' would respond). A Teacher Rating Scale (TRS) was administered at the end of the course: the students rated their teachers on nine items (not reported) on a five point continuum (unsatisfactory - excellent).

The data were analyzed using multiple regression procedures and the results, in brief, suggested that attitude similarity accounted for 6 percent of the variance in instructor ratings when teacher-generated and student-generated variance were confounded. However, once the teacher-effects were removed, similarity scores explained only about 1 percent of the variance in student ratings. The authors thus concluded that differences among teachers rather than perceived attitude similarity explained the differences in ratings.

Abrami and Mizener (1985) were also interested in student/instructor attitude similarity and its effects on student ratings of instruction. Students' course performance was one of the variables in the design.

Two different groups of college students took part in the study. The first group (349 students) rated their own attitudes and their perceptions of instructor attitudes on a modified version of a Hofman and Kremer attitude scale whose items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Another group (296 students) rated their and the perceived attitudes of their instructors on a modified Byrne's Survey of Attitudes. The items on this survey were rated on a six-point response scale (strongly disagree - strongly agree). Student ratings of instruction in both groups were collected using a 28-item instrument with five points being the highest score. Each student's responses were matched with his or her end-of-term grades.

In both groups, there were modest correlations between student ratings and perceived attitude similarity. The size of this relation was consistent across rating measures and did not depend on student course performance. There was, however, a modest correlation between attitude similarity and grades: those whose attitudes

matched with those of their instructor's earned somewhat higher grades and in turn, rated their instructor more positively than students with dissimilar attitudes. Abrami and Mizener nevertheless argue that noting the size and direction of these correlations, the validity of student ratings is not substantially affected by student/instructor attitude similarity. Instead, instructor differences were a greater source of variation in ratings while student achievement was less sensitive to differences in instruction.

In addition to correlations between attitude similarity and student ratings of teaching, other correlations studied have included teacher personality (Jones 1989), student study strategies (Prossier and Trigwell 1990) or study orientations (Entwistle and Tait 1990), and academic environment (Entwistle and Tait 1990). According to Jones (1989), teacher personality was significantly related both to overall teaching quality and to students' ratings of teacher quality. In fact, most correlation was due to items that measured teacher personality while a teacher's knowledge of the subject matter and course content were less significant factors. Jones argues that the validity of student ratings is not undermined by students' perceptions of teacher personality but instead it would be very surprising if they did not affect ratings of teaching competence. In the Prossier and Trigwell (1990) study on the relationship between study strategies and evaluations of teaching, the correlations suggested that those courses in which students adopted deeper approaches to study were also rated more highly. These results were taken to support the validity of student ratings of teaching. Entwistle and Tait (1990), however, found no link between deeper approaches to study (i.e. meaning or achieving orientation to study) and good teaching. Instead, perceptions of heavy workload overlapped with surface approaches (i.e. reproducing and non-academic orientations to study). According to Entwistle and Tait (1990), student attitudes to learning thus influence their ratings. Also, students with different study orientations prefer different kinds of academic environments and teaching situations but the direction of this causal link could not be established. It was concluded, however, that, depending on the study orientation, students judged teaching based on different criteria.

### 2.2.1.3 Evaluation processes: the role of implicit theories

Harrison et al. (1996) replicated the Ryan and Harrison (1995) study (p.17) but a further dimension was added to the design. The objective of this study was to determine whether, and to what extent, students had self-insight into how they made overall evaluations, and if there was a reasonably high level of consensus among the students in making these evaluations.

The study was carried out with the same three groups of students as in the Ryan and Harrison (1995) study. The students were once again asked to rate the 32 hypothetical instructor profiles that were constructed using the nine SEEQ factors. This time, however, the students were also asked to rank order the nine teaching factors and to assign a weight to each of the factors using a ratio ranking method (see Harrison et al. 1996:777).

The results suggested that student ratings were not based on spurious or purely situational factors. Instead, students used a reasonable weighting scheme and possessed substantial self-insight into how they made evaluations. Furthermore, there was strong evidence for a common set of beliefs concerning the relative importance of the nine SEEQ factors related to teaching effectiveness, i.e. students operated on a common implicit theory. Harrison et al. also concluded that since the study did not provide the students with a context, common beliefs of the SEEQs was something the students carried with them from context to context.

In addition, Kishor (1995) has looked into the effect of implicit theories on students' judgements of teacher performance. Unlike Harrison et al. (1996), he, however, considers the existence of such theories a biasing factor. In his study, Kishor hypothesized that students would have implicit personality theories (IPT's) that would be activated if information needed in teacher ratings were unavailable: students would infer personality traits on the basis of observable behaviour if direct information on a teacher's personality was not available. In a similar manner, person schema or traits of an effective teacher would influence inferred behaviours when data regarding such behaviours were required but unavailable.

A total of 219 voluntary university undergraduate students completed a performance rating task that consisted of a written vignette of a hypothetical college instructor and a 10-item rating scale. The items measured personality dispositions (enthusiasm, leadership ability, dependability), implied behaviour (interaction with students, command of subject matter, attention to individual differences), and actual behaviour (clarity of presentation, level of feedback, use of class time and assessment technique). However, the vignette describing the hypothetical instructor did not include information on personality traits. Furthermore, it withheld behavioural information (on items on implied behaviour). The students were asked to rate the items on a 6-point scale (1 = poor, 6 = excellent), but they were not informed about the information withheld nor forced to rate all the items.

The results supported the hypothesis according to which implicit personality theories (IPTs) have a causal influence on students' judgements of instructor behaviour. The results indicated that students use mental representations and inferences in ratings of teacher performance when information needed in ratings was unavailable. If the IPTs cause the rating to be negative, i.e. if the actual teaching does not meet the standards set by the mental representation, the comparison and inferences bias the ratings and as a consequence, student ratings of effective teaching contain errors.

#### **2.2.1.4 Criticism**

In recent years, the positivist position and quantification have met with increasing criticism as it has become more and more apparent that social behaviour is too complicated an object to be explained in terms of general laws or without taking into consideration the meanings people attach to different activities (Bar-Tal and Bar-Tal 1988, Guba and Lincoln 1994). Guba and Lincoln (1994:106-107) have described several of the problems associated with attempts to combine the

positivist position and the social sciences. Some of these problems concern also the studies on student perceptions of effective teaching that were reviewed above.

The aim of producing universal principles and generalizations is in many ways suspect. For example, in studies on construct validity as well as in studies on the validity of student ratings, data have been collected in actual situations, concerning one particular teacher or a group of teachers but the results have nevertheless been considered general truths. Studies on construct validity group together the questionnaire responses of individual students and through various analysis procedures, such as factor analysis, produce neat core constructs of teacher effectiveness. Feldman (1988) has taken this process of averaging even further in his synthesis of studies by grouping together a number of studies and producing one factor solution.

Producing general truths from particular instances requires also context-stripping. The first phase of context-stripping takes place once student ratings of individual teachers are taken from that particular context. The study by Ryan and Harrison (1995) is an exception as regards context-stripping, because it took into account variation of instructional contexts in the research design as well as in interpreting the results, though these in turn were considered true in all similar contexts. In the studies on student rating validity, however, all idiosyncrasies due to the context or the raters (e.g. academic environment, perceived attitude similarity, course performance) were treated as biasing factors whose influence on ratings needs to be studied so that it can be eliminated or "reduced" from the true, underlying perception or attitude. Such claims as those made by Tollefson et al. (1989) and Kishor (1995) that teacher-effects cause a bias in student ratings of effective teaching and should be removed before a rating can be considered valid seem contrary to common sense because surely factors like teacher personality and behaviour contribute to effective teaching. What should also be considered are the limits of these procedures: what are the factors that should be regarded as biasing and how much of these factors can and need to be stripped off in order to reveal the true and authentic attitude or perception of effective teaching?

Another problem mentioned by Guba and Lincoln (1994: 106) is what they call the etic/emic dilemma. This means that the researcher imposes on the subjects his theory of the investigated phenomenon, although it may have little or no meaning to the subjects. This dilemma is manifest in all the studies on student perceptions of effective teaching in the form of questionnaire contents. The researchers assume that students will consider the same items relevant or important to the construct of 'effective teaching' as they themselves do. Furthermore, the fact that the researchers have chosen to use questionnaires that were not developed for the particular occasion (e.g. SEEQ), implies that there exists a universal construct of effective teaching that can be applied from situation to situation with very little or no changes made to the questionnaire content. Yet, the aim of the studies on construct validity (e.g. Bursdal and Bardo 1986) speaks against such a universal or general construct, because if such a universal existed, why are student constructions of teaching effectiveness in particular so "suspect" that their validity needs to be investigated? Another problem caused by pre-selected questionnaire items concerning studies on construct validity in particular is a certain circularity. Students' constructs of effective teaching were produced through factor analysis from these pre-selected questionnaire items. The constructs might have been altogether different if other characteristics or features had been offered or if the students had had the possibility to name the questionnaire items themselves.

Questionnaires not only impose on students pre-selected items and thus the researcher's view of effective teaching, but according to Potter and Wetherell (1987:39-40), questionnaires also restrict student responses in other ways. First of all, the number of possible responses to a single item is limited: depending on the questionnaire and its format it can, for example, be a scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree or a numerical rating anchored to an adjective (e.g. 1 = poor, 6 = excellent). The fact that only one response to every item is allowed reveals the underlying assumption of a consistent and stable perception or attitude. The response format thus effectively rules out ambivalent or flexible opinions. In the actual analysis, the responses are converted into a numerical form and, according to Fenstermacher (1986:41), statistical techniques serve as a further



control of results. Any deviation from the standard can easily be explained away as error variance (Erickson 1986:131).

Researchers also make inferences about students' perceptions of or attitudes toward effective teaching relying on fairly limited information. According to McGuire (1985:242), researchers often ignore the information that could be acquired by investigating all three components of attitude and reduce it to the evaluative aspect alone. This "peculiar evaluation monomania" (McGuire 1985:242), i.e. evaluating objects only in terms of how good or bad they are, is also manifest in the studies above. Evidence on student attitudes toward effective teaching most often consists of ratings of actual teaching (or hypothetical teacher profiles). Based on this evidence, researchers, by means of objective factor analysis rather than inference, arrive at a student construct of effective teaching thus revealing the attributes students supposedly attach to quality instruction, instead of asking students themselves what these attributes are, i.e. the content of the cognitive component of their attitude.

### **2.3 Phenomenologic position on student perceptions of effective teaching**

While quantitative research is neatly coupled with the positivist position, qualitative methods are associated with a host of approaches and in some cases there are also dissenting opinions as to what is a method and what is an approach or a research position. Erickson (1986:119), for example, proposes that attributes such as ethnographic, qualitative, phenomenological or interpretive can be used alternatively in reference to one and the same approach. According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994:3), the phenomenological approach comprises not only qualitative research, but also other areas of inquiry such as ethnomethodology. Hathaway (1995:543) talks about interpretive research and describes it as phenomenological, hermeneutical, experiential, and dialectic. For the sake of clarity, in the present study the attribute 'phenomenologic' will be used in reference to research position and 'qualitative' when referring to methodology.

One of the reasons to include phenomenologic research under the heading 'mainstream' was the fact that studies taking this position have also adopted the representational account of attitudes, perceptions and other related cognitive entities, i.e. phenomenology subscribes to mind-reality dualism. But unlike positivism, the phenomenologic position does not assume attitudes and perceptions to be products of independent, law-governed mechanisms, but rather, it assumes that reality is co-constituted by those who participate in it (Erickson 1986, Maykut and Morehouse 1994, Hathaway 1995). Mental representations are considered equally real as the external reality and, according to Erickson (1986:126), the fact that these representations are subjective constructs does not call into question their truth value. Human interpretations of the physical and behavioural objects of the environment are taken as "real", because it would be extremely impractical to constantly question or reinterpret every perceived detail.

Resulting from this "naive realism" (Erickson 1986:126), the aim of study shifts more towards the student and the analysis of their subjective meanings. Researchers taking this position are more interested in identifying and describing individual student interpretations and meanings of effective instruction than in the ratings they produce. Researchers also need to take into consideration the context in which the study takes place because according to Hathaway (1995:548), "facts have no meaning in isolation from the setting". The phenomenologic position also allows for researchers to use their subjective knowledge about what they are studying and thus add to the understanding and interpretation of the data.

In order for the results not to remain collections of individual perceptions the analyst needs to identify what is universal and what is unique in the particular case (Erickson 1986:130). Accordingly, phenomenologic research, like positivism, is interested in the discovery of universals but where the positivist position is in search of abstract universals and arrives at them through statistical generalizations, the phenomenologic position is looking for concrete universals arrived at by studying specific cases and by comparisons with other similar cases.

Methodologically qualitative studies on student perceptions of effective teaching are more varied than those conducted within the positivist position. The

studies reviewed below have used techniques such as open-ended questions (van Rossum et al. 1985, Benz and Blatt 1996) and participant observation and interviews (Cooper and McIntyre 1993). As was mentioned above (p.15), these verbal data (be it acquired with questionnaires or through interviews) are considered a means to access the underlying meanings or perceptions that, by definition, are not available to direct observation. This means assuming a correspondence between words and reality.

### **2.3.1 Qualitative studies on students' perceptions of effective teaching**

The aim of a study by Benz and Blatt (1996) was to examine how students interpreted the items of a faculty evaluation instrument and draw conclusions about construct validity.

At the University of Dayton, USA, 389 undergraduate students in ten classes completed the regular end-of-term Student Evaluation of Faculty form (27 items rated on a Likert-type scale). Simultaneously, another form was administered and the students were asked to copy their ratings on the eight items concerning the instructor and, after each rating, answer the question: "Why did you rate this item as you did?"

An initial coding of the eight questionnaire items was carried out using analytic induction. The objective of this stage was to identify "subjective participant constructs", i.e. each response was summarized in one or more "codes" - descriptive labels that characterize the response and retain as much as possible of the original wordings used by the student. Finally, the responses of each set of students to each of the ten teachers were grouped together and thematically interpreted.

The meanings students ascribed to items varied widely but the level of inference in the evaluation process did not seem related to agreement in meaning, i.e. validity. The data suggested four patterns of student thought. Firstly, the students used a variety of evidence in making their ratings, such as their being

bored during the classes. Secondly, students attributed their ratings mainly to the subject matter, to the teacher, to their own behaviour or to the class in general. Thirdly, the students' understandings about the teaching process were a mixture of attributions to the teacher, the students etc. and, according to Benz and Blatt, often naive and odd. They suggested that it might be useful if teachers explicitly presented their teaching strategies so that the students would understand the 'point' of certain activities and teaching methods. Fourthly, Benz and Blatt noted the students' frequent ambiguity and attributed it to over-quick initial judgements made by the students.

Van Rossum et al. (1985) investigated students' views on learning and teaching and a number of other related concepts (e.g. study activities). A sample of 42 first and second year Arts students answered a number of open questions concerning eight topics, one of which was the meaning students gave to good teaching.

The data were analysed and attention was paid to similarities in the answers, for example, to recurring themes. An attempt was made also to look for links between a learning conception, teaching conception, and the other themes. Five categories of description emerged, each of which was based on a particular learning conception and accompanied with a teaching conception that seemed to be similar in attitude.

The first teaching conception was teacher-dependent and linked well with the aim of learning: the acquisition of knowledge. The teacher was expected to "clarify everything" or to "explain well". In the second view, traces of a technical teaching conception could be discerned. Organizational features such as good teacher preparation, control and structuring as well as an authoritative role of the teacher were typical of this view. Also the third teaching conception was very technical. However, student participation (limited) was brought up for the first time. The fourth view was closely linked to constructive learning and it emphasized creative student participation and a certain measure of independence. Finally, the fifth concept was very similar to the fourth, but the quality of teaching was also measured in terms of personal development and student-teacher interaction.

Cooper and McIntyre (1993) studied pupils' and teachers' perceptions of effective classroom learning and teaching. Eight English teachers, five history teachers and their year 7 classes participated in the study. The main method of study was informant type interviewing but the researchers also engaged in participant observation of lessons. The data were analysed using a form of recursive comparative analysis, i.e. data were tested against one another and refined as the description unfolded.

The results suggested a structure of effective teaching that was defined in terms of classroom outcomes (including learning outcomes and other classroom outcomes) and in terms of teaching methods and strategies. In the pupils' view, the acquisition of factual information or mastery of instrumental skills were indicators of learning. Other positive classroom outcomes were described as desirable social behaviour or a positive general climate of the classroom, as well as with the notion of 'working well', i.e. appropriate on-task behaviour during the classes. Also experiences of fun and enjoyment were considered important.

The findings also suggested a strong agreement between pupils and teachers about the most effective teaching strategies and techniques. Pupils valued activities of high degree of participation and a relatively high level of arousal, such as story telling, drama and role play, and use of stimuli related to pop-culture. Discussions, question-answer sessions, blackboard work, and pair/group work were valued because they stimulate thinking and give pupils an opportunity to develop and share their own ideas. Simultaneously, new information gets personal meanings. Based on these results, Cooper and McIntyre (1993) concluded that method rather than content was the critical focus of pupils' claims of effectiveness because the setting and the activities created important links with new information and served as helpful cues in memorizing.

### **2.3.2 Criticism**

While qualitative studies on student perceptions of effective teaching certainly need to be given credit for bringing the student perspective in the focal point, a closer

examination of the qualitative techniques reveal that some of the criticisms aimed at quantitative methods are equally valid here.

Although the data collection procedures used (open-ended questions, interviews) allow students to respond using their own words, the responses are nonetheless brought together. While quantitative studies produced factor structures, qualitative studies classify verbal data into gross categories. In the study by van Rossum et al. (1985), the verbal responses of 42 students were classified into just five categories. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987:41), such broad categories are likely to be used if researchers expect consistency. In their study on students' understandings of questionnaire items, Benz and Blatt (1996:421), were clearly troubled by variability or ambiguity, as they interpreted it, in the students' responses and attributed it to over-quick initial judgements that forced the students to waver between the initial judgement and its conditions. This kind of wavering, according to Potter and Wetherell (1987:37), has not been treated as a normal feature in traditional social psychology but as a psychologically unpleasant state. According to cognitive consistency theories (Potter and Wetherell 1987:37), conflicting or inconsistent attitudes cause psychological tension and furthermore, inconsistency is considered an undesirable feature in a person. From the point of view of qualitative studies like the ones reviewed here the problem is perhaps more practical than theoretical. While the data collection procedures do not restrict the form of the responses (cf. questionnaire items), the researchers still assume the existence of a stable attitude, perception or understanding. When faced with responses that contain contradictory views, gross categories and other means of classification become inadequate because they cannot cope with variability.

The study conducted by van Rossum et al. (1985) investigated student perceptions of a number of related questions such as learning conception and effective teaching is not only an example of a study in which, by means of gross categorizing, variable responses were suppressed, but it can also be criticised for forcing the data into ad hoc categories. The researchers first formed five categories of learning perceptions and all other issues, including students' views of effective teaching, were then forced to accord with the learning perceptions. This solution

suggests a correspondence or a causal link between a certain learning conception and a certain view on effective teaching. While this may be a neat solution, it is also an unconvincing one, because the researchers gave very little concrete evidence of such correspondence and where examples were given, they did not always seem to support the conclusions that were made. All in all, there is thus a great resemblance between this study and quantitative studies on construct validity regardless of the fact that van Rossum et al. (1985) had chosen to use qualitative data. The same results could have been obtained by using a questionnaire.

The study by Cooper and McIntyre (1993), in turn, has much in common with that of Kishor's (1995) on the influence of implicit theories on students' judgements of effective teaching because by including observation in the data collection procedures, Cooper and McIntyre (1993:384) wanted to ensure that pupils' accounts were based on observed events and not on previous experience or on "unfounded generalization". Observation is considered a safeguard which enables the researchers to keep at bay perceptions that they consider unimportant in the present situation and could thus distort the results. The claim that their research represents "the authentic thinking" (Cooper and McIntyre 1993:384) reveals that the researchers subscribe to the view of attitudes and perceptions as stable, mental entities. If as much as possible of the biasing factors can be effaced by methodological procedures, then arriving at a true, authentic perception is conceivable.

Claiming quantitative methods to be better applicable to studies on student perceptions of effective teaching may seem provocative, but most of the benefits associated with qualitative methods are missed by subscribing to traditional cognitive psychology. While cognitive constructs like attitudes and perceptions are, by definition, stable constructs, qualitative data collection procedures produce data that bring this stability under suspicion; the subjects' accounts are not consistent. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987:39, 41-42), in order to manage this variability, researchers, when dealing with interview data, resort to strategies of analysis such as gross categorization (like in the study by van Rossum et al. (1985)) or selective reading that suppress variable responses. Quantitative

methods are better equipped to deal with variability because possible responses are restricted at the outset by imposing pre-selected alternatives on the subjects.

In recent years, mainstream research and the mentalist definition have been challenged by a discursive approach that subscribes to a social constructionist paradigm. The following chapter will outline this alternative approach and its ontological and epistemological features, and these will be further illustrated by a discursive definition of student attitudes and perceptions of effective teaching. The final section of the chapter will be devoted to methodological questions, i.e. the role of discourse analysis in discursive social psychology.



### 3 DISCURSIVE APPROACH TO STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

#### 3.1 Philosophical background

The discursive approach applies ideas from discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and rhetoric, among others, (Potter 1998) and it has in recent years marked a major change from traditional, mainstream research in social psychology. The changes relate particularly to views on the nature of language, reality, and scientific knowledge, and they also call for a new definition of central psychological concepts, such as attitudes and perceptions in this case.

According to the traditional view, language is a "referential-representational system or a code of meaningful signs" (Shotter 1993:20) and it takes for granted that language reflects or mirrors reality the way it is (Potter 1996:97). This belief that verbal data are factual and faithful representations has made it possible for researchers to study such unobservable phenomena as mental entities because language serves as a means to penetrate beyond language to the actual, underlying cognition (Shotter 1993; Potter 1996). Discursive research, in turn, is based on a constructionist view on language with two senses of construction (Potter 1996:97). Firstly, there is no direct correspondence between words and reality, but instead, reality, or versions of reality are constructed with language. Shotter (1993:28) maintains that whatever is being talked about is developed by what is being said. Accordingly, he suggests that instead of seeing words as having an already defined meaning, their use should be seen as a *means* in the social making of meaning. The second sense of construction (Potter 1996:97) is that the descriptions and accounts used to constitute reality are themselves constructed with already existing linguistic resources.

Although the ontological assumption is that reality is constituted in human practices, it does not mean that reality remains non-existent if it is not uttered (Shotter 1993:8-9, 20; Potter 1996:28). According to Shotter (1993:20), reality exists on two planes:

That plane upon which we talk about what we think of as the orderly, accountable, self-evidently knowable and controllable characteristics of both ourselves (as autonomous individual persons) and our world, is constructed upon another, lower plane, in a set of unacknowledged and unintended, disorderly, conversational forms of interaction involving struggles between ourselves and others.

In other words, the first level is almost like the objective, independently existing reality of positivism, but Shotter (1993:8-9) claims that it is not the material shape of reality that forces us to conform to it, but the *moral* shape, or the social conventions against which the rationality or irrationality of our accounts and descriptions are judged (Shotter 1993:29; Gergen 1988:35).

Constructionism is also closely related to a relativist meta-theory (Potter 1998:235) and the idea of reflexivity (Potter 1996:228) which refer to the researcher's relation to his own research and to the production of scientific knowledge. These issues are less of a concern in the positivist tradition which largely determines the quality of knowledge by the quality of procedures, i.e. objective observation and exact measurements and takes language to be neutral and transparent (Potter 1996:229). In contrast, since discursive research takes descriptions and accounts to be constructed versions of reality, the production of scientific facts in research reports should not be considered any different from other types of social texts. In other words, objectivity is not an automatic or a natural feature of scientific texts but instead, research reports are constructed as objective and neutral by their authors (Potter and Wetherell 1987:182; Potter 1996:229; Kalaja and Leppänen 1998). Furthermore, according to Gergen (1988:36), the fact that scientific language, spoken or written, follows certain conventions, will also influence what we take to be knowledge. As a consequence, Kalaja and Leppänen (1998) emphasize that in discursive research the researcher is by no means independent of the object of inquiry or of the analytic process because the construction of facts results not only from the researcher's analytic and interpretative practices, but also from the linguistic means used to report the findings.

The ontological and epistemological issues outlined here will be exemplified in the following section by redefining the notions of attitude and perception.

### **3.2 Attitudes and perceptions as evaluative discourse**

Instead of trying to redefine established concepts, discursive social psychologists rather avoid presupposing attitudes and other similar cognitive concepts (Potter 1998:245). The reason for this is perhaps the fact that the outlines of these notions are strongly influenced by traditional mentalist definitions. For example, the fact that none of the studies on student perceptions of, or attitudes towards effective teaching reviewed above defined the object of their inquiry implies that the mainstream definition is largely taken for granted. Instead of using the notions of attitude and perception, Potter (1998), for example, simply talks about evaluative practices or about the production of assessments.

In discursive social psychology the constructionist ontology manifests itself as anti-cognitivism (Potter 1998:235). In fact, the whole notion of 'mind' as a mediating organ between ourselves and reality is rejected as a myth (Shotter 1993:22) and psychological phenomena, such as attitudes and perceptions are no longer taken to exist as stable entities inside our heads, but as discursive phenomena that come into existence in talk and text (Harré and Gillett 1994:21-22; Potter 1998:235). Along with the new paradigm, the focus of study in social psychology has thus moved from underlying mental entities to linguistic practices (Potter 1998).

Harré and Gillett (1994:21-22) outline the subject matter of discursive social psychology as subjective discourse that is produced in a certain sociocultural context. This view of attitudes and perceptions as social constructions has some important implications. First of all, the "shape" of the construction depends on the linguistic means used, and initially, as Harré and Gillett (1994:27) point out, on the skills of the actors. In other words, the linguistic resources available to different people are not identical and some are more skillful at using those resources than

others. Secondly, the social context is important, too. According to Harré and Gillett (1994:35), the same speakers may take different positions depending on the situation, i.e. their rights, duties and obligations as speakers are contextually variable. As a consequence, in different contexts and positions, our judgements of the same object may be different. For example, students discussing the quality of instruction among themselves may define that quality in quite different terms than in discussions with the teacher. Thirdly, according to Potter (1998:242), the fact that our attitudes are not consistent also speaks for the consequential and constitutive nature of evaluative practices. In other words, we use different linguistic means, not only in different positions, but also depending on what we want to accomplish with the evaluation. The point is that even views that would traditionally be considered opposite are no longer seen as mutually exclusive, but simply resulting from different functional aims, different contexts, participants, and different uses of linguistic resources.

Traditional research on attitudes assumes not only the existence of a single, underlying evaluation, but also a commonly shared object of thought. For example, in questionnaire studies on effective teaching reviewed in section 2.2.1, the "shape" of effective teaching was imposed on the subjects in the form of questionnaire content. However, within the discursive approach, the object gets its shape in the course of the evaluation (Potter and Wetherell 1987:51). In other words, in student evaluations of effective teaching, the whole construct of 'effective teaching' is being developed while students discuss its features. The subjects decide what features are included in the construct and which are left out on that particular occasion, as well as the importance given to each of these features. In a sense then it is impossible to separate the object of thought and the evaluation because the two are simultaneously constructed.

Perhaps the very different nature given to attitudes and perceptions depending on the definition, and the role given to people, either as subjects to cognitive processes or as actors in social construction best sums up the main differences between the traditional approach and the discursive approach. Traditionally defined, attitudes and perceptions are products of cognitive

processes, while, when discursively defined, attitudes are socially constructed in linguistic activity. The traditional view has it that attitudes are stable, but in discursive social psychology evaluations are considered contextually variable. Traditionally, behaviour is considered to be dependent of, and in accordance with attitudes, while in discursive social psychology different evaluative practices are constructed to *do* different things, albeit that use is often implicit and indirect (Potter, 1998:242).

Because the aim of study has shifted from attempts to define some underlying attitude to describing and interpreting the linguistic constructs produced in certain contexts, the methods used in mainstream social psychological research, such as questionnaires in quantitative research, or content analysis in qualitative research, are not suitable. Discourse analysis has been proposed as a method which enables the study of constructive language use (Potter and Wetherell 1987, Suoninen 1992).

### **3.3 Discourse analysis in discursive social psychology**

Potter and Wetherell (1987:7) define discourse in its broadest sense to include all types of spoken and written language, and the foundations of discourse analysis, in turn, lie on the view of language as functional, constructive, and variable (Potter and Wetherell 1987:32, see also Suoninen 1992; Jokinen et al. 1993). As has already been mentioned above, according to the constructionist view, language is used to do things: people are thought to produce variable accounts of objects and events depending on the function given to language. Thus, according to Potter and Wetherell (1987:35), the basic claim of discourse analysis is that function involves constructing different kinds of versions, and function is demonstrated by language variation. Potter and Wetherell (1987:35) have summarized the main tenets of discourse analysis in the following six points:

1. language is used for a variety of functions and its use has a variety of consequences
2. language is both constructed and constructive
3. the same phenomenon can be described in a number of different ways
4. there will, therefore, be considerable variation in accounts
5. there is, as yet, no foolproof way to deal with this variation and to sift accounts which are 'literal' or 'accurate' from those which are rhetorical or merely misguided thereby escaping the problems variation raises for researchers with a 'realistic' model of language
6. the constructive and flexible ways in which language is used should themselves become a central topic of study.

Accordingly, in discourse analysis the functional and constructive nature of accounts becomes central and discourse as such occupies the focal point: the aim is to look at how different forms of evaluative discourse are produced with linguistic resources. Due to the priority given to discourse itself, discourse analysis also manages to avoid some of the problems associated with mainstream research, such as treating discourse as an indicator of attitudes and using discourse as a means to retrieve those underlying attitudes (Potter and Wetherell 1987:46). Discourse analysis also responds to another difficulty as it does not presuppose the existence of a commonly shared attitude object. Since the focus is on how the topic is constructed in discourse, different versions are possible and acceptable. There is thus no need for the researcher to impose his theory of the investigated phenomenon on the subjects.

Potter and Wetherell (1987:175) point out that discourse analysis is not a method in the traditional sense, but rather a broad theoretical framework. There are, however, suggestions as to how discourse could be studied. An interpretative repertoire (see e.g. Potter and Wetherell 1987; Jokinen et al.1993) is one possible unit of analysis and it refers to a set of linguistic resources, such as particular lexicon or a register of terms that are drawn upon to produce descriptions, accounts or evaluations (Potter and Wetherell 1987:138). It should be noted here

that repertoires are thus the product of analysis, not its raw-material (Jokinen et al. 1993:28 ).

By using different linguistic resources it is possible to produce contradictory or even opposite accounts within one and the same discourse. According to Suoninen (1992:15), different repertoires offer alternate perspectives to the same topic or simply construct different versions of the world (Jokinen et al. 1993:24). The analysis should also bear on the uses and functions of different repertoires (Potter and Wetherell 1987:149).

Repertoires are also closely linked to the position (Harré and Gillett 1994:35) or identity taken by people in certain situations, although, as Potter and Wetherell (1987:156) point out, repertoires do not automatically result from the position. For example, there are no predetermined repertoires available for teachers and other repertoires for students. On the contrary, positions or identities are constructed in social interaction and they change in each discourse and in each repertoire (Jokinen et al. 1993:38-39). That is why, according to Potter and Wetherell (1987:156), there is variability rather than consensus in the use of repertoires because their use is dependent both on the function and on the speaker's position.

Potter and Wetherell (1987:157) emphasize that a repertoire is just one, preliminary analytic unit and one that should be refined by taking into consideration other kinds of discursive phenomena. The risk involved with repertoires is that the analysis is restricted to simple identification, i.e. establishing the existence of different repertoires and their features. What is more interesting, however, is what these features are doing *inside* the repertoires. In his more recent work Potter (e.g. 1996) has in fact given less attention to repertoires, and more to other discursive phenomena, such as rhetorical devices.

One possible discursive feature is the rhetorical contrast case (Potter 1998:251). According to Billig (1991:143), every attitude is not only in favour of a position, but also a stance against the opposite position. It is thus not sufficient to pay attention simply on how evaluations are constructed, but also on how they undermine any opposite claims and "protect" themselves from counterarguments.

Any account displaying an attitude should defend its right to be considered "accurate" by utilizing both offensive and defensive rhetoric (Potter 1996:107). The rhetorical contrast thus results in a double analytic focus, i.e. the construction of "accurate" evaluations and the construction of discourse that undermines possible counter versions (Potter 1996:107).

The next chapter will outline the research questions of the present study as well as the data that were used. It will also outline some of the ideas and different analytic units from discourse analysis and finally, the section on analysis will illustrate in more detail how these were applied to studying students' discourse on effective teaching of English.



## **4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THE PROCEDURE**

### **4.1 Research questions**

There are a number of reasons why the discursive approach was chosen for the present study. First of all, the discursive approach together with a constructionist view of language avoids the aforementioned problems associated with mainstream research, the realistic model of language, and the mentalist definition of attitude. Secondly, according to Potter (1996:98), discourse analysis is a productive method, because due to the constructionist point of view, research questions focus on discourse: how it is put together, what resources are being used and what is produced with it. These are all questions that do not make sense for researchers who adopt the realistic point of view. It should equally be noted that these research questions should not be understood in the traditional way, i.e. as previously formulated and precisely specified hypothesis (Potter 1998:238), because the data, discourse itself, directs the course of research and the kinds of questions that can be asked. Thirdly, the scope of possible questions is further broadened by the double analytic focus, i.e. by focusing both on how discourse is constructed as accurate or justifiable, but also on how that discourse is defended against possible counter positions and how those counterpositions are undermined.

Along these lines, then, the aim of the present study is to focus on students' discourse on good English teaching and the questions focus particularly on two aspects: the action orientation of discourse and the epistemological orientation of discourse (Potter 1996). Action orientation refers to questions of construction, such as

- how is good English teaching categorized in students' discourse and in what terms is it evaluated in the course of the construction?

In contrast, the epistemological orientation of discourse refers to questions of justifiability, such as

- what kinds of resources do the students use to construct their views as reasonable and justifiable?

- what kinds of ironizing discourse do the students use, i.e. how do they undermine possible counter positions?

## 4.2 Data

The data used in the present study are a part of a larger corpus whose collection Kalaja and Leppänen started in 1994. The corpus consists of two types of materials from learners of English as a foreign language: written autobiographies on students' experiences as learners of English and tape-recorded pair discussions on a number of related themes, such as the learners' attitudes towards the English language and their views on learning and teaching English. Parts of this corpus have already been used in discursive research: Kalaja and Hyrkstedt (1998, 2000) have studied learners' attitudes towards the English language and Heikkinen (1999) has used the data in her study on students' explanations for success and failure in English studies.

Out of this corpus, a total of nine pair discussions involving both university students of English and students studying at a commercial college was given at my disposal for the present study. For the discussions, the students had been given a set of orientative questions on a number of topics, one of which was the features of good English teaching (Table 1)<sup>1</sup>.

Discourse analytic research often uses naturalistic records of interaction as data which, according to Potter and Wetherell (1987:162), have the virtue of almost completely avoiding researcher influence on the data. Interviewing in turn allows for the researcher to question the subjects on the same issues, which facilitates comparing the results and simplifies the initial coding (Potter and Wetherell 1987:163). It could be argued that by using pair discussions and orientative questions Kalaja and Leppänen made it possible for the situation in which the data were collected to remain more informal than if they had chosen to

---

<sup>1</sup>Translations for the orientative questions are in Appendix 1.

interview the subjects themselves. Furthermore, orientative questions are a less intrusive manner to influence the topic of discussion than interviewing.

TABLE 1. Topics for discussion: aspects of good English teaching

<p><b>Tavoitteiltaan?</b> (oppinäärien suorittaminen, arvosanat, tutkinnon suorittaminen, itsensä kehittäminen)</p> <p><b>Sisällöltään?</b> <b>Menetelmiltään</b></p> <p><b>Työtavoiltaan?</b> (opettajajohtoisesti, oppilasjohtoisesti? Yksin, pareittain, ryhmissä? Kaikki yhdessä, eriytetysti?)</p> <p><b>Oppiaineistoltaan?</b> (oppikirjojen, työkirjojen, kieliopin, sanakirjojen, jne., sisällöt ja aihepiirit)</p> <p><b>Työmäärältään?</b> <b>Etenemistahdiltaan?</b></p> <p><b>Palautteeltaan?</b> (virheiden osoittamista ja korjaamista, kehuja, kannustusta, kiitosta?)</p> <p><b>Kuka päättää tavoitteista, oppisisällöistä, menetelmistä, työtavoista, oppiaineistosta?</b> <b>Millaisia ovat opettajan tehtävät ja roolit?</b> <b>Millaisia ovat oppilaiden tehtävät ja roolit?</b></p> <p><b>Muuta?</b></p>
---

Although the data were ready transcribed (for the symbols used in transcription, see Appendix 2), discourse analysis is still a very labour-intensive approach and therefore it was reasonable to restrict the number of pair discussions. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987:161), amassing too much data may also hinder the emergence of linguistic detail and it is thus often more interesting to use small samples or a few interviews (or in this case, pair discussions). After an initial coding of the nine pair discussions, the final number was cut down to two. The selection of the two pair discussions was based on a number of criteria. Firstly, it was decided that an equal number of pair discussions involving university students and commercial college students should be included. Secondly, the number of pair discussions for each of the two groups was limited to just one. This seemed reasonable because even two pair discussions amount to a considerable body of data. Furthermore, with only one representative for each group, it would be possible to treat each of the pair discussions as individual cases. Thirdly, pair

discussions in which the students had discussed at least most of the orientative questions were selected because it would certainly facilitate further analysis. Finally, the two pair discussions (Appendix 3) that were chosen for analysis seemed to be somewhat typical representatives of the more general tendencies.

### **4.3 Analytic units**

The following sections will outline the kinds of linguistic resources and devices, such as categorizing, maximizing, and externalizing, that are available for speakers in the construction of factual accounts. These notions were applied to the present study as analytic units, i.e. the analysis focused on the ways in which these resources were used in the students' constructions of good English teaching. The introduction is based on Potter's (1996:108) basic argument that descriptions and accounts have a double orientation: action orientation and epistemologic orientation. It should be noted, however, that although the two orientations are treated as separate actions, in actual situations the two are usually blended together. As Potter (1996:121) points out, it is often through fact construction (i.e. the epistemologic orientation) that the actual action gets done. It should equally be noted that this outlining covers only a small number of the kinds of linguistic resources available to speakers in the construction of descriptions and accounts (for a more detailed introduction, see Potter 1996).

#### **4.3.1 Action orientation**

The idea of action orientation of discourse is based on the basic tenet of social constructivism that descriptions and accounts are used to perform actions. Potter (1996) has named three general features of action orientation. The first and the most basic feature is *categorization*. It is through this action that objects or events are formulated as something and specific qualities are attached to them. For

example, good English teaching could be categorized in terms of its objectives, the learning materials that are being used or even in terms of the teacher's abilities. Each of these, in turn, can be categorized in countless different ways. In other words, the specific sense of good English teaching is constituted through categorization. It is important to bear in mind, however, that categorizations are highly indexical: their specific sense can be understood or treated as such only in that particular situation in which the constituting is being done because, as Potter (1996:178) points out, the choice of descriptive language, the choice of words, is tightly bound up with the specific activity. How we choose to describe an object or an event is not haphazard, even though it may not be entirely conscious either, but the power of our description is highly dependent on the descriptive categories we choose to use, and reversely, also on what we ignore or leave out from our description. As a consequence, a certain description can only work in the context in which it is being produced and categorizations cannot be considered stable, i.e. it does not automatically follow that if, for example, good English teaching has once been categorized in terms of learning objectives this categorization would work or be relevant in all possible contexts. On the contrary, the choice of descriptive terms makes it possible to produce contrasting versions of the same thing, each of which works in different contexts.

The second general feature of action orientation is the use of extreme-case formulations (Potter 1996:187) that serve to strengthen the case the speaker or writer is making. One way of achieving this effect is the use of extreme points on relevant evaluative dimensions either by *maximizing* or *minimizing* some quality of an action or a feature of the world. According to Potter (1996:194), these features often focus on dimensions such as big versus small, or good versus bad. For example, an extreme-case formulation of good English teaching could categorize the learning objectives as *the most important* feature. Another type of maximizing and minimizing is the use of modalizing terms (Potter 1996:188) like *every*, *always*, *never*, or other similar words that modify descriptions.

The third and final constructive dimension of descriptions is the way actions are presented either as normal or abnormal (Potter 1996:194). According to Potter

(1996:194), *normality* is an indexical feature and, as a consequence, it is not enough to describe an action that is generally recognized as normal or abnormal but instead, it has to be constructed as such in discourse. Normality, for instance, is often constructed through contrast structures (Potter 1996:194), i.e. a discursive organization through which normality is produced by contrasting it with something that is considered deviant. Issues of normality are also closely connected to regularity, and it is in fact often difficult to distinguish the two: when does something that is regular become normal?

The contrast structure and the frequency of an action are only two examples of the kinds of devices that can be used to make events or actions normal or abnormal, usual or exceptional and an exhaustive list is not even possible due to the diversity of possible means available to speakers.

#### **4.3.2 Epistemologic orientation**

The other orientation of discourse, the epistemologic orientation, has to do with the kinds of linguistic resources that can be used to increase the facticity, or at least, the credibility, of an account (Potter 1994:122). Potter (1996) divides these devices into two different types. This division is based on the idea that the nature or the identity of the speaker influences the facticity of an account. In other words, the speaker is often considered to have some *stake* or *interest* (Potter 1996:124) in producing a certain kind of description, i.e. he is trying to achieve something by doing so (which is usually the case since discourse is action oriented). On the one hand, there are devices that are used to manage the possibly harmful effects that the identity of the speaker may have on facticity. On the other hand, there are procedures that are used to draw attention away from the identity of the speaker and which thus help avoiding the problems identity may cause.

#### 4.3.2.1 Interest management devices

Potter (1996:148) names three closely connected dimensions which relate the speaker's identity to issues of facticity and interest management in accounts. Firstly, it is possible for the speaker to present himself as unmotivated or authentic vis-à-vis his own account of some event or action through what Potter (1996:125) calls *stake inoculation*. This is a procedure that works to increase the credibility or facticity of an account by diverting the effects of stake attribution. In situations where descriptions might be undermined as interested, stake inoculation presents a counter-interest: the speaker rids himself from the suspected interestedness and instead, presents himself as neutral or impartial.

*Stake confession* (Potter 1996:129) is the opposite procedure to stake inoculation in managing the dilemma of stake. According to Potter (1996:130), stake confession may not seem like a reasonable technique of fact construction, but it is nevertheless useful in situations where issues of stake cannot be avoided. Although stake confession may open up the account to undermining, it may also disarm criticism, since it is the speaker himself who brings up the issue and shows that he has already taken his own interests into account and is thus able to put them aside and be objective.

The second dimension of interest management is the idea of *category entitlement* (Potter 1996: 133). According to this idea, some people, in certain contexts, are considered knowledgeable simply because they are members of a certain category. For example, students can be regarded as knowledgeable participants in discussions on the qualities of good English teaching since they have experience in this domain. Entitlements are not, however, automatic but the speaker needs to work up his entitlement through discourse. Furthermore, as Potter (1996:135) points out, in addition to fact construction, speakers also need to anticipate the kinds of questions and criticisms they may face and be able to balance between facticity and managing issues of accountability. Different category entitlements assume different levels of accountability and it is thus possible for the one and the same speaker to resort to a certain entitlement on one occasion but

renounce it on another depending on the level of accountability he is willing to accept or is able to manage without compromising the facticity of the account.

The third and final dimension in managing<sup>e/</sup> stake or interest is the notion of *footing* (Potter1996:142). This notion refers to the different participant roles the speaker may take in a conversation and, depending on the footing, the speaker may either present an account as his own or distance himself from it. He may, for example, take up the role of a witness who has first-hand information about an event, or he may choose to resort to the role of an over-hearer who is merely reporting other people's opinions or experience. Depending on the speaker's role, he will be assigned different accountability since, in terms of the facticity of his description, it is one thing to make a claim and take responsibility for it and a completely different thing to report the claims made by others. In summary, the issue of footing is not so much concerned with establishing a factual description as it is with managing responsibility for it (Potter 1996:148).

#### 4.3.2.2 Externalizing devices

The other type of procedures used in dealing with issues of stake do not work to manage interests but to draw attention away from the speaker's identity. In Potter's (1996:150) words they "construct the description as independent of the agent doing the production". Simultaneously, these procedures relieve the speaker from at least some of the responsibility for the facticity of the description.

The first, and perhaps the most obvious of these externalizing devices, are the kinds of constructions of *impersonality* that are common in scientific contexts but not restricted to science alone. Formulations like 'it is believed' or 'facts show' minimize the agent's involvement and maximize the independent existence of a thing or an action. According to Potter (1996:151), they are constructed as not being constructed. They just are there.

The second way of increasing the facticity of an account and of drawing attention away from the speaker are constructions of *consensus* and *corroboration*.



These notions refer to a situation where the speaker establishes the facticity of his account on the existence of a reliable witness. According to Potter (1996:159), it is a crucial feature of everyday reasoning that consensus in reports provides corroboration of the facticity of a version. In other words, the existence of a witness, or even better, multiple witnesses, and their agreement on the issue supports facticity. Simultaneously, accountability is shared between the speaker and the witnesses. However, according to Potter (1996: 159), consensus alone is not enough: consensus should be achieved independently, without the witnesses influencing or being influenced by one another. Furthermore, both the existence of the witnesses and their independent corroboration need to be worked up in discourse in order to increase the facticity of an account.

The third and final way of externalizing is the use of *narratives* and *detail*. According to Potter (1996:118), embedded narratives in descriptions may increase the credibility of an account and they are often an expected or even a necessary part of a description. Potter (1996: 175) names three different levels upon which detail works in narratives. Firstly, it can be used to reproduce an event: vivid details make a convincing narrative. Secondly, details can be organized to an internally focalized narrative (Potter 1996:164), i.e. the events are presented from the point of view of a participant. This involves working up a particular category entitlement, the witness category. Finally, detail can be used for drawing the reader or the listener into the narrative, as in literary texts. In summary, the use of rich detail makes it possible for the reader or listener to take the position of a perceiver. As a consequence, based on the details, the recipient can make inferences and judgements about the event or action described. The agent doing the description becomes externalized because he is only reporting what he has observed and the recipient, in turn, evaluates what the details mean. However, the use of detail involves certain risks since details can easily be reworked or undermined. According to Potter (1996:168), vague or global formulations may, at times, be a reasonable way of sustaining the credibility of an account without providing the kind of descriptive detail that can easily be undermined by picking them apart.

The next section will introduce the different stages of the analysis and explain some of the methodological choices that were made. It will also illustrate how the different linguistic resources that were outlined above were applied to the analysis.

#### **4.4 Analysis**

Because the topic of this study, good English teaching, is so multifaceted (including such aspects as learning objectives, materials, contents and methods), it was reasonable to treat each of the aspects as a question of its own. Thus the initial coding consisted of looking for instances in the discussions in which the different issues were discussed, and each of the issues that were chosen for analysis formed a file of its own. The aim of this procedure was to organize the body of discussions into smaller and manageable units. There were a number of reasons why the coding categories adhered to the orientative questions. Firstly, although the research questions bear on issues of categorizing and justification, i.e. action orientation and epistemological orientation of discourse, it was not possible to code the data along these two orientations because the functions of the linguistic means are not that clear-cut. The same devices, e.g. maximizing (Potter 1996: 118-119), can be used for both categorizing and justifying.

Secondly, the notion of interpretative repertoire (see p.38) that has been used in many discursive studies (e.g. Suoninen 1992, Hyrkstedt 1997, Heikkinen 1999), seemed to be too tight. It would have been impossible to squeeze into one and the same analytic unit both the questions of construction and epistemology and at the same time maintain at least some kind of topical order. Using the interpretative repertoire would simply have resulted in too much gross categorizing. The unit would have blended together rhetorical contrast (i.e. construction and epistemology), all the different aspects of good English teaching,

and above all, the two pair discussions would have been treated as just one body of data, not as two separate discussions.

The initial coding thus consisted of organizing the data along the lines of the orientative questions. It was only after this procedure that the actual analysis could begin. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987: 168), the analysis involves a lot of careful reading and rereading, but what is even more important than reading, is, as Kalaja and Hyrkstedt (2000:376) propose, asking questions. Each reading of the data focused on a different detail and aimed at answering a different question: in what terms is this particular aspect of good English teaching categorized, what means are used to justify the speaker's position, what function does narrative serve in the speaker's account and so forth. The linguistic resources that were outlined in the previous section thus became the focus of analysis at this point. The first reading of a passage usually aimed at answering the question of how, or in what terms were aspects of good English teaching categorized? What constructive and evaluative terms were used? Were there instances of maximizing or minimizing? The second reading usually focused on facticity, while the following readings addressed issues of interest management. It should be noted, however, that the different stages of analysis were not as clear-cut as they may seem here since the questions were often intertwined, just as the two orientations, the action orientation and the epistemologic orientation, of discourse. The results of this analysis are reported in the next chapter.

## **5 FINDINGS**

The analysis focused on four aspects of good English teaching. Each of the themes, learning objectives, learning materials and their contents, teaching methods and approaches, and teacher's roles and duties, are discussed in a section of their own, respectively. Although the analysis is organized in categories that adhere to the orientative questions that were at the students' disposal during the pair discussions, the findings do not necessarily follow the order in which the different aspects of good English teaching had been discussed. However, when possible, the passages of discourse that are taken as examples follow the order in which they occurred in the pair discussions and the two pairs, commercial college students and university students, are treated as individual cases. The four sections can thus be read as relatively separate wholes.

### **5.1 Learning objectives**

During the pair discussions, the students had at their disposal a set of orientative questions (see p. 43) on the different aspects of good English teaching. Out of the orientative questions on learning objectives (completing a course, grades, diplomas, educating oneself) the students had discussed grades and diplomas, but also objectives that did not feature among the orientative questions had come up during the discussions. What was common to both pair discussions was a critical position on the importance of grades and diplomas while the means used to construct these evaluations and other accounts varied considerably in the two discussions.

***"The most important objective is that you just learn how to speak"***

In the commercial college students' accounts the objectives of good English teaching are clearly defined in practical terms:

(1)

Kai: [...] mun mielestä kaikkein tärkeintä tavoite on vaan se että *oppii puhumaan* ja, *uskaltaa puhua*, *ymmärtää puhumista*, ja tulee sujuvaksi sen kielen kanssa [...]

Accordingly, objectives are precise skills, such as the ability and the courage to use the English language as well as understanding spoken English. It is not surprising that a student who studies international marketing should construct the objectives as skills that are useful for him in the future. However, although the opinion is clearly stated as the speaker's own, the objectives themselves are presented in a more general form, using impersonal verb forms, such as *oppii puhumaan* (one learns to speak), *uskaltaa puhua* (one has the courage to speak), and *ymmärtää* (one understands spoken language). Personal opinion is thus constructed as something more broadly applicable, not as idiosyncratic and strictly individual. By changing from the personal mode of speaking to impersonal, the speaker externalizes himself from his own construction and the objectives become more general and as a consequence, more justifiable and generally acceptable. The impersonal mode thus diverts the attention away from the speaker's own interests, i.e. the fact that the objectives are formulated as skills and activities that commercial college students are likely to envisage in the future. But sometimes, as in example (2), the impersonal mode helps little to hide the speaker's personal stake:

(2)

Kai: [...] kaikkein tärkeintä on se, että *sä meet ulkomaille*, *sä teet bisnestä* näitten ihmisten kanssa pystyt puhumaan niitten kans, ja pystyt uskoo käyttää sitä [...]

In (1) the objectives are constructed in more generic terms (e.g. learning to speak, having the courage to use the language) but in (2) the specificity of the objectives, i.e. going abroad and doing business, reveal the speaker's stake as a student of international marketing. The speaker uses the second person singular *sä meet ulkomaille* (you go abroad), *sä teet bisnestä* (you do business) which refers to people in general, including, however, also the speaker. The construction nevertheless effaces some of the speaker's personal stake.

The above examples illustrate the use of the impersonal mode of speaking as a means to make the speaker's account more generally applicable, but the commercial college students use also maximizing in order to justify the objectives:

(3)

Kai: [...] mun mielestä *kaikkein tärkeintä* tavoite on vaan se että oppii puhumaan [...]

Learning to speak is not just important but it is *kaikkein tärkeintä* (most important). Furthermore, it is the single important objective: only learning how to speak English is important. The function of this maximizing discourse is twofold. Firstly, and more obviously, it is used to emphasize the importance of the objectives that the speaker attaches to good English teaching. Secondly, it serves to undermine possible counter positions by making the account seem so solid that it leaves little room for possible suggestions that the objectives could be constructed in some other terms. This possibility is turned down at the outset by using maximizing. Had the speaker left out the two maximizing devices, his construct would be much more open to counter positions. Compare with.: "...tärkein tavoite on se että oppii puhumaan". This utterance could easily face the question: "What are the other objectives?". In contrast, by constructing his opinion as an extreme case, the speaker frustrates this question.

In addition to maximizing, the importance of the aforementioned skills is further strengthened by categorizing possible counter positions, i.e. other possible objectives, in negative terms:

(4)

Kai: [...] mun mielestä tämä, arvosanat ja tän tutkinnon suorittaminen  
mun mielestä ne on *roskaa* [...]

The speaker anticipates a possible position which could categorize good English teaching in terms of short-term objectives, such as getting good grades or getting a diploma. The speaker's own position is defended by disparaging those objectives that are excluded from the speaker's own construction of learning objectives: grades and diplomas are *roskaa* (rubbish) and as such they cannot be considered important.

In the previous example, the function of the description is purely action-oriented, i.e. it simply categorizes grades and diplomas as rubbish but there is nothing in the description that would justify it. Instead of merely stating his opinion of grades and diplomas, in (5) the speaker defends this description with witness knowledge:

(5)

Kai: [...] ei oo väliä onks se numero viitonen vai kymppi, jos sä tuut  
ymmärretyks ja niin pois päin, koska, *mä tiedän* ihmisiä millä on  
huonot numerot, mutt ne uskaltaa käyttää sitä ja niin pois päin, *sitten*  
*on* tämmösiä kympin oppilaita jotka ovat tämmösiä, tota nin, mitkä,  
mitkä voi just tajuta kaikki kielioipit ynnämuut paremmin kun itse  
aito amerikkalainen tai jotain, ja mutt silti, ne ei uskalla puhua ja ne  
piipittää hiljaa tai jotakin, siinä pitää, kaikkein tärkeintä on että sitä  
uskaltaa käyttää, mun mielestä se on niinku se ykköstavoite tuota nin  
[...]

The insignificance of grades is based on both personal and common knowledge. The speaker's position that grades are of no importance is founded on his personal knowledge: *mä tiedän* (I know). The speaker knows people who have poor grades but who nevertheless are able to use the English language. The speaker then shifts the footing from personal knowledge to common knowledge in order to contrast the people with poor grades with those who get A's but are unable to use English. In his description of a good student, the speaker uses a stereotypical construction:





koulussa, ylioppilaskirjotuksiin *aivan*  
 Tiia:           nii just   joo  
 Hanna:       *niinku elämää ei ois sen jälkeen*

The narrative constructs the matriculation examination as the only objective, the goal at which *everything* in school aimed. By referring to the existence of life after school the speaker expresses her disagreement with the established objective: schools act as if life after school did not exist and concentrate on preparing the students for the matriculation examination. However, the speaker makes no suggestions as to what objectives would be more relevant.

The second speaker uses her past experience in a similar manner as material in constructing objectives in secondary school, but while (6) is a description which simply categorizes the matriculation examination as the most important objective, (7) is closer to a narrative in style:

(7)

Tiia:           [...] ja sit oli oikein niinku mahollista että ää mä en saa ikinä  
                   niitä ylioppilasruusuja ja se oli niinku se, se niinku se  
 Hanna:   (naurahdus)  
 Tiia:           *pääasia* siinä. et se opettajaki teki siit semmosen ihan,  
 Hanna:   nii  
 Tiia:           tyttömäisen naisellisen ja semmosen ihanan et kaikki saa sen  
                   valkosen puvun ja, sitten ne ruusut nii [...]  
 Tiia:           sellane ilmapiiri kyllä ahistaa sitte et mitäs varte mää  
 Hanna:   mm  
 Tiia:           oikeen näitä opiskelen

In the example, the objective, graduation, is constructed through the external features of the graduation ceremony. The speaker establishes their importance in two ways. Firstly, the external, almost uniform like features, the roses and the white dress, are categorized as the *main issue*. Secondly, the narrative constructs this objective as the norm because not only the pupils, but the teacher as well, participated in making this wonderful and feminine event their common goal. Although the speaker shares this common objective, the positive qualifiers that categorize the graduation ceremony nevertheless conflict with the atmosphere that the speaker describes as distressing. This turn from positive to negative

categorization distances the speaker from the commonly shared objective and by questioning its importance the speaker portrays herself as more serious-minded than the others.

Since one function of the narratives is to criticize the objectives in secondary school, they need to seem factual in order to be convincing. Although the narratives are descriptions of past experience, the speakers draw upon different resources in building up their facticity. One way of achieving this is the use of rich detail, as in (7), where the speaker mentions the colour of the dress and the type of flowers that everyone was supposed to get for the graduation ceremony. The fact that the speaker has this kind of detailed knowledge presents her as a well-informed witness: the scene she is describing has actually taken place.

Another type of detail that the same speaker uses in order to increase the facticity of the account is reproducing passages of discourse from a particular scene:

(8)

- Tiia: [...] meilläki oli yks ruotsin opettaja joka joka tunti se alotti sillä että, [...] *kyllä se on niin ihanaa minä muistan vieläkin sen päivän kun minä ne ylioppilasruusut (naurua) sain.* ja sitte taas että
- Hanna: (hymähdys)
- Tiia: *riveissä, viis jokaiselle, ja sit siinä vaan niinku tuhras niitä omia läksyjä että onko tää nyt oikein, ja sit oli oikein niinku mahdollista että ää mä en saa ikinä niitä ylioppilasruusuja [...]*

By reproducing passages of her teacher's discourse and by reporting her own feelings the speaker creates an impression of being there, i.e. the speaker and the interlocutor are projected to the time and place of the event. The ability to cite a person word-for-word might strike as unbelievable and actually work against the facticity of the account but in this case, this seemingly impossible ability is explained by the fact that the speaker is also constructing the scene as recurring. The fact that the teacher had repeated the same words at the beginning of every lesson makes it possible for the speaker to remember them.

By reproducing passages of dialogue the speaker not only increases the facticity of her account, but at the same time, she normalizes the scene and the role of the matriculation ceremony as the most important objective. The speaker's criticism of the objectives in secondary school becomes more justified since it is not based on just one, isolated occasion, but on something that was actually a feature of everyday life.

In (9), the other university student does not draw so much upon detailed narratives in increasing the facticity of the account but achieves the same effect by drawing upon witness knowledge:

(9)

Hanna:                                       nii. se oli *tiivätkö*, lukiossa just *mun mielestä* sitä  
*puhuttiin kavereitten kanssa* et ku, si- *kaikki*, tähtäs siinä  
koulussa, ylioppilaskirjotuksiin

The speaker first starts the narrative of secondary school experience as her personal opinion, but then shifts the footing and formulates the state of affairs as something that is witnessed by more than just one person. By referring to a discussion with her friends the speaker makes her point seem more factual: the fact that the matriculation examination was the only objective in secondary school is not just her personal opinion, but a number of other people agree with the speaker.

The lack of detail, in turn, has the effect of making the account so generic that it can be representative of any similar scenes. The speaker claims that *everything* in her school aimed at the matriculation examination but the fact that the speaker does not specify the actions that particularly worked towards this goal makes it possible for more people to identify with the situation. It is thus possible for the speaker to rely also on her interlocutor's knowledge of similar cases, *you know*. The lack of detail is also a means to protect the construction against undermining: it is difficult to contest a construction which gives no concrete examples or details upon which one could seize.

Compared with the commercial college students whose arguments were based on practical reasoning, the university students use a completely different

approach in their constructions. The university students use narratives of past experience as their material in the construction and they rely more on emotional argumentation. They avoid expressing their position directly: the narratives used to criticize the objectives in secondary school only indirectly imply that in good English teaching the objectives should be categorized in some other terms. How this should be done is a question that the university students leave without a direct answer.

## 5.2 Learning materials and their contents

Learning materials and their contents was a theme that university students in particular found interesting. The commercial college students mainly discussed the contents of a good textbook and they were found a necessary part of English teaching. University students, in turn, were critical of the dominant role of textbooks in classrooms and made demands for authentic materials, such as video tapes and radio programmes. Teachers were blamed for favoring traditional learning materials.

### *"Of course one has to have some kinds of textbooks"*

In their discussion on learning materials and their contents, the commercial college students defend the use of textbooks. In fact, their use is taken for granted:

(10)

Kai: [...] niin, niin niin mun mielestä niin kun *oppikirjathan tietenkin pitää olla* jonkinlaiset mutta sellaset mielenkiintoiset koska niissä on mun mielestä niin *typeriä*, juttuja mitä käsitellään usein ett siinä vois olla *niinkun semmosta* mikä on *niinkun mahdollisesti* olis, mielenkiintosta mitähän nyt sanos ehdotuksesi, [...]

The speaker constructs the textbook as an essential part of English teaching and their use is self-evident: *oppikirjathan tietenkin pitää olla* (of course one has to have textbooks). Although the speaker sees textbooks as a necessary aid in learning English, he also criticizes their contents for being *typeriä* (silly). These two points are expressed in an assertive manner and the speaker presents these points explicitly as his personal opinions. In contrast, in his attempt to qualify a good textbook, the speaker starts to hesitate. The assertive manner changes into vague expressions such as *something* and *possibly* and the speaker starts repeating the expletive *niinkun* (like).

Finally, the speaker uses his personal likings as the criteria for a good textbook:

(11)

Kai: [...] jos mä itte saisin valita minkälaista oppikirjojen mä lukisin nii ne olis hyvinkin käsittelis niinku tällästä tekniikkaa tämmöstä paljon, ja tota nin tällästä mitä haluaisin itte oppia koska mua kiinnostaa tämmöset jutut tuota nin, se on tietenkin vaikea siinä mielessä että tietenkin ku on niin paljon, tota nin erilaisia ihmisiä että toiset on kiinnostunu toisista asioista ja niin pois päin

The speaker attributes the quality of a textbook to its contents and establishes a connection between an interesting topic and the willingness to learn. The speaker uses his personal point of view as evidence, but he repeatedly uses imprecise qualifiers and, as a consequence, the speaker seems incapable of elaborating on his interests. On the other hand, the speaker may find it futile to categorize the quality of a textbook by basing the arguments solely on personal interest. In fact, the speaker admits the impossibility of his own account and he thus takes the sting out of possible criticism and counter positions. By admitting that his construction may be inconceivable, he also gives up the responsibility of finding another solution and devolves it to his interlocutor.

In (12) the first speaker's construction is in fact contested, but without acutely criticizing the speaker:

(12)

- Mika: onhan siinä hyvä ottaa tietysti jossain oppikirjassa, niinkun, sellasia asioita mitä kiinnostaa kaikkia, yleisiä asioita. miten mä nyt sanoisin ton oikeestaan järkevästi se on niinku sitä että, mistä ihmiset yleensä puhuu, luonto, ihmiset, politiikka,
- Kai: mm
- Mika: politiikka tulee siinä mielessä mukaan ett koska joka maassa on jonkinlaista politiikkaa ja #
- Kai: nii se pitää sanasto pitää osata ja mielipiteet pitää tietää tota nin totta kai

Instead of constructing the contents of good English teaching from a personal point of view, Mika argues for topics of more general interest, such as nature, people, and politics. Textbooks are seen as imitations of reality and their contents should be representative of everyday conversation. The speakers give textbooks an instrumental value: they are necessary in learning the vocabulary needed in expressing opinions.

In summary, the commercial college students firmly construct the textbook as an essential part of good English teaching and its role is to simulate reality and to serve as a practice for real language use. However, although their use is taken for granted, the speakers also criticize their contents. The assertive manner of speaking gives way to vague expressions as the students try to categorize a good textbook.

***" They just use their books"***

In contrast to the commercial college students, the university students produce critical accounts of learning materials and their contents. The accounts contain arguments against the dominant role of the textbook and demands for alternative materials. The abundance of authentic materials is contrasted with the monotonous reality of classrooms where the textbook is in a dominant role:

(13)

- Hanna: nii, jotenki vaan tuntuu että, niinku maailma on täynnä kaikkea,

- sää voisit vaikka. bbcltä ni nauhottaa jonku,  
 Tiia: mm  
 Hanna: oikeen radio-ohjelman vaikka ja kuunteluttaa niillä ja  
 Tiia: mm nii joo nii  
 Hanna: kaikkea mahdollista mut ku, *ne* [opettajat] vaan niinku niitä kirjoja  
 sillei että kuka, kirjantekijä tulee niinku sinne poliisiin kanssa että  
 et käynyt, näitä kahta kappaletta

The possibility of using authentic materials is constructed as an alternative that is available to everyone: *you* could do a lot of things with such quantities of material. In contrast, the dominant role of the textbook is directly associated with teachers: *they* just use their books. Teachers are thus held accountable for the dominant role of the textbook because they choose not to use authentic materials although they are available. Furthermore, the speaker sees that no outside party can bring pressure on teachers and make them maintain the central role of the textbook in the classroom. Teachers alone are responsible and students are victims of the teachers' lack of imagination.

The use of textbooks and other traditional materials is further criticized by categorizing them in negative terms:

(14)

- Tiia: [...] mää en muista hirveesti noist kieli studiojutuista ja noista mut  
 eiks siel oo *aina* joku sellane *tos* *steriili* bi- brittiaksentti, niillä,  
 ihmisillä ja sit ne, l- luki *hirveen hitaasti* ja (naurahten) tälle,  
 mikä niinkun on oikein sellast  
 Hanna: nii  
 Tiia: studio niinkun. tai niinkun *laboratorio*. ympäristössä

The tape-recordings used in English teaching are criticised for being unnatural: the speakers have sterile British accents which, along with the language laboratory conditions, create an artificial experience. The speaker uses maximizing in order to strengthen her case: the accents are not merely sterile, they are *really sterile*, and the narrators are not reading slowly, but *terribly slowly*. In a similar way, maximizing is used to describe the case as recurring. By claiming that the tape-recordings *always* featured unnatural speech the speaker makes the criticism seem more justifiable, because it is not based on a single, isolated case. Unnatural

speaking in tape-recordings is thus also normalized by categorizing it as something that is frequent.

In (14) the speaker made a strong case in criticising the teaching materials. In the same passage the speaker nevertheless also renounces her entitlement to be considered a knowledgeable witness:

(15)

Tiia: [...] *mää en muista* hirveesti noist kieli studiojutuista ja noista mut *eiks siel oo* aina joku sellane tosi steriili bi- brittiaksentti, niillä, ihmisillä [...]

The speaker begins her account by admitting that she does not remember what the tape-recordings were actually like: *mää en muista* (I don't remember). So, if her account is criticised for not being accurate, it is because she does not remember. The rhetoric question *eiks siel oo* (isn't there) then invites the interlocutor to confirm or to agree with the speaker's criticism of tape-recordings and, as a consequence, share responsibility for the facticity of the account. In the same passage the speaker is thus describing the tape-recordings in some detail (really sterile, terribly slowly) in order to make her criticism solid and claiming that she cannot remember in order to renounce responsibility for her account. In summary, the speaker uses two, contradictory linguistic resources that serve different functions in the account.

While the speakers are on the one hand emphasizing the negative points, on the other hand the criticism is toned down by basing it on personal experience, and even more often, on the speaker's feelings about the state of affairs:

(16)

Hanna: [...] ja vaikka silleinki *tuntuu* että miksei oo. ikinä kukaan voinu vaikka, nauhottaa jostaki, vaikka filmnetiltä ottaa jonkun missä ei oo tekstitystä tai jotain tämmöstä tai

In (16), by referring to her personal feeling about the matter, the justification of the account becomes incontestable but at the same time, by constructing the account in this manner, the criticism becomes less acute, since the speaker is not claiming its



facticity. It is impossible to tell whether the speaker's claim of teachers never using alternative materials is based both on experience and feeling, or on feeling alone. However, it is not easy to undermine this construction, because it is difficult to deny a person's right to feel in a certain way.

Another common feature of the university students' talk about learning materials and their contents was the use of <sup>interrogative</sup> interrogative form instead of the declarative:

(17)

Hanna: jotenki tuntuu että sellanenk, luulis et tommone. nyt ku alkaa miettii ni miksei niinku ikinä kukaan opettaja esimerkiks sanonu että, tylsä kappale tässä, [...]

Firstly, the use of an interrogative instead of a declarative sentence has the same effect as referring to personal feelings: it becomes less apparent if the question is used as an example of a situation that has actually occurred or an example of a possible situation. Judging its facticity is difficult, if not impossible. The question contains elements that construct it as factual (the speaker has actually witnessed the absence of a certain behaviour among teachers) but at the same time this behaviour is constructed only as a hypothetical example. The use of an interrogative, instead of a declarative, also has the effect of presenting the speaker in a slightly more sympathetic light, since using a declarative would seem a downright accusation. By using the interrogative, the speaker is implying that there may be reasons not known to the speaker that make teachers' behaviour justifiable.

To sum up, the university students criticize the dominant role of the textbook in English teaching at the expense of other possible materials. The speakers hold teachers responsible for this. Furthermore, inauthentic materials are categorized in negative terms as artificial. The speakers use maximizing both to justify their case and to strengthen the arguments. The university students skillfully blur the facticity of their arguments by basing them on personal experience and on feelings, both of which are difficult, if not impossible, to undermine.

### 5.3 Teaching methods and classroom procedures

Neither of the two pairs named any particular teaching methods in their discussions. The discussions focused on classroom procedures with which the students were obviously more familiar. The word procedure is used here in reference to issues of how teaching and learning is actually organized in the classroom (e.g. teacher-centred vs. learner-centred learning, individual work vs. groupwork). Two main points concerning classroom procedures were considered in the two pair discussions. According to the students, the choice of procedures can be based either on the particular skill that is being taught, e.g. grammar or communication skills, or it can take into account the students' personal likings. The question of how grammar is best taught was discussed in some length in the university students' pair.

***"The most important thing in it is that you talk"***

The commercial college students base their arguments about classroom procedures on their previous constructions of learning objectives (see section 5.1). Since the objective is to learn how to use English in practical situations, English lessons should provide opportunities to practise English use:

(18)

Mika: nii ja *siihen* [tavoitteeseen] *päästään nimenomaan* sillä että *sitä käytetään*, jo täällä harjotustilanteissa, ne on niinku käyttökielenä englanti, me saadaan mennä sitten kenelle tahansa puhumaan, joka ymmärtää englantia ja me tullaan ymmärretyks

The speaker categorizes English lessons as practice situations for future language use where English should be used on a daily basis. Furthermore, this link between the objective and the procedure is constructed as self-evident: the use of English *nimenomaan* (in particular) guarantees that the objective is achieved. The speaker is using impersonal constructions *siihen päästään*, *sitä käytetään* (it is achieved, it

is used) which further strengthen the impression that the connection between the objective and the procedure is a self-evident truth and not just his personal opinion.

Also in (19) the speaker builds up a connection between the learning objective and the procedure:

(19)

Kai: [...] no *mun mielestä* tota nin *kaikkein parasta on* sitten kun, just jos #varsinkin tosta puhuin harjotuksii keskusteluja tosta nin, että joko pareittain ryhmissä tai milloin kaikki yhdessä ett ois semmosta yleistä keskustelua annetaan esimerkiksi aihe, ja porukka keskustelee siitä englanniks mun mielest se on *kaikkein paras tapa oppii puhumista, tietenkin*, kielioppia on ehkä kaikkein parasta opetella yksin mutta, jos aatellaan siis tätä siis kommunikointia niin silloin pitää olla monta ihmistä jonka kanssa voi jutella

Here the speaker constructs the opinion as his own, *mun mielestä* (in my opinion) and uses extreme-case formulations to strengthen his case: *kaikkein parasta on, kaikkein paras tapa oppii puhumista* (the best thing is, the best way to learn speaking). These two means, a direct expression of an opinion and maximizing, create an impression that the speaker knows what he is talking about and is willing to take responsibility for his account. It is possible that the speaker also relies on the idea that there is some natural link between the procedure (conversations in English) and the learning outcome (ability to communicate in English). The use of the word *tietenkin* (of course) could imply this. However, the position of the word *tietenkin* (of course) between two different claims (*se on kaikkein paras tapa oppii puhumista* and *kielioppia on ehkä kaikkein parasta opetella yksin*) is problematic:

(20)

Kai: [...] mun mielest se on kaikkein paras tapa *oppii* puhumista, *tietenkin*, kielioppia on *ehkä* kaikkein parasta *opetella* yksin mutta, jos aatellaan siis tätä siis kommunikointia niin silloin pitää olla monta ihmistä jonka kanssa voi jutella

It is impossible to say with certainty if the word *tietenkin* (of course) is used to categorize the connection between the suggested procedure and the learning outcome as somehow obvious or if it is a part of the next claim the speaker makes.

Example (20) also illustrates well some of the qualitative differences that the speakers make in learning different subskills, such as oral communication or grammar, for example. The first and most obvious difference the speaker establishes is that while learning oral skills requires communication and interaction with other students, learning grammar, in turn, is best done alone. Another interesting point in (20) is the speaker's choice of verbs that describe the learning of these different skills. When referring to communication skills, the speaker uses the verb *oppia* that implies an automatic or an effortless learning process. In contrast, the verb chosen to describe learning grammar, *opetella*, assumes active participation on the learners' part and a considerable degree of effort.

Also, when speaking of oral skills, the student seems confident in his opinion and there seems to be no doubt about how one becomes a fluent speaker. In contrast, as far as grammar skills are concerned, the speaker still uses an extreme case formulation, but he tones it down with the word *ehkä* (maybe). The word *ehkä* not only moderates the construction, but it also portrays the speaker as less knowledgeable and thus less accountable for the facticity of the claim he is making. Furthermore, it serves as a means of defensive rhetoric since if the claim is contested, the speaker can always refer back to this one word and free himself from responsibility: he said *ehkä*.

The following two examples are a direct continuation to example (20) and rare cases of actual negotiation between the participants. In the previous examples the speaker established a link between the procedure and the learning objective, but the question that caused need for negotiation was the issue of how different learner types should be taken into account in deciding on the procedures:

(21)

Mika:     *nii joo se on, ihan totta siinä että tota, sillen kun on  
mahdollisimman paljon ihmisiä, me saadaan mahdollisimman*

paljon ajatuksia ja kaikki ajatukset kun on eriä, nin me saadaan semmonen monipuolinen keskustelu aikaseks *mutt sitt toisaalta, ajatellaan* koska *kaikki ei oo tietysti yhtä, suupaltteja*, siinä isossa ryhmässä ni sitt ku me, pilkootaan tää iso porukka pienii porukoihin ni sitt me saadaan, kaikki puhumaan

The speaker first expresses his agreement with the previous speaker's ideas that group discussions are a natural way of learning communication skills: *se on, ihan totta* (it's, quite true). This expression of agreement is then followed by an additional point of view, introduced by *mutt sitt toisaalta* (but then on the other hand). While the speaker still agrees that conversations are important, he suggests that discussion groups should be small because *kaikki ei tietysti oo yhtä, suupaltteja* (not everyone is of course that chatty). The word *suupaltti* (chatty) is usually used with reference to people who are not only talkative but who also dominate conversations or to whom excessive talking may be a way of attracting attention. By choosing this particular word the speaker implies to a situation where less talkative or shy students might be discouraged from speaking. Furthermore, the speaker uses a simple statement (*kaikki ei tietysti oo yhtä, suupaltteja*) as a justification for his suggestion for smaller conversation groups but he constructs this statement as a description of a natural state of affairs by using the word *tietysti* (of course) and by effacing himself by using the impersonal mode of speaking: *me saadaan, ajatellaan* (we get, let's think). The fact that people are different is thus constructed not only as a self-evident truth but also as something that is commonly known, not a personal opinion.

The competing suggestion on what should be decisive in deciding the procedures is followed by the actual negotiation in (22):

(22)

- Kai: *no joo, (rykäisee) se on semmonen ehkä, no se ehkä ois se riippuu tietenki millasta porukka on mutta, joko suuri*
- Mika: *nii*
- Kai: *ryhmä mutt kuitenkin että voi keskustella siinä*
- Mika: *joo, tärkeintähän siinä on se että puhutaan*

The presenter of the original idea, Kai, undermines the competing suggestion in two ways. Firstly, he begins his turn with *no joo* (yeah well). By using this expression the speaker admits that learner differences are a factor that can be taken into account when deciding on classroom procedures, but at the same time he belittles its significance. Secondly, he uses vague expressions and repetitions like *se on semmonen* (it's like) *ehkä, no se ehkä* (maybe, well it maybe). On the one hand, these serve to turn the previous speaker's suggestion into something so indefinite or so unimportant that one cannot even comment on the issue. On the other hand, the same vague expressions reveal that Kai has very little counterarguments to offer and, in fact, he can only stick to his original idea that conversation groups need to be big enough so that views can be exchanged in the first place.

The issue of teaching grammar was already briefly discussed in (20) but in the following examples the commercial college students discuss in more detail how grammar should be taught:

(23)

Mika: mm, nii, *tottakai kielioppihan pitää osata* mutt se että, *mun mielest*, niinkun opetuksessa on liikaa, keskitytty kielioppiin, [...]

The speaker builds up grammar as an essential part of language skills but nevertheless, even though its importance is admitted, the speaker criticizes its central role in language teaching. The view that grammar is an essential part of language skills is constructed, once again, as an uncontested fact: *tottakai kielioppihan pitää osata* (of course one has to know the grammar). The importance of grammar is not only self-evident, but it is also so commonly acknowledged that the claim does not need to be defended in any way. In contrast, the view that grammar has too central a role in language teaching is clearly constructed as the speaker's own: *mun mielest* (in my opinion). There would have been little point in trying to take credit for the idea that grammar is important, but

the idea that grammar is too central is more controversial, if not completely novel, and it is thus more tempting to present it as one's own.

In (24) the speaker substantiates his claim that grammar dominates language teaching. Grammar is categorized as an inbuilt part of a language that has nevertheless been separated from the whole and taught out of context:

(24)

- Mika: [...] opetuksessa on liikaa, keskitytty kielioppiin, koska se kielioppi, tulee näkyviin kuitenkin kaikissa niissä teksteissä, tottakai kielioppi pitää osata mutt se että  
 Kai: joo  
 Mika: sitä ei tartte niinku kerrata kielioppimaisena-kieliop-pi-maisena opetuksena vaan siinä pitää olla sitten,  
 Kai: joo  
 Mika: esimerkkejä, puhetta ääntä

The speaker firmly builds up his view that since grammar is apparent in language itself, there is no need for reviewing it separately. Also the idea that oral skills are primary is consistently brought up: also grammar should be verbalized.

Classroom work and the quality of exercises in particular were also largely discussed topics:

(25)

- Kai: [...] pitää tietenk# ne tehtävät olla, *mielekkäitä* tuota nin, jollai tavalla  
 Mika: joo niissä pitää olla *luovuutta* ei saa olla niinku olla pelkkä lause, jota sä  
 Kai: *rutiinilla*  
 Mika: käännät vaan se on se ett sun pitää saada joku, asia sanottua, ja se keino ei oo sillei niinku tärke,ett se pitää tietyllä tavalla tehdä vaan sut pitää tulla  
 Kai: joo  
 Mika: ymmärretyks, aina

The speaker makes a demand for meaning-centred teaching instead of the usual form-centredness: how you say what you need to say is not important, but being understood is. The qualities of a good exercise are constructed through a contrast structure: form-centred tasks are categorized in negative terms as *rutiini* (routine)

while good exercises have positive features like *mielekäs* (meaningful) and *luova* (creative).

The leading idea in the college students' accounts on procedures is that their choice should depend on the learning objective. Language teaching was criticized for focusing too much on grammar while the content, not the form of the message should be more important. The demands for verbalized grammar teaching instead of routine translations were in accordance with the idea that teaching and learning should mainly involve oral communication. Most of the claims were presented as facts and as such they were constructed through impersonal expressions. Formulations of personal opinion were rare.

***"The procedures could be a little bit different so that it wasn't always the same"***

The university students discussed classroom procedures only briefly and, as was the case with the commercial college students, they did not name any particular teaching methods, either. Most of the discussion dealt with the teaching of grammar but learner differences were nevertheless taken as the starting point for the discussion:

(26)

Tiia: ois vähän niinku, jos joku tykkää, vaikka et just puhutaan, ni olis sitä ja sit toinen tykkää taas, vaikka lukea tai, tehä jotain muun tyylistä et ne työtavat ois vähän erilaiset et ei se oo *aina sitä samaa* [...]

The speaker constructs hypothetical cases of different learner profiles that serve to illustrate how personal likings and preferences could increase variability in language lessons if only they were taken into account when deciding on the procedures. This possibility, *et ne työtavat ois vähän erilaiset* (that the procedures would be a little bit different), is contrasted with an account of how learning is



*aina sitä samaa* (always the same). The monotony in the procedures is built up using two different means:

(27)

Tiia: [...] et ei se oo aina sitä samaa että, *seuraavat kaksi lausetta ja seuraavat kaksi lausetta* ja, kyllä ne aika äkkiä niinku mun mielestä ne opitaan yläasteella, niinku esimerkiks (hymähtäen) aikamuodot, ja muut, joita niinku *jankataan ja jankataan* [...]

Firstly, the speaker constructs an example case of a typical, monotonous lesson. The speaker actually takes the role of a teacher and speaks the teacher's words: *seuraavat kaksi lausetta ja seuraavat kaksi lausetta* (the next two sentences and the next two sentences). Although this is not a description of a real situation, it is a representation that could be real because, according to the speaker, teaching is always the same. This idea that teaching is monotonously routine is made concrete by repeating the same utterance *seuraavat kaksi lausetta*. Secondly, the speaker uses the verb *jankata* (to harp on) that includes in itself the idea of repetition and here as well the effect is strengthened by repeating the verb. The repetitions in this account not only categorize lessons as monotonous, but they also construct the example case of a lesson as normal.

In (27) the one-sidedness of teaching was constructed through repetitions. In addition, maximizing is used to increase the effect:

(28)

Tiia: [...] et ne työtävät ois *vähän erilaiset* et ei se oo aina sitä samaa että, *seuraavat kaksi lausetta ja seuraavat kaksi lausetta* ja, kyllä ne aika äkkiä niinku *mun mielestä* ne opitaan yläasteella, niinku esimerkiks (hymähtäen) aikamuodot, ja muut, joita niinku *jankataan ja jankataan* kyllä ne on  
 Hanna: joo  
 Tiia: aika hyvin niinku hollilla että . *emmä sit tiitä* että osaanks mä just sen takia ne , niin hyvin, että niitä on *koko ajan* niinku, jankattu. [...]

The extreme-case formulation *koko ajan* (all the time) is used to further strengthen the claim that learning English involves a lot of repetitions and that they are

commonly used. Although maximizing is usually common in critical accounts like this one, here the use of modifying expressions, such as *vähän erilaiset* (a little bit different) and the repeated occurrence of the expletive *niinku* (like) rather tone down the criticism. The speaker also uses impersonal verb forms, such as *jankataan* (are harped on) and this way she avoids directing the criticism to anyone in particular. It seems as if the speaker did not want to be held accountable for any of the criticism although the account is partly constructed as the speakers' personal opinion, *mun mielestä* (I think). The speaker also directly questions her own justification for this criticism, since she admits that her own good knowledge of grammar may result from these repetitions. Although the speaker is entitled as a student to describe teaching methods, at the end of her account she renounces this entitlement to knowledge: *emmä sit tiä* (I don't know). The speaker admits that she cannot necessarily evaluate the effectiveness of a method and by explicitly expressing this inability, the speaker rejects accountability for the evaluation. In a way the speaker is undermining her own account just in case someone else might do it.

Most of the discussion on procedures focused on the issue of how grammar should be taught. Although learning grammar was already categorized in negative terms as routine repetitions in (28), the speaker nevertheless argues for traditional teacher-centred teaching in the next example:

(29)

Hanna: nii, ja kielioppi jotenki. *mä en tiedä* miten sen nyt sais. paremmin, opetettua *must tuntuu* et melkein (---) ja se pitäs löytää *jotenki selittää*, silleen yksinkertaisesti ja sanoo että okei, nyt käsi ylös joka ei ymmärtäny tätä ja sitte *mahollisesti selittää* niinku.

Tiia: mm

Hanna: käydä läpi lisää sitä *tai jotain*. [...]

Also here the speaker constructs an example case where she takes the teacher's role and creates a possible teaching situation. In her example the speaker constructs teaching in very traditional terms as a situation where the teacher explains and goes through the rules and students respond if they do not understand

her explanation. The speaker does, however, make the point that she does not actually know how grammar is best taught: *mä en tiedä* (I don't know). Instead of knowledge, she bases her account on how she feels about the issue, *must tuntuu*. The fact that the speaker is not knowledgeable becomes apparent also in the vague expressions like *jotenki selittää* (explain somehow), *mahollisesti selittää* (possibly explain) and *tai jotain* (or something). The speaker not only admits her own ignorance and but the vague expressions and frequent pauses reinforce the impression that the speaker renounces responsibility for the accuracy of her own construction.

Although the speaker questions her own well-informedness, she nevertheless justifies her demands for changing the procedures of grammar teaching. This justification is based on personal experience:

(30)

- Hanna: käydä läpi lisää sitä tai jotain. että ku se oli *melkein*  
 Tiia: joo  
 Hanna: *aina ainaki mulla* semmosta että jotta. opettaja luki ja laitto kalvon. luki et täs on säännöt. täs on kakstuhatta  
 Tiia: mm  
 Hanna: poikkeusta. että näin, ja koe on huomenna

This description of an English lesson is constructed as a normal case that could apply to other similar situations. On the one hand, the speaker normalizes the scene using an expression that could be called a modified maximization, *melkein aina* (almost always). On the other hand, the expression *ainakin mulla* (at least in my case) limits the account to the speaker's personal range of experience. Even if the speaker constructs the scene as something that has actually happened, it is not a faithful representation of the situation but instead, the speaker is exaggerating when repeating the teacher's supposed words: *täs on säännöt. täs on kakstuhatta poikkeusta. että näin, ja koe on huomenna* (here are the rules. there are two thousand exceptions. that was that, and the exam is tomorrow). The fact that the speaker is exaggerating does not mean that there would be no truth to her account since exaggerations are often used in critical accounts to make them more acute. In

summary, the normalized description makes it possible for other people to identify with the situation, but at the same time it is true at least in the speaker's experience and, as a consequence, its accuracy cannot be denied even if the account cannot be an exact representation of the actual situation.

To sum up, the university students took learner differences as their starting point in constructing the procedures of good English teaching. Once again the university students expressed their position on the issue indirectly, through example cases of what English teaching is actually like. The speakers were careful in avoiding extreme-case formulations and acute criticism and when propositions for better procedures were made, the speakers questioned their own knowledgeability. By renouncing their entitlement to knowledge, the speakers gave up responsibility for the facticity of their own accounts and, in a sense, undermined their own accounts.

#### **5.4 Teacher's roles and duties**

The question of a teacher's roles and duties was quite briefly discussed in the two groups. The teacher's roles were categorized mainly in traditional terms, including duties such as managing the classroom, encouraging the learners and enhancing their interest and motivation in the English language. The commercial college students also put forward a suggestion for a teacher role in which the teacher acts as an expert who guides students in learning.

#### ***"Teacher is the one who manages the situation"***

The commercial college students assign teachers two different roles in their discussions. The first and more traditional role includes tasks such as managing the classroom, detecting mistakes and encouraging the learners:

(31)

Kai: joo ehdottamasti, millaisia ovat opettajan tehtävät ja roolit, mun mielestä opettaja on se mikä johtaa sitä tilanne että se, se nyt pitää niinku *suurinpiirtein hallinnassa* sen tunnin tuota ja, *totta kai* nyt opettajan tehtävä on *kuitenkin*, ne virheetkin sieltä seuloa että nee, että sitäkin puolta voidaan parantaa tuota ja kannustaminen on yks [...]

The speaker firmly states his opinion that the teacher is the person in charge in the classroom: the speaker gives the teacher the role of a leader. This may seem like an opinion in favour of strict discipline, but the speaker then modifies his view: it is enough that the teacher keeps the lesson *suurinpiirtein hallinnassa* (more or less under control). Also the task of detecting mistakes is seen as an obvious part of teaching. This, however, is a claim that may raise objections, because there are also those who think that learners' mistakes should be overlooked. It is possible that the speaker anticipates a counterargument because the construction clearly assumes the existence of opposite opinions. Firstly, detecting mistakes is constructed as a self-evident part of the teacher's duties: *totta kai* (of course). Secondly, the speaker's construction includes the word *kuitenkin* (still). This implies that the speaker is aware of the opposite opinions and he uses the word *kuitenkin* to insist on his own view. The speaker thus uses these two resources to defend his account against possible counterarguments.

The importance of oral communication skills is a theme that the commercial college students have emphasized consistently throughout their pair discussion. The theme is brought up again in (32). The teacher should encourage learners to work towards the objective, i.e. good communication skills:

(32)

Kai: [...] ja kannustaminen on yks että, jos sitä löytyy näitä vähän arempia yksilöitä mitkä eivät niin uskalla tota niin, se pitää kannustaa heitä tota nin, siihen ulosantiin ja, esiintymiskyky ja siihen että se uskaltaa käyttää sitä englantia ja uskaltaa käyttää sitä englantia monenkin ihmisen edessä, ettei tuu mitään semmosta, kenellekkään mitään traumaaja, ja jos *joku* on ei uskalla puhua niin, niin opettajan pitäis huomioida että se niinkus, aiheut-mitään traumajuttuja aiheuta sillai ett *se pistää sen heti suoraan sinne eteen ja se joutuu puhumaan ja sitten saa jonkun, paniikki kohtauksen siellä ja jotai tämmöstä*

According to the speaker, the teacher should pay particular attention to weak students since they lack the courage to communicate in English. The speaker is very careful in avoiding the impression that he himself would need encouragement, i.e. he excludes himself from the group 'weak students'. The speaker uses the pronouns *se* (it) and *joku* (somebody) in reference to a weak student and the use of these pronouns not only explicitly excludes the speaker (and the listener), but it also categorizes a weak student as somehow distant, as someone who does not belong to the speaker's immediate circle.

The speaker also associates encouragement with responsibility. Since it is the weak students in particular that need support, the teacher should be sensitive to their feelings of insecurity. Although the speaker distances himself from weak students, he nevertheless seems to know what kinds of situations cause anxiety and which the teachers should consequently avoid causing. To support this claim, the speaker builds up a scenario of a situation where the teacher has failed in taking the learner into account: *se pistää sen suoraan sinne eteen* (she makes him go straight there to the front), *se joutuu puhumaan* (he has to speak), *saa jonkun paniikki kohtauksen* (he gets a, panic attack). These details make the speaker's construction more convincing, but at the same time they work against the speaker's attempt to distance himself from the students in need of support. In order to avoid the impression that the details used in constructing the scenario are based on personal experience, the speaker turns details into vagueness and concludes his account with the expression *ja jotain tämmöstä* (and something like this) whose function is, on the one hand, to show that the speaker is in fact describing a hypothetical, not a real situation, and on the other hand, to portray the speaker as someone who does not have first-hand information. The use of detail thus creates a conflict of interests: it makes the speakers' account seem convincing, but at the same time it works against his attempt to distance himself those who need encouragement.

The second role that the commercial college students assign to teachers is that of an expert:

(33)

- Mika: [...], mä, *mä näkisin ehkä semmosen vision tulevaisuudessa* että, jopa lukioasteella ni, opettaja toimis lähinnä tota asiantuntijana, ja, oppiminen ois, lähinnä oppilaiden, välistä, ku oppilaat...
- Kai: kommunikaatiota
- Mika: joo, sitä kommunikaatiota nimenomaan ja sitten tietysti opettaja seuraa mikä on tilanne ett miten se menee, [...]

The speaker's account follows the recent constructivist conception of learning according to which the teacher only guides learning while students have a more active role and take responsibility for their own learning. Although this development has been largely discussed in recent years, the speaker constructs this idea as his personal opinion and takes the role of a visionary: *mä näkisin ehkä semmosen vision tulevaisuudessa* (I would think perhaps the kind of vision in the future). However, the teacher's expert role is constructed only as a possible situation or a state of affairs and the expression contains the reservation that the vision may never come true: the speaker should not be considered accountable if his vision of the future is not realized.

In summary, two different roles were assigned to teachers in the commercial college students' discussions. The first role was the more traditional of the two, including tasks such as classroom management, detecting mistakes and encouraging the learners. Encouraging students in oral communication was seen particularly important and also issues of responsibility were considered: teachers have the power of making students do things and they should be careful in exercising this power. The link between power and responsibility was supported with a descriptive example. The second role assigned to teachers was that of an expert whose task is mainly to guide learning. This role was constructed as a possible state of affairs that is not yet reality.

*"Teacher should hold the reins"*

Also the university students mention classroom management as the teachers' first duty but they are also given an authoritative role:

(34)

- Hanna: no nyt päästiin. am mm (---) no no, se riippuu siis, *just niinku sanottiin* niin kyllä mun täy-, mielestä sillä, opettajalla täytys olla ne ohjat käsissään, ja se täytys olla tietty semmonen niinku. että kun se sanoo että tämä tehdään. niin ne oppilaat ei niinku oo vaan sillei että
- Tiia: mm
- Hanna: no ei herran j-, vaan siis että se tehdään kans.

Teachers' authority is constructed through a description of a possible situation where the teacher says what the students should do and the students obey the teacher. Although the speaker constructs the account as her personal opinion, she also refers to a previous discussion where the speakers had already discussed the matter and agreed upon it. The expression *just niinku sanottiin* (as was said) is not explicit in a sense that it is not clear whether there was real agreement or if the issue had just been discussed, but it nevertheless involves more than one person. This is enough to support the speaker's account.

In (35) the same speaker continues to discuss the issue of discipline, but this time she constructs her view through two extreme-case descriptions:

(35)

- Hanna: [...], et jos se opettaja
- Tiia: mm
- Hanna: rupeis siellä sitte niitten kanssa *kaveeraamaan*. ni ei
- Tiia: mm
- Hanna: *siitä tuu mitään* mut emmä nyt tarkota välttämättä semmosta hirveetä, niinku. *tyrannia* että *joka siellä ää*
- Tiia: mm mm
- Hanna: mutta. kumminki, [...]



At one end of the continuum is a teacher who keeps no discipline. This teacher profile is constructed through the teacher's actions: the verb *kaveerata* (to chum up) assumes equality and it is not usually associated with teacher-student relationships. The speaker thus categorizes equality between teachers and students as abnormal and inappropriate: *ei siitä tuu mitään* (it doesn't work). At the other end of the continuum is a teacher that is constructed through the descriptive category *tyranni* (a tyrant). The speaker is about to continue with a description of how such a teacher, a tyrant, acts in a classroom but she leaves it because she seems to feel the word *tyranni* is descriptive enough. In both cases then, the teacher profiles are built up by a careful selection of one word or a descriptive term that captures the essence of the two contrasting profiles. The speaker does not, however, place her own position on this continuum in an explicit manner, but instead, she leaves it to the listener to conclude.

Although the speaker seemed to be in favour of discipline, and strictness and being pleasant were even contrasted in example (35), the speaker does not, however, see them as mutually exclusive features:

(36)

- Hanna: [...] sillä  
oli sillä naisella *kumminki* sillein et se niinku *piti*  
*semmosen että, että läksyt tehään*. siis se toinen. mut se
- Tiia: mm
- Hanna: oli *kumminki* hirveen jotenki *mukavanolonen*, semmone et *mä*
- Tiia: joo
- Hanna: *en tiiä miten se sitte teki* (naurahtaen) *sen*. [...]

The speaker uses a narrative of past experience as her material and its facticity is based on the speaker's first-hand information: she knows that the teacher demanded that homework was done and the speaker is able to make judgements on the teacher's personality. It seems, however, that the speaker considers this teacher an exception and that being likeable and strict is a combination that is not usually found in one and the same teacher. First, the speaker uses the word *kumminki* (nevertheless) which constructs the two features as somehow mutually exclusive.

The contrast is also further strengthened by using maximizing, i.e. the teacher is categorized as *hirveen mukavanolonen* (terribly nice) and so her being demanding at the same time is made even more exceptional. Secondly, the speaker wonders at the teacher's ability to combine the two features: *mä en tiä miten se sitte [...] teki sen* (I don't know how she then [...] did it).

Teachers are also given responsibility for making learning interesting. Again, the speaker constructs two contrasting descriptions:

(37)

Tiia: [...] et niinkun, ottas uusia

Hanna: nii

Tiia: näkökulmia siihen, opetukseen. et sillä olis semmonen, se ois tosiaan tehny töitä ettei vaan sillei että, et okei et *nää asiat mun täytyy opettaa otetaas täst nää op- oppikirjat ne on kivat ja sit käyvään nää läpi, [...]*

In this first description the speaker builds up a picture of a teacher who has a routine approach to teaching: *nää asiat mun täytyy opettaa* (these things I have to teach). Also the reference to textbooks *otetaas täst nää op-oppikirjat ne on kivat* (let's take these textbooks here they're nice) can be understood as criticism, since the speakers had already found fault in their use previously (see section 5.2). The use of textbooks is constructed as an easy choice: you just take them and they are ready to be used. Finally, the expression *käyvään nää läpi* (let's go through these) adds to the impression of a teacher who lacks methodological creativity. The speaker is thus projecting herself to the role of a this particular type of teacher and creating an example case of a teacher who works in a mechanical way.

The first description was constructed through the teacher's thoughts and actions and the fact that it involved only the teacher strengthens the impression that this type of teacher leaves the learners unnoticed and outside the whole process. In contrast to the first description, the following account works differently, since the description goes beyond the teacher and includes a description of the effects that a more innovative teacher may have on the learners:

(38)

Tiia: sil ois sellane iso kuva niinku mielessään, jossa johon se ois

miettiny semmosia juttuja et sillon tällön tulis aina joku juttu joka. niinkun. a, ihmiset ois tosi, kiinnostuneet tekee joku vähän niinku tavallaan. sen päivärutiinin ulkopuolelta. ja sit niinku tavallaan, [...]

The speaker makes a demand that teachers should make an effort and think about the choices they make. The speaker accepts the existence of a daily routine but she asks for some variety. This demand is nevertheless put forward in a very reasonable form: extra things need not be part of the daily routine and it is enough that there is something special *sillon tällön* (from time to time). By using two contrasting descriptions the speaker avoids expressing her opinion directly. She is merely describing two different types of teachers and lets the listener make his or her own conclusions.

Like the commercial college students, the university students saw classroom management as one of teachers' tasks but, unlike the commercial college students who argued for reasonable discipline, the university students constructed teachers as authorities who students should obey. The possibility that a teacher could be both demanding and pleasant was considered exceptional, but not impossible. Teachers' actions were also seen to have a decisive influence on students' motivation to learn. The speakers often constructed their claims through contrast structures and thus avoided stating their position directly. This was left for the listener to conclude.

The study will be concluded in the next chapter with an evaluation of the discursive approach and the method, discourse analysis. The final chapter will also summarize and evaluate the findings of the present study and finally, suggestions for further research are made.

## 6 CONCLUSION

The present study has brought forward an alternate paradigm, discursive construction, to the study of student evaluations of teaching. This has meant major theoretical and methodological changes.

Firstly, the present study is anti-cognitivist. While in previous research student evaluations were considered enduring, mental states, the present study took evaluations to be constructed through descriptions and accounts. On the one hand, categorizations and descriptions were taken to construct evaluations of good English teaching and on the other hand, the descriptions themselves were taken to be constructed from words and from a range of discursive resources.

Secondly, it meant that the analytic focus shifted from cognitive entities to discursive practices. The focus of the present study was on students' constructions of good English teaching and on the linguistic resources that were used in those constructions. The scope of analysis was further broadened by looking into the means that the students used in justifying their views and in defending them against possible counterpositions. None of these questions would have made sense if the traditional cognitive account of attitudes had been adopted.

Thirdly, it meant a move away from questionnaires and factor analyses. In the present study the data consisted of records of pair discussions between students instead of data obtained with a questionnaire. Furthermore, discourse analysis gave deeper insights into student evaluations of English teaching than the traditional factor analysis. The findings of the present study supported the constructionist view that evaluations are not stable entities: the aspects of good English teaching were constructed and shaped in the discussions, and one and the same aspect could be categorized using various evaluative points. Evaluations are thus more complicated than choosing between 'good' or 'bad'. The study also provided insights into how students made their constructions solid and factual.

Due to the kinds of theoretical and methodological differences mentioned above, it is very difficult to compare the findings of the present study with those of previous research: the different definitions of the topic of research have resulted in

different analytic foci. While traditional research has mainly been concerned with the validity of student constructions of teaching quality (e.g. Burdsal and Bardo 1986; Feldman 1988; Broder and Dorfman 1994, Ryan and Harrison 1995) or with the validity of student ratings of teaching (e.g. Abrami and Mizener 1985; Tollefson et al. 1989), the present study focused on students' linguistic constructions of good English teaching and on the resources that were drawn on. Accordingly, the findings of traditional research consist mainly of factor solutions of dimensions of teaching quality or of percentual figures explaining factors influencing rating validity, while descriptions of language use constitute the results of the present study. These are findings that cannot be expressed in a simple numerical form. Previous research included also qualitative research (e.g. van Rossum 1985; Cooper and McIntyre 1993) but, although verbal data was used, the focus was not on language itself, but on the underlying perceptions language was thought to reflect.

The findings of the present study are summarized in the next section so that each of the three questions, action orientation, epistemologic orientation, and ironizing discourse are discussed in turn. The findings and methodology are discussed in the second section and finally the study is concluded with suggestions for further research.

### **6.1 Summary of the findings**

The present study was conducted in order to find out what kinds of linguistic means were used in commercial college students' and in university students' evaluative discourse on good English teaching. The analysis focused both on the action orientation and the epistemologic orientation of discourse (Potter 1996). The scope of analysis was further broadened by looking into means of ironizing discourse, i.e. how possible counterpositions were undermined. The four aspects of good English teaching that were chosen for final analysis were learning objectives,

learning materials and their contents, teaching methods and procedures, and teacher's roles and duties.

### **6.1.1 How was good English teaching categorized?**

The first question focused on issues of construction, i.e. on how good English teaching was categorized in the two pair discussions and in what terms it was evaluated in the course of the construction.

The commercial college students evaluated the objectives of good English teaching mainly in terms of precise skills, such as the ability to communicate. In contrast, other objectives like diplomas and grades were categorized in negative terms. The speakers used maximizing in emphasizing the important objectives, while other objectives were not only categorized in negative terms, but also minimized.

Narratives of past experience were used in the university students' discussions as an indirect way of expressing opinions. In these narratives it was the graduation and its external features, graduation roses and the white dress, that made up the objective and their importance was strengthened through maximizing. Even if graduation constituted the objective in the narratives, it was clear that the narratives served to point out that the speakers did not agree with these objectives. However, no explicit suggestions were made as to what the objectives should be. This was left for the listener to conclude.

Both the commercial college students and the university students evaluated textbooks, their contents and use. The commercial college students considered textbooks a necessary part in learning English and their contents were evaluated in terms of the book's ability to imitate and reproduce real language use situations and in terms of how well the book's contents met with the learner's personal likings.

Unlike the commercial college students, the university students were critical of the textbook's dominant role in the classroom. Also tape-recordings were categorized in negative terms and the negative points were further strengthened

through maximizing. The university students made demands for using authentic materials such as radio and television programmes in English teaching.

Neither of the two groups named any teaching methods in their discussions and the focus was on classroom procedures. The procedures were evaluated in the commercial college students' discussions in terms of how well they went together with the learning objective, in this case, learning how to communicate. Another point of evaluation was the procedure's suitability for different kinds of learners, although this was not considered quite as important as compatibility with the objective. The commercial college students had also evaluated grammar exercises and their quality was defined in terms of meaningfulness and creativity.

The university students argued for procedures that took into account the learners' likings and personal preferences. This was also seen as a way to ensure variability in lessons, in contrast to the normal, tedious classroom reality which the speakers constructed through narratives. Traditional teacher-centred teaching was associated with simple and explicit teaching of grammar.

Teachers' roles and duties were briefly discussed by the two pairs and the speakers evaluated teachers' role in good English teaching in quite similar terms. The commercial college students' construction contained two different roles for teachers. The first one was the more traditional role, including duties like classroom management, encouragement, and detecting mistakes. Encouraging was associated with power and responsibility in exercising that power. The second role was in accordance with the learning conception according to which the teacher guides students in learning. However, this role was constructed only as a future possibility, not a present state of affairs.

Also the university students saw it as the teacher's role to run the lessons but they gave teachers more authority than the commercial college students. The speakers also assigned teachers the responsibility for motivating their students in learning English.

### 6.1.2 How were the constructions made reasonable and justifiable?

While there were no major differences between the two pairs in the descriptive and evaluative terms used in constructing aspects of good English teaching, significant differences could be found in the ways in which the speakers had made their accounts seem reasonable and justifiable.

It was typical of the commercial college students to construct their accounts as self-evident facts that usually needed very little if any justification: they were part of common knowledge. In accordance with this feature was the use of constructions of impersonality: the speakers effaced themselves and diverted attention away from themselves when there were issues of stake involved. This was the case, for example, in their constructions of learning objectives (learning to communicate, going abroad and doing business) where the categorization itself revealed the speaker's interest, but impersonality was used to hide it. The use of externalizing devices was strikingly consistent throughout the discussions and other means were rarely used.

In contrast, the university students expressed their views indirectly through narratives and descriptions of past experiences. Another type were descriptions of situations that had not actually taken place but were constructed as possible or hypothetical examples and as such their facticity was very difficult, if not impossible, to judge: the speakers skillfully blurred elements of reality with the imaginary.

The use of narratives and descriptions in itself does not guarantee facticity. One way in which the university students established their entitlement to knowledge and thus the facticity of an account was the use of detail in narratives. For example, anyone who knows that people who feature on the tape-recordings used in English teaching always have *really sterile* accents and speak *terribly slowly* must have experience in listening to tapes like that.

In connection with the narratives the university students often presented themselves as persons who are entitled to knowledge: they had witnessed the situation they were describing. References to other witnesses were also used.



Although the speakers often referred to personal knowledge in order to establish themselves as well-informed witnesses, there were also instances where they explicitly renounced this entitlement to knowledge.

### **6.1.3 How were possible counterpositions undermined?**

There were very few instances in the two discussions where the speakers would have contested and undermined one another's constructions. Furthermore, in most of the instances counterpositions were anticipated and defensive rhetoric was thus inbuilt in the speakers' constructions.

The first instance of ironizing discourse was in the commercial college students' discussions on learning objectives and even here there was no real counterargument but the speaker nevertheless anticipated one. While it was the speaker's opinion that learning oral communication skills is the most important objective, he categorized a possible counterposition in favour of grades and diplomas in negative terms as rubbish.

In another instance where the students were discussing teaching methods one of the commercial college students undermined a counterposition according to which the learning objective is not the only basis for choosing a teaching method, but also learner differences should be taken into account. This counterposition was undermined by belittling the importance of learner differences and by turning the whole issue into something vague and indefinite.

## **6.2 Evaluation of the findings and the method**

The fact that the topic of this study, good English teaching, contains so many aspects, made the analysis difficult. Furthermore, a number of analytic units were available. The two orientations of discourse, action orientation and epistemologic orientation, could have been taken as the starting point in the analysis, but since the functions of the different linguistic means are not clear cut, this choice would have

resulted in repetitions in the analysis, i.e. the same resources and the same themes would have been discussed in connection with both orientations. This would also have meant leaving out the question of ironizing discourse. The fact that the analytic units conform with the themes of the orientative questions was a compromise and as such it is not without flaw. It was very difficult to report the findings on the three questions in a clear and consistent manner as a number of different linguistic means featured in one and the same short passage. In other words, a short passage could contain descriptive terms, maximizations, constructions of impersonality and any number of other resources. Organizing the results along the lines of the three research questions (as was done in the summary in 6.1) could have been possible if the research had focused on a more limited set of linguistic features.

Perhaps more important than how the results are organized is that the findings are supported with a substantial amount of raw data. According to Potter (1998:240), the presentations of material makes it possible for readers to make their own judgements about the data and the analysis. In the present study, attention was paid not only to the amount of data, but also to the fact that, when possible, the examples were presented in a chronological order so that the reader can follow the course of the discussions. Unfortunately, this was not always possible (e.g. the university students' discussion of learning materials) because the attempt to maintain chronological order further complicated the task of organizing the results in as logical a way as possible.

The summary of the findings in the previous section showed that there were no important differences between the two groups concerning the descriptive and evaluative terms that were used in the constructions. One aspect of good English teaching where the terms differed significantly was the learning objectives. The commercial college students argued for oral communication skills, while graduation ceremony and its external features (rose bouquets and white dresses) constituted the objective in the university students' narratives. The commercial college students thus constructed the objective as a skill that they will need in the future when working in international marketing, but the university students made

references mainly to past experience, not to future careers. One of the speakers mentioned a possible career as a teacher, but it was not seen as a certainty. It is possible that since university students do not get a training for a particular profession, the speakers did not categorize the objective in terms of precise skills. The secondary school experience may also have given the university students more 'common ground' for their discussions since, unlike the commercial college students, the university students did not have that common future career that could have served as a starting point for their discussion on learning objectives.

The influence of the orientative questions on the descriptive and evaluative categories should also be considered here. The students were given a set of questions (see Appendix 1) which suggested both aspects of good English teaching and various points on which those aspects could be evaluated.

Where suggestions for evaluative points were made, the students had included some of them in their constructions, but not all of them were used. Furthermore, the suggested points, e.g. grades and diplomas, textbooks and their contents, were completely or partially categorized in negative terms by the two pairs. The points of evaluation that the students added to the constructs on their own initiative were usually the ones they considered important. For example, the university students brought into their discussion the issue of materials being authentic. Where suggestions were not made, the speakers used their own descriptive and evaluative points. Neither of the pairs discussed teaching methods and it is possible that since the orientative questions did not provide the students with suggestions for evaluative points, the question may have been difficult to grasp. The speakers thus probably focused on the more concrete and practical question of classroom procedures.

The use of orientative questions has no doubt influenced the discussions, since most of the suggested aspects of good English teaching were discussed by the pairs and very few themes were added. There was some variation in the descriptive and evaluative terms the students used in constructing these aspects. The orientative questions may thus have outlined the construct 'good English

teaching' but the students nevertheless had a free choice of descriptive and evaluative terms.

The fact that the orientative questions had 'shaped' the students' constructions is not a disadvantage from the researcher's point of view. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987:163) interviewing allows the researcher to ask the subjects the same questions, which makes the initial coding and comparing the results easier. The orientative questions worked in a similar manner but, unlike an interview, the orientative questions gave the students the choice of considering or not considering the themes. Furthermore, it is very likely that the orientative questions addressed issues that the students' would not have even considered evaluating if there had not been questions to give them ideas. As a consequence, there was more data to be analysed.

The data were well suited for this study. As mentioned, the use of orientative questions ensured that the themes discussed by the two pairs were in broad outline the same but since there were 11 orientative questions to begin with, it was surprisingly difficult to find two pair discussions in which all the same themes were considered. The two pairs that were finally chosen for the present study were the best match but even here the question on feedback had to be left out because the university students did not discuss it, although, as Potter (1996:186) points out, the power of a description may also lie in what is *not* described. Nevertheless, it would have been impossible to argue that the university students had meaningfully left out this aspect and identify reasons for ignoring it.

The fact that the third question, the use of ironizing discourse and undermining counterpositions produced very few findings could be considered an indicator that the data were poorly suited for the study or that the results were inconclusive. However, as Potter (1998:238) points out, in discursive research the questions should not be taken as previously formulated or precise hypotheses. Thus the data should not be forced to conform with the questions but instead, the data direct the course of the research and the kind of questions that can be asked. Then, a logical question at this point would be the reasons why ironizing discourse was not used in the two pair discussions.

There are at least three reasons for the absence of ironizing discourse and undermining. Firstly, it is possible that the subjects did not care that deeply and passionately about the issue of good English teaching. Secondly, it is also possible that since the two students who were discussing together represented the same group of people, i.e. commercial college students or university students, there were no conflicting views. Both discussions were carried out in mutual understanding and the interlocutor's views often produced only a short response. The consensus between the speakers may thus have been an expression of solidarity towards a peer and a means of avoiding face-threatening conflict situations. However, based on the length of turns the speakers had during the discussions it seems that in both pairs one of the students had a dominant role. Kai had longer turns in the commercial college students' discussions and Hanna was the dominant speaker in the university students' pair although the difference between Hanna and Tiia was not as clear as the difference between the commercial college students.

The differences between the two pairs in means of justification, i.e. facts and externalizing vs. narratives, are also worth discussing. According to Potter (1996:109), descriptions are usually used to perform actions that are in some way sensitive. Thus, the advantage of using descriptions is that they are indirect and they let the reader or listener make inferences. In the university students' discussions narratives were used, on the one hand, as an indirect way of expressing opinions and, on the other hand, as a subtle way to make critical points. What still remains unclear, however, are the reasons why the university students felt that expressing opinions and criticizing is a sensitive action, while the commercial college students did not. There is not enough knowledge about the context and about the relationships between the participants for this question to be answered.

One possible answer can nevertheless be put forward. According to Hakulinen (1989:54-55), there are certain features that are typical of the language of women. One of these features is called reservations and it refers to the use of phrases that express insecurity and make an appeal to the interlocutor. Expressions like *tiiätkö* (you know) and *emmä sit tiiä* (I don't know) that featured in the

university students' discussions are examples of reservations. Another feature that is typical of women is the use of direct speech in reporting. According to Hakulinen (1989:55) women try to reconstruct dialogues from word-for-word in their narratives and not just summarize the contents. This particular feature was characteristic of the university students' discussions and the results of the present study thus support the existence of a women's genderlect, i.e. a language that is typical of women.

### **6.3 Suggestions for further research**

One of the difficulties in the present study was the number of questions on which the analysis focused. Because discourse analysis is such a labour-intensive method and since there are no ready-made analytic units available (what they will be depends on the data), it would perhaps be wiser for anyone taking up discursive research to limit the number of questions and focus on fewer aspects of discourse.

The use of narratives alone would provide quite enough food for analysis since, although narratives may be part of a larger construct (as in the case of the present study, as parts of the construct of good English teaching and its different aspects), they themselves are constructed. The same topic, good English teaching could be studied through students' narratives of their experience of good English teaching or poor teaching: most people can tell stories of good and bad teaching. The analysis could focus exclusively on the linguistic resources that are used in establishing the facticity of these stories.

Good English teaching could also be studied with data from mixed groups, i.e. students coming from different educational domains. It is possible that there would be more dissenting views and this should also have an influence on the speakers' choice of defensive rhetoric. This kind of setting could also produce more instances of ironizing discourse and undermining.

It was concluded from the findings of the present study that the use of orientative questions had shaped the students' constructions of good English

teaching, but this was not considered a disadvantage. Potter and Wetherell (1987:163) have argued for interviewing since, when the subjects are questioned on the same issues, the initial analysis and comparing the results is easier. It seems however, that interviewing is the more intrusive of the two data collection methods and the analysis could thus focus on the influence the researcher may have on a student's views on teaching.

In conclusion, discursive research can focus on any of the linguistic resources used in constructing evaluative discourse and when means of justification are included, the scope of possible questions is further enlarged. Also, the quality of teaching is just one area of educational research and there is no reason why the discursive approach could not be used more widely in studies on teaching and learning.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Abrami, Philip, C., and Deborah A. Mizener 1985. Student/instructor attitude similarity, student ratings, and course performance, *Journal of Educational Psychology* 77: 6, 693-702.
- Ajzen, Icek. 1988. *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ajzen, Icek, and Martin Fishbein 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Baron, Reuben, M. 1988. An ecological framework for establishing a dual-mode theory of social knowing, in D. Bar-Tal, and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*, Cambridge: University Press, 48-82.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel, and Yoram Bar-Tal 1988. A new perspective for social psychology, in D. Bar-Tal, and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*, Cambridge: University Press, 83-108.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel, and Arnie W. Kruglanski 1988. The social psychology of knowledge: its scope and meaning, in D. Bar-Tal, and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*, Cambridge: University Press, 1-14.
- Benz, Carolyn, R., and Stephen J. Blatt 1996. Meanings underlying student ratings of faculty, *The Review of Higher Education* 19: 4, 411-433.
- Broder, Josef M., and Jeffrey H. Dorfman 1994. Determinants of teaching quality: what's important to students, *Research in Higher Education* 35, 235-249.
- Burdsal, Charles, A., and John W. Bardo 1986. Measuring students' perceptions of teaching: Dimensions of evaluation, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 46, 63-79.
- Cooper, Paul, and Donald McIntyre 1993. Commonality in teachers' and pupils' perceptions of effective classroom learning, *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 63, 381-399.



Deprez, K., and Y. Persoons 1987. Attitude, in U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, and K.L. Matthier (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: an international handbook of the science and of language and society 1*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 125-132.

Dunkin, Michael, J. 1986. Research on teaching in higher education, in Merlin C. Wittrock, (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. 3rd edition. New York: Macmillan, 754-777.

Entwistle, Noel, and Hilary Tait 1990. Approaches to learning, evaluations of teaching, and preferences for contrasting academic environments, *Higher Education* 19, 169-194.

Erickson, Frederick 1986. Qualitative methods in research on teaching, in Merlin C. Wittrock, (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. 3rd edition. New York: Macmillan, 119-161.

Feldman, Kenneth, A. 1988. Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities?, *Research in Higher Education* 28: 4, 291-345.

Fenstermacher, Gary D. 1986. Philosophy of research on teaching: three aspects, in Merlin C. Wittrock, (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. 3rd edition. New York: Macmillan, 37-49.

Gergen, Kenneth J. 1988. Knowledge and social process, in D. Bar-Tal, and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*, Cambridge: University Press, 30-47.

Graumann, Carl F. 1988. From knowledge to cognition, in D. Bar-Tal, and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*, Cambridge: University Press, 15-29.

Guba, Egon G, and Lincoln, Yvonna S. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hakulinen, Auli 1989. Mies, nainen ja kieli, in T. Hoikkala (ed.), *Kieli, kertomus, kulttuuri*, Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 52-70.

Harré, Rom, and Grant Gillet 1994. *The Discursive Mind*. London: Sage.

Harrison, Paul, D., Joseph M. Ryan, and Philip S. Moore 1996. College students' self-insight and common implicit theories in ratings of teaching effectiveness, *Journal of Educational Psychology* 88: 4, 775-782.

Hathaway, Russel S. 1995. Assumptions underlying quantitative and qualitative research: implications for institutional research, *Research in Higher Education* 36, 535-562.

Heikkinen, Annika 1999. A discourse analysis of success and failure in learning English as a foreign language. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.

Hyrkstedt, Irene 1997. "Oma kieli mansikka, muu kieli mustikka": Discourse-analytic study of attitudes towards English in Finland. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.

Jokinen, Arja, Kirsi Juhila and Eero Suoninen 1993. *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jones, John 1989. Students' ratings of teacher personality and teaching competence, *Higher Education* 18, 551-558.

Kalaja, Paula, and Irene Hyrkstedt 1998. Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: a discourse-analytic study, *World Englishes* 17, 345-357.

Kalaja, Paula, and Irene Hyrkstedt 2000. "Heikot sortuu elontielle": asenteista englannin kieleen, in Kalaja, Paula, and Lea Nieminen (eds.), *Kielikoulussa - kieli koulussa*. AFinLAN vuosikirja 2000. Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen julkaisuja no. 58. Jyväskylä: University Press, 369-386.

Kalaja, Paula, and Sirpa Leppänen 1998. Towards discursive social psychology of second language learning: the case of motivation. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 33, 165-180.

Kishor, Nand 1995. The effect of implicit theories on raters' inference in performance judgement: consequences for the validity of student ratings of instruction, *Research in Higher Education* 36, 177-195.

Laki ammatillisesta koulutuksesta 630/1998.

McGuire, William J. 1985. Attitudes and attitude change, in L. Gardener and E. Aronsson (eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* vol 2. 3rd edition. New York: Random House, 233-346.

Marsh, H.W. 1982. SEEQ: a reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students' evaluations of university teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52, 77-95.

Maykut, P., and R. Morehouse 1994. *Beginning qualitative research: a philosophic and practical guide*. London: Falmer Press.

*Oppilaitoksen arvioinnin ja kehittämisen käsikirja*. 1999. Helsinki: Efektia Oy.

Oskamp, Stuart 1991. Attitudes and opinions. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs (N.J.): Prentice Hall.

Perusopetuslaki 628/1998.

Potter, Jonathan 1996. *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.

Potter, Jonathan 1998. Discursive social psychology: from attitudes to evaluative practices, *The European Review of Social Psychology* 9, 233-266.

Potter, Jonathan, and Margaret Wetherell 1987. *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

Prossier, Michael, and Keith Trigwell 1990. Student evaluations of teaching and courses: student study strategies as a criterion of validity, *Higher Education* 20, 135-142.

Rossum, Erik J. van, Rien Deijkers, and Rebecca Hamer 1985. Students' learning conceptions and their interpretation of significant educational concepts, *Higher Education* 14, 617-641.

Ryan, Joseph M., and Paul D. Harrison 1995. The relationship between individual instructional characteristics and the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness across different instructional contexts, *Research in Higher Education* 36, 577-594.

Shotter, John 1993. *Conversational realities: constructing life through language*. London: Sage.

Shulman, Lee S. 1986. Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching, in Merlin C. Wittrock, (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. 3rd edition. New York: Macmillan, 3-36.

Suoninen, Eero 1992. *Perheen kuvakulmat: diskurssianalyysi perheenäidin puheesta*. Tutkimuksia Sarja A, Nro 24. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, sosiologian ja sosiaalipsykologian laitos.

Tollefson, Nona, Ju Shan Chen, and Audrey Kleinsasser 1989. The relationship of students' attitudes about effective teaching to students' ratings of effective teaching, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 49, 529-536.

Zanna and Rempel 1988. A new look at an old concept, in D. Bar-Tal and A.W. Kruglanski (eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*. Cambridge: University Press, 315-334.

**APPENDIX 1. TRANSLATIONS FOR THE ORIENTATIVE QUESTIONS**

*In your opinion, what is good English teaching like?*

**Its objectives?**

(completing a course, grades, diplomas, educating oneself)

**Its contents?**

**Its methods?**

**Its classroom procedures?**

(teacher-centred, learner-centred? Individually, with a partner, in groups?

All together, streamed teaching?)

**Its learning materials?**

(the contents and topics of textbooks, workbooks, grammar, dictionaries, etc.)

**Its work load?**

**Its pace?**

**Its feedback?**

(correcting and pointing out mistakes, positive feedback, encouraging, praising?)

**Who decides on the learning objectives, contents, methods, classroom procedures, materials ?**

**What are the teacher's roles and duties?**

**What are the learner's roles and duties?**

**Other things?**

**APPENDIX 2. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS**

,	a short pause
.	a longer pause
(---)	a long pause
...	unfinished utterance
-	truncated speech
#	unintelligible word/words/longer stretches of speech
(laughter)	transcriber's comments e.g. on laughter or other noises
[...]	a shortened example

### APPENDIX 3. PAIR DISCUSSIONS

Commercial college students

K = Kai

M = Mika

- K no niin millaista on mielestäsi hyvä englanninkielen opetus, ja ensimmäiseksi tavoitteeltaan. no tota niin niin. tavoitteena on se että, tässä nyt on, suluissa määritniinku tämmöset niinku tämmöset oppimäärien suorittaminen arvosanat tutkinnon suorittaminen itsensä kehittäminen, mun mielestä kaikkein tärkeintä tavoite on vaan se että oppii puhumaan ja, uskaltaa puhua, ymmärtää puhumista, ja tulee sujuvaksi sen kielen kanssa mun mielestä tämä, arvosanat ja tän tutkinnon suorittaminen mun mielestä ne on roskaa, kaikkein tärkeintä on se, että sä meet ulkomaille, sä teet bisnestä näitten ihmisten kanssa pystyt puhumaan niitten kans, ja pystyt uskoo käyttää sitä, silloin ei oo väliä onks se numero viitonen vai kymppi, jos sä tuut ymmärretyks ja niin pois päin, koska, mä tiedän ihmisiä millä on huonot numerot, mutt ne uskaltaa käyttää sitä ja niin pois päin, sitten on tämmösiä kympin oppilaita jotka ovat tämmösiä, tota nin, mitkä, mitkä voi just tajuta kaikki kieliovit ynnämuut paremmin kun itse aito amerikkalainen tai jotain, ja mutt silti, ne ei uskalla puhua ja ne piipittää hiljaa tai jotakin, siinä pitää, kaikkein tärkeintä on että sitä uskaltaa käyttää, mun mielestä se on niinku se ykköstavoite tuota nin
- M nii ja siihen päästään nimenomaan sillä että sitä käytetään, jo täällä harjotustilanteissa, ne on niinku käyttökielenä englanti, me saadaan mennä sitten kenelle tahansa puhumaan, joka ymmärtää englantia ja me tullaan ymmärretyks
- K mm, silloin ei oo mitään väliä onko sulla viitonen vai kymppi.
- M nimenomaan
- K lukion päästötodistukses, sitten, seuraava on tota niin, työtavoiltaan, täss on vaihtoehto opettajajohtoisesti oppilasjohtoisesti yksin pareittain ryhmissä kaikki yhdessä, no mun mielestä tota nin kaikkein parasta on sitten kun, just jos #varsinkin tosta puhuin harjotuksii keskusteluja tosta nin, että joko pareittain ryhmissä tai milloin kaikki yhdessä ett ois semmosta yleistä

keskustelua annetaan esimerkiksi aihe, ja porukka keskustelee siitä englanniksi mun mielestä se on kaikkein paras tapa oppii puhumista, tietenkin, kielioppia on ehkä kaikkein parasta opetella yksin mutta, jos aatellaan siis tätä siis kommunikointia niin silloin pitää olla monta ihmistä jonka kanssa voi jutella

M nii joo se on, ihan totta siinä että tota, silloin kun on mahdollisimman paljon ihmisiä, me saadaan mahdollisimman paljon ajatuksia ja kaikki ajatukset kun on eriä, niin me saadaan semmoinen monipuolinen keskustelu aikaseksi mutt sitt toisaalta, ajatellaan koska kaikki ei oo tietysti yhtä, suupalteja, siinä isossa ryhmässä ni sitt ku me, pilkotaan tää iso porukka pienii porukoihin ni sitt me saadaan, kaikki puhumaan

K no joo, (rykäisee) se on semmoinen ehkä, no se ehkä ois se riippuu tietenkin millasta porukka on mutta, joko suuri

M nii

K ryhmä mutt kuitenkin että voi keskustella siinä

M joo, tärkeintähän siinä on se että puhutaan

K joo. tossa on sitten oppiaineistoltaan tossa on oppikirjat työkirjat kielioppi niin pois päin niin, niin niin mun mielestä niin kun oppikirjathan tietenkin pitää olla jonkinlaiset mutt sellaset mielenkiintoiset koska niissä on mun mielestä niin typeriä, juttuja mitä käsitellään usein ett siinä vois olla niinkun semmosta mikä on niinkun mahdollisesti olis, mielenkiintosta mitähän nyt sanos ehdotuksesi, jos mä itte saisin valita minkälaista oppikirjojen mä lukisin nii ne olis hyvinkin käsittelis niinku tällästä tekniikkaa tämmöstä paljon, ja tota nin tällästä mitä haluaisin itte oppia koska mua kiinnostaa tämmöset jutut tuota nin, se on tietenkin vaikea siinä mielessä että tietenkin ku on niin paljon, tota nin erilaisia ihmisiä ett toiset on kiinnostunu toisista asioista ja niin pois päin

M onhan siinä hyvä ottaa tietysti jossain oppikirjassa, niinkun, sellasia asioita mitä kiinnostaa kaikkia, yleisiä asioita. miten mä nyt sanoisin ton oikeestaan järkevästi se on niinku sitä että, mistä ihmiset yleensä puhuu, luonto, ihmiset, politiikka,

K mm



- M politiikka tulee siinä mielessä mukaan ett koska joka maassa on jonkinlaista politiikkaa ja #
- K nii se pitää sanasto pitää osata ja mielipiteet pitää tietää tota nin totta kai
- M mm, nii, tottakai kielioppihan pitää osata mutt se että, mun mielest, niinkun opetuksessa on liikaa, keskitytty kielioppiin, koska se kielioppi, tulee näkyviin kuitenkin kaikissa niissä teksteissä, tottakai kielioppi pitää osata mutt se että
- K joo
- M sitä ei tartte niinku kerrata kielioppimaisena-kielioppi-maisena opetuksena vaan siinä pitää olla sitten,
- K joo
- M esimerkkejä, puhetta ääntä
- K tottakai, nii justii, ja sitten työmäärältään tuota nin, mitäpä nyt tohon sitten sanois. no tottakai töitä pitää tehdä sen eteen että jot-jotakin oppii mutta, mutta pitää tietenkin# ne tehtävät olla, meikkaitä tuota nin, jollai tavalla
- M joo niissä pitää olla luovuutta ei saa olla niinku olla pelkkä lause, jota sä
- K rutiinilla
- M käännät vaan se on se ett sun pitää saada joku, asia sanottua, ja se keino ei oo sillei niinku tärkeä, ett se pitää tietyllä tavalla tehdä vaan sut pitää tulla
- K joo
- M ymmärretyks, aina
- K joo, työmäärä vois antaa #aineestoo esimerkiksi parille, ja sitten niitten pitää, esitellä se jotenkin esimerkiksi tehdä joku referaatti siitä ja mennä porukan eteen ja esittää se ja englantia käyttämällä #...
- M nimenomaan esittäminen on tärkeä
- K tuota nin, että tämmöstä # työmäärähän tottakai, mitä nyt siihen vois sanoa, paljon töitähän pitää tehdä sen eteen mutta pitää olla mielekästä hommaa tota, se on typerä jotenki tämmösiä että on, on esimerkiks joku tehtävä, monta lausetta peräkkäin sitt sun pitää sinne

alla oleville viivoille ite muuntaa se joksikin, muuta nämä lauseet, joku juttuun perfektii tai jotai, se on nii kuivaa, tota nin, silloin tehdä samaa juttua tota nin

- M sen voi tehdä monipuolisemmassa muodossa sillei ett voidaan puhua jostai historiasta ja silloin on käytettävä mennyttä muotoa tietyllä muotoo
- K nii, se on # paljon huomattavasti mielekkäämpää siinä vois käyttää niinku vähä omia aivojansa, esimerkiksi otsikko kerro itsestäsi, nii jotaki että mitä olet tehnyt joskus, joskus tai jotain, tai mitä olisi-, tai jotain tämmöstä, tai mitä on tapahtunu silloin ja silloin, nii sä joudut pakosti käyttää sitä tiettyä aikamuotoa tai oli nyt sitten mikä tahansa tuota nin
- M se on ihan hyvä, siinä on hyvä idea siihen ett mitä vois
- K joo, sitt toss mainitaan semmonen ku etenemistahti (---) mikäs sun mielipitees ois siihen
- M niin, mä ei oikeestaan tiedä, se on aika yksilöllistä tietysti miten pitäs edetä (---) tohon ei oikee voi sanoo semmosta yleispätevää juttuun oikeestaan
- K ei, no mun mielestä mitä nyt, voi sanoo omalta kokemkohdalta ni, mun mielestä etenemisnopeus on ollu hyvännyten, sinänsä kuinka nopeaa on edetty tota ni eteenpäin, että mä en ainakaan itse oo ainakaan henkilökohtasesti missään vaiheessa esimerkiks lukion aikana ni, niin tota nin tuntenu että oltas edetty liian nopeasti tuota nin että
- M joo kyll se pitää paikkansa tietysti, omaa, minun kohdalla oma kiinnostukseni, kieliin on ollu hirveen aktiivista ja mä oon tykänny aina kielistä ni, itseasiassa mä oon,
- K sama juttu mullakin
- M oikeestaan imeny aina kaiken sen tiedon hirveen nopeesti ja mä oon tykänny, käyttää kieltä ja tollel että, mun
- K joo
- M mielestä on edetty ihan hyvää vauhtia ja
- K joo no mullakin mä olin, koska mä värkkäsin tietokoneella paljon, nuorempana ja tota nin, kaikki oli englanniks, ni se oli pakko niinku oppia se kieli nii se oli niinku kiinnostus, oli kiinnostus oppia koska mä halusin o-tietää

ja tajuta mitä ne kaikki, sanat on ja mitä hommat tarkoittaa

M nimenomaan # tietokonehan on, oikeestaan semmonen pakkokeino, hauska pakkokeino oppia englantia koska

K mm

M kaikki siellä, käskyt sun muut ohjelmat on englanniks suurimmaks osaks

K ja tietenkin tietokonehan voi hyvin käyttää tässä, tietokone itseasias, olis hyvä tässä, itse opiskelussa mitenkä opitaan tuota nin, että esimerkiksi, tommoset tietokoneohjelmat tuota niin, ynnämuut niin, esimerkiksi mitkä auttaa oppimiseen niitä on varmasti olemassa jotaki cd-romppuja missä on kielen, tällasia juttuja mitä, mitenkä niinku opitaan ett ne ois varmaa sitte

M #teknistä sanastoo minäkin oon oppinu nimenomaan tietokoneelta

K joo justii, sitten, palautteeltaan, tässä on virheiden osoittaminen korjaaminen kehu-kehuminen kannustaminen, kiittäminen, mun mielestä, kannustus on, niinku kaikessa työssä niin, ihmiset kaipaa kannustusta ja kehua, se oli...

M se on, tietysti se, mikä kannustetaan jos sua kannustetaan siihen oikeellisuuteen ni sulle tulee aika paljon paineita siitä että, meneekö sulla kaikki oikein

K no se ei oo mun mielestä pitäis kannustaa siihen että uskaltaa ilmaista itsensä englanniks tuota nin

M nimenomaan siihen sen pitäis tähtätkin että sua kannustetaan siihen ett sä tosiaan käytät sitä, #...

K eikä  
siihen että, mitä tota nin, onkoo joku, muoto nyt, ett se nyt, jos se on hiukan väärin, tai jos se on oikein nin, mun mielestä ne on niinku vähän irrelevanttia koska esimerkiksi amerikan e-, englantia niin, ku ne puhuu, jenkit puhuu ni niillä nyt ei, sinänsä oikeen oo välttämättä kaikki oikein ett tärkeintähän on siis se että ymmärretään

M nii no kyllähän tietysti, ku me opetellaan kieltä ni pitäähän siinä ne virheet, niinku osottaa ett jos on

- K tottakai
- M virheitä ollu mutta siihen ei saa hirveesti panostaa eikä #...
- K eikä liikaa kiinnittää koska semmonen, niinku esimerkiksi, esimerkki tästä on se että se on, on esimerkiksi keskustelu tilanne puhutaan englanniksi keskustellaan tunnilla, ja tota ni opettaja jatkuvasti esimerkiksi keskeyttää jonkun pienten virheiden vuoksi, niinkun mulla on esimerkki tämmösestä kielten opettajista, ett, tota, että esimerkiksi, se kysyy jotain, ja me, oppilas alkaa sanoo sitä, omaa juttuansa, niin opettaja ei saa missään tapauksessa keskeyttää sitä jonkun pik-pienen typerän virheen takia, vaan pitää antaa sen, oppilaan puhua sen loppuun sen sanansa koska muuten sille tuloo pelko, virheiden pelko, mikä taas johtaa siihen ett se ei uskalla lopuksi sanoa yhtään mitään, tuota nin
- M se keskittyy vaan siihen miten se vääntää, sanansa oikein eikä keskity siihen ulosantiin ollenkaan
- K nii mikä on kaikkein tärkeintä kuitenkin tuota nin
- M tottakai siinä pitää sen jälkeen jos huomataan virhe ni lauseen jälkeen tai asian jälkeen sanoo että...
- K nii sen jälkeen mutta ei saa keskeyttää sitä juttua, tuota ni
- M mm, nii, sanoo vaan että toi, ton oisit sanonu noin ni se ois ollu ihan täysin oikein
- K jees, ja tota nin niin, sitten kuka päättää tavoitteista oppisisällöistä menetelmistä työtavoista oppiaineista-tosta, mun mielestä se vois hyvinkin tehdä interaktiivisesti opiskelijoiden ja tota ni opettajan välillä, ett opettaja voi esimerkiksi kysyä että mitä ne haluaa tuota nin, opiskelijat
- M se on ihan totta, kyll siis tottakai pitäs pystyy, lukiossa on aika pitkälle se, että mennään jonkun kirjan mukaan, tai jotain ja oppilaat sitten niinku vaan kuuntelee, tai, ottaa sen vastaan mitä opettaja käskee, mun mielestä siinä ois paljon enemmän sitä että just niinku, kysyttäs oppilailta mitä he haluavat oppia, tottakai kielioppihan pitää, se kuuluu olennaisena osana mutt sitten se että minkälaisista teksteistä, käydään läpi asioita ja opetellaan niinkun sanastoa sun muuta, lauseen, lauseita, koska, esimerkiks poliittisissa, teksteissä tai, teknisissä

- teksteissä on hirveen pitkiä lauseita jotka tota, on pikkusen erilaisia kun jossain, pikku tekstissä, mitä kirja, kirjoissa on, ni mun mielestä tässä pitäis ottaa sitä
- K mm m
- M monipuolisuutta mukaan
- K joo ehdottomasti, millaisia ovat opettajan tehtävät ja roolit, mun mielestä opettaja on se mikä johtaa sitä tilanne että se, se nyt pitää niinku suurinpiirtein hallinnassa sen tunnin tuota ja, totta kai nyt opettajan tehtävä on kuitenkin, ne virheetkin sieltä seuloa että nee, että sitäkin puolta voidaan parantaa tuota ja kannustaminen on yks että, jos sitä löytyy näitä vähän arempia yksilöitä mitkä eivät niin uskalla tota niin, se pitää kannustaa heitä tota nin, siihen ulosantiin ja, esiintymiskyky ja siihen että se uskaltaa käyttää sitä englantia ja uskaltaa käyttää sitä englantia monenkin ihmisen edessä, ettei tuu mitään semmosta, kenellekkään mitään traumoja, ja jos joku on ei uskalla puhua niin, niin opettajan pitäis huomioida että se niinkus, aiheut-mitään traumajuttuja aiheuta sillai ett se pistää sen heti suoraan sinne eteen ja se joutuu puhumaan ja sitten saa jonkun, paniikki kohtausten siellä ja jotai tämmöistä
- M toi on aika pitkälle totta, mä, mä näkisin ehkä semmosen vision tulevaisuudessa että, jopa lukioasteella ni, opettaja toimis lähinnä tota asiantuntijana, ja, oppiminen ois, lähinnä oppilaiden, välistä, ku oppilaat...
- K kommunikaatiota
- M joo, sitä kommunikaatiota nimenomaan ja sitten tietysti opettaja seuraa mikä on tilanne ett miten se menee, kieliopillisesti ja kaikki muukin sellanen, ett sitten opettaja korjaa niitä virheitä, tarvittaessa mutta se on se että oppilaat, kommunikoi enemmän, ja nimenomaan, puhe on hirveen tärkeä
- K joo, ehdottomasti tuota nin, ja sen vois, esimerkiks semmonen mahdollisuus tuota nin, oppilaat vois esimerkiks yhdessä vois mieltii ett tuota nin että mitä ne haluais, minkälaisia tekstejä ne vois periaatteess, tuota nin, sanotaanko että, sais tosiaankin valita mitä ne haluaa mistä ne, haluaa tehdä, ja, jotenkin siinä on se että, no lukiossa nyt on kuitenkin oppilaita jo, pitkällä, jos yläasteella voitais toteuttaa, yläaste tilanteessa niin opettajalla on pakko olla johto tilanne koska siellä on niitä laiskoja yksilöitä mitkä ei mikään kiinnostakaan,

- M joo se pitää paikkansa
- K mutt lukiossa vois olla enemmän vapaaehtoista että ne sais niinkun, enemmän siirtyis oppilaille se että ne, mitä ne haluaa niinkun oppia, koska must tuntuu että sillon mentäs oikeempaan suuntaan, koska ne vois esimerkiks aatella mitä ne mahdollisesti tulee tulevaisuudessa tarvitsemaan, niin ne vois itte, mieltää, porukassa, mitä he haluaa oppia, mitä tiettyjää osa alueita, ja jos on esimerkiksi kysymys keskustelusta, niin mistä aiheesta ne keskusteloo mistä aiheesta ne haluaa sanastoo ja niin pois päin, ja opettaja toimis siinä sitte semmosena asiantuntijana, ett se auttaa niitä näissä hommeleissa ja, ottaa antaa informaatiota ja niin pois päin
- M mitä sää kari muuten mieltä oot tosta, porukan koosta, minkä kokosen porukan sää haluaisit jos sää lukiossa lähtisit nyt opiskelemaan englantia, minkä kokosen porukan sää haluaisit siihen
- K no se ei saa olla liian suuri koska sillon se muuttuu sellaseks äläkäksi, mun mielestä semmonen, kymmenen ihmistä, tota nin
- M mä ajattelin nimittäin suurinpiirtein samankokosta ryhmää koska, siinä saatas nää ujut ihmiset, ku ajatellaan ett meillä ois kolmenkymmenen hengen porukka
- K joo
- M ni ujo ihminen menee,
- K lukkoon siinä
- M aika helposti lukkoon siinä
- K mutt kymmenen on just siinä rajoilla tuota nin
- M kymmenen on sopivan kokonen porukka me saadaan aina jotai viis paria jotka keskustelee me saadaan, kaikki, siinä ei oo sitä äläkkää vielä koska, opettaja pystyy keskittyä helposti siihen viiteen pariin jos parikeskustelua on,
- K joo
- M tai sitten saadaan kymmenestäkin ihan hyvä, ryhmäkeskustelu
- K joo, ja vois esimerkiksi tämmönen, jos aatellaan jotain keskustelujuttua ni annetaan aiheet joka ryhmälle tota

nin ja sitten, ne keskustelelee aiheesta, yks toimii, esimerkiks voi toimi-vois olla ikään kun kokous vois samalla harjotella tätä kokous juttua että yks niistä on, valitaan aina puheenjohtajaks ja aina eri henkilö, yks on sihteerinä, mikä kirjottaa ylös nää jutut ja lopuksi, valitut, esimerkiks kaks henkeä, esittää tän homman tuota nin

M nii ett mitä ollaan saatu aikaseks täällä mejän

K mitä on...

M keskustelussa

K mitä on, mitä ne on saanu aikaan siellä tuota nin, tai tämmöstä, ett mun mielestä tämmönen ois koska se tois sitä just keskustelu juttua se antas pohjaa esimerkiks esiintymistaidolle että muille tuota samaan aikaan

M toi oli aika hyvä kyllä, siinä on hyvä idea siihen mitä vois, käyttää tota, ihan englannin opiskelussa

K joo, se huomattavasti tekis sitä mielenkiintoseks koska ne sais valita, juttui

University students

H = Hanna

T = Tiia

T #, millaista on mielestäsi hyvä englannin kielen opetus

H no nyt päästiin. am mm (---) no no, se riippuu siis, just niinku sanottiin niin kyllä mun täy-, mielestä sillä, opettajalla täytys olla ne ohjat käsissään, ja se täytys olla tietty semmonen niinku. että kun se sanoo että tämä tehdään. niin ne oppilaat ei niinku oo vaan sillei että

T mm

H no ei herran j-, vaan siis että se tehdään kans. ja et-.

T mm

H että tietty (naurahdus) vaikka...

mistä me puhuttiin. a, tai mistä (naurahtaen) minä puhuin, niin noista opettajista nii että, tietenki sillei

T (hymähdys)

H tota. a niinku täällä mun mielestä on enemmän, semmonen. että ne on (---) ei oo semmosta että, pelkää minua, niinku siis, semmone asenne että pitäs niitä opettajia

T mm

H sillein mm mut se on ehkä ku, kumminki ollaan aikuisia täällä kaikki mut tolei niinku, ku kumminki jossaki,

T nii

H vielä lukiossaki. sitä jotenki, ku siellä ei pysty valitsemaan sitä, sillä tavalla että jos, ei kiitos. niin

T ei kiitos

H ni. ei pysty sillei valitsemaan niinku että, haluanko mä ottaa englantia vai ei, ni se jossaki mielessä vieläki se

T mm

H on, pakollista. vaikka voihan sen lopettaa koko lukion

T mm



- H millon tahansa mutta ku sitä ei voi sitä yhtä englantia
- T (naurahdus)
- H lopettaa siinä nii, sitä niinku. niillä on sitte monilla
- T nii joo
- H semmone justtiisa että n- e- ne mahollisimman vähällä työllä haluaa päästä siitä. niin ni, et jos se opettaja
- T mm
- H rupeis siellä sitte niitten kanssa kaveeraamaan. ni ei
- T mm
- H siitä tuu mitään mut emmä nyt tarkota välttämättä semmosta hirveetä, niinku. tyrannia että joka siellä ää
- T mm mm
- H mutta. kumminki, mä en tiiä miten tota. mä oon miettiny
- T (naurua)
- H tässä että lukiossa niinku, meil oli hirveen mukava. meil oli kaks englannin opettajaa ku oli jaettu luokka ja mul oli tietenki se va-, semmone vanha käppärä ja, ja se toinen jotenki se aina tuntu hirveen mukavalta (naurahdus) #, mutta tota, (naurahtaen) mitä täällä on.
- T ei  
mitään, #
- H #, a, niin ni mun mielestä se ei ollu. se, sillä oli sillä naisella kumminki sillein et se niinku piti semmosen että, että läksyt tehään. siis se toinen. mut se
- T mm
- H oli kumminki hirveen jotenki mukavanolonen, semmone et mä
- T joo
- H en tiiä miten se sitte teki (naurahtaen) sen. meil oli
- T joo

- H enemmän semmone opettaja sitte niinku että. että istukaa  
 alas. että, en tiä mut tota. niin ni, a opetus taas
- T joo
- H opettajista vaan puhutaan niin tota, et semmone tietty,  
 tiukka linja siinä ja, mun mielestä. jos musta tulis  
 englannin kielen opettaja. (hymähdys) god help them, niin
- T (naurua)
- H ni. mää siis, mää pistäsin ne kyllä puhumaan siellä, mää
- T joo
- H pistäsin ne lukemaan kirjoja. mää pistäsin (---) mutta,
- T mm
- H tuoki on oikestaan väärin että, mää tuputtasin omia  
 mielenkiintojani niille, e-
- T nii mut koittas tehdä siitä sellai  
 niinkun, a et se ois, useamman saatavilla, ettei vaan  
 niinkun ne jotka on kiinnostunu ja jotka on muutenki  
 (hymähtäen) hikipinkoja siellä. et niinkun, ottas uusia
- H nii
- T näkökulmia siihen, opetukseen. et sillä olis semmonen, se  
 ois tosiaan tehny töitä ettei vaan sillei että, et okei  
 et nää asiat mun täytyy opettaa otetaas täst nää op-  
 oppikirjat ne on kivat ja sit käyvään nää läpi, vaan et
- H mm
- T sil ois sellane iso kuva niinku mielessään, jossa johon  
 se ois miettiny semmosia juttuja et sillon tällön tulis  
 aina joku juttu joka. niinkun. a, ihmiset ois tosi,  
 kiinnostuneet tekee joku vähän niinku tavallaan. sen  
 päivärutiinin ulkopuolelta. ja sit niinku tavallaan, emmä
- H nii
- T tiedä tulisko siit semmone että hei että, onkohan meillä  
 taas jotain kivaa, semmonen fiilis. mut sillei et siit
- H nii
- T ois vähän niinku, jos joku tykkää, vaikka et just

puhutaan, ni olis sitä ja sit toinen tykkää taas, vaikka lukea tai, tehä jotain mu- muun tyylistä et ne työtävät ois vähän erilaiset et ei se oo aina sitä samaa että, seuraavat kaksi lausetta ja seuraavat kaksi lausetta ja, kyllä ne aika äkkiä niinku mun mielestä ne opitaan yläasteella, niinku esimerkiks (hymähtäen) aikamuodot, ja muut, joita niinku jankataan ja jankataan kyllä ne on

H joo

T aika hyvin niinku hollilla että. emmä sit tiä että osaanks mä just sen takia ne, niin hyvin, että niitä on koko ajan niinku, jankattu. mut on sitä niinku paljon

H nii

T muutaki mitä vois opetella että

H jotenki tuntuu että sellanenk, luulis et tommone. nyt ku alkaa mieltii ni miksei niinku ikinä kukaan opettaja esimerkiks sanonu että, tylsä kappale tässä, että hei

T mm, nii

H että mä monistin teille tällasen että, musta ainaki

T joo

H tuntuu että, jos musta vaikka tulis opettaja ni. tai

T mm

H vaikkei tuliskaan niin kyllä mää uskon että mää, varmaan tuun tilaileen ja osteleen kaikkia englanninkielisiä

T mm

H lehtiä ja tälle ni enkö mä voi sieltä vaikka niinku,

T mm nii

H monistaa jonku mukavan jutun että joo että, että käykääpä

T just nii

H tätä läpi tai jotaki tai...

T ja ite tehä sanasto sinne alle. ku

H nii

- T ne oli siis mä muistan just oli tosi typerää, lukiossa vielä niinku, muut niinku, meil oli tyttöluokka, ni siellä niinku monet huus että, aina jonku sanakokeen jälkeen että, ei tää sana ollu täs kappaleessa (hymähtäen) tai jotain, et se on niin semmosta niin sellasta sektori, niinku ajattelua, et ei mun tarvi tätä
- H nii
- T nyt osata tällä viikolla. niinku sellasta älytöntä että
- H nii
- T eiks se vois niinku vähän laajentua siitä ja. ei sillä lailla et se, tulis sit hirveesti työtä että just ne jotka haluu vaan tehdä sen pienimmän tavallaan jotenki päästä, ni ettei niille tulis sit semmone olo et tää on ihan hirveetä et näin paljo vielä, vaan et se ois niinku monipuolisempi ja
- H mm  
ja vaikka silleinki tuntuu että miksei oo. ikinä kukaan voinu vaikka, nauhottaa jostaki, vaikka filmnetiltä ottaa jonkun missä ei oo tekstitystä tai jotain tämmöstä tai
- T mm
- H tilata usasta. ja, niinku kääntää sitte (---)
- T mm
- H eurooppalaiselle videolle tai jotain niinku semmone joku
- T mm
- H leffa vaikka ja näyttää sitä sillei et siinä ei oo
- T mm
- H tekstitystä että, kyllä siinä, niinku ihmiset kummasti...
- T ja sit pitäs  
tehä joku ju- juttu sitte, tavallaan
- H nii, tai sillei että, kyllähän ne. ihmisillä on vaan semmone mielikuva et emmää käsitä jos se otetaan pois,
- T mm

- H mut sitä kummasti y- ku, on pakko ja sitä huomaa
- T mm mm
- H ihmisten, ilmeestä niinku, niitten näyttelijöitten
- T nii joo
- H ilmeestä että no, whats going on ja tällei, mut...
- T hei mulle  
tuli mieleen seki että ku, mää en muista hirveesti noist  
kieli studiojutuista ja noista mut eiks siel oo aina joku  
sellane tosi steriili bi- brittiaksentti, niillä,  
ihmisillä ja sit ne, l- luki hirveen hitaasti ja  
(naurahtaen) tällei, mikä niinkun on oikein sellast
- H nii
- T studio niinkun. tai niinkun laboratorio. ympäristössä
- H nii
- T ettei sillei kukaan toimi, ei kukaan puhu niin hitaasti  
eikä semmosella aksentilla et vois olla jotain eri  
murteita ja
- H nii, jotenki vaan tuntuu että, niinku maailma on täynnä  
kaikkea, sää voisit vaikka. bbcltä ni nauhottaa jonku,
- T mm
- H oikeen radio-ohjelman vaikka ja kuunteluttaa niillä ja
- T mm nii joo nii
- H kaikkea mahdollista mut ku, ne vaan niinku niitä kirjoja  
sillei että kuka, kirjantekijä tulee niinku sinne  
poliisin kanssa että et käynyt, näitä kahta kappaletta
- T (hymähdys)
- H läpi siis sillei että
- T nii ja mitä siit kukaan menettää että
- H nii, ja kielioppi jotenki. mä en tiedä miten sen nyt  
sais. paremmin, opetettua must tuntuu et melkein (---) ja  
se pitäs löytää jotenki. selittää, silleen  
yksinkertaisesti ja sanoo että okei, nyt käsi ylös joka ei

ymmärtäny tätä ja sitte mahdollisesti selittää niinku.

- T mm
- H käydä läpi lisää sitä tai jotain. että ku se oli melkein
- T joo
- H aina ainaki mulla semmosta että jotta. opettaja luki ja laitto kalvon. luki et täs on säännöt. täs on kakstuhatta
- T mm
- H poikkeusta. että näin, ja koe on huomenna
- T (hymähdys) joo, ja sitte, lukios sanotaan että ja nämä on knoppeja nämä tulee aina ylioppilaskirjotuksissa, ja sitte sen jälkeen sun ei
- H nii
- T tarvi niinku mitää enää muistaa
- H nii. se oli tiiätkö, mun mielestä lukiossa just sitä puhuttiin kavereitten kanssa et ku, si- kaikki, tähtäs siinä koulussa, ylioppilaskirjotuksiin aivan
- T nii just joo
- H niinku elämää ei ois sen jälkeen
- T joo  
meilläki oli yks ruotsin opettaja joka joka tunti se alotti sillä että, kai se oli jollain lailla motivoimassa mut mua ainaki se ahdisti että. kyllä se on niin ihanaa minä muistan vieläkin sen päivän kun minä ne ylioppilasruusut (naurua) sain. ja sitte taas että
- H (hymähdys)
- T riveissä, viis jokaiselle, ja sit siinä vaan niinku tuhras niitä omia läksyjä että onko tää nyt oikein, ja sit oli oikein niinku mahdollista että ää mä en saa ikinä niitä ylioppilasruusuja ja se oli niinku se, se niinku se
- H (naurahdus)
- T pääasia siinä. et se opettajaki teki siit semmosen ihan,
- H nii

- T tyttömäisen naisellisen ja semmosen ihanan et kaikki saa sen valkosen puvun ja, sitten ne ruusut nii joku meidän
- H nii
- T luokkal sano kaikki et pitää olla valkone puku. ni
- H (naurahdus)
- T sellane ilmapiiri kyllä ahistaa sitte et mitäs varte mää
- H mm
- T oikeen näitä opiskelen
- H se, se oli jotenki, justiisa mun mielestä kielissä siitä puhuttiin mutta sehän on että kielistähän yleensä reputetaan eniten, niin niin, jotenki kielten opettajat
- T joo
- H nii siitä niinku puhuttiin hirveesti ja jotenki se vaan tuntu että. ei ees puhuttu jatko-opinnoista niin paljon
- T mm
- H ku se oli vaan ne ylioppilaskirjotukset ja sitte
- T mm
- onkohan niillä joku semmone että, se on tavallaan ne tuntee ittesä huonoks jos moni reputtaa niiden kielestä
- H no onhan se s- nyt sillei että jos perkele (naurahdus) sä
- T (hymähdys)
- H opetat hyvin anteeks, niin ni jos sä opetat hyvin ja sä,
- T a
- H kaikki ymmärtää asian, niin kyllähän niitten pitäs sitte
- T nii
- H päästä läpi ellei ne oo aivan tyhmiä ja ne niinku siellä,
- T mm
- H syö vaan kynsiä. mut tota, mennäänkö eteenpäin,

#### APPENDIX 4. TRANSLATIONS FOR THE EXAMPLES

(1)

Kai: [...] I think the most important the objective is that one just learns to speak and, one has the courage to speak, one understands speech, and becomes fluent in that language [...]

(2)

Kai: [...] the most important thing is that, you go abroad, you make business with these people you are able to talk with them, and you can believe use it [...]

(3)

Kai: [...] I think the most important the objective is that one just learns to speak [...]

(4)

Kai: [...] I think that this, grades and getting this diploma I think they're rubbish [...]

(5)

Kai: [...] it doesn't matter if the grade is a D or an A, if you make yourself understood and so forth, because, I know people who have poor grades, but they have the courage to use it and so on, then there are these students who get A's who are like these, like, who who can understand grammar and other stuff better than a native american himself or something, and but still, they don't have the courage to speak and they mumble quietly or something, one has to, the most important thing is that one has the courage to use it, I think that's like the number one objective [...]

(6)

Hanna: yeah. it was you know, in secondary school I think it was we talked about it with the friends that, everything, aimed at that school, at the matriculation exam as if

Tiia: right yeah

Hanna: as if there was no life after that

(7)

Tiia: [...] and then it was really like possible that nah I'll never



- get those graduation roses and that was like the, the like the  
 Hanna: (laugh)  
 Tiia: main thing in it. so that even the teacher made it something quite,  
 Hanna: yea  
 Tiia: girlish feminine and kind of wonderful that everyone will get that  
 white dress and, then the roses so [...]  
 Tiia: an atmosphere like that is distressing then like what is the reason  
 Hanna: hmm  
 Tiia: I'm actually studying for
- (8)
- Tiia: [...] we also had this one Swedish teacher who who every lesson  
 she started with the [...] it is so wonderful I still remember the day  
 when I got those (laughs) graduation roses. and then again like  
 Hanna: (makes an ironic hum)  
 Tiia: in lines, five for each, and then you just like slogged at your own  
 homework like is this correct now, and then it was really like  
 possible that nah I'll never get those graduation roses [...]
- (9)
- Hanna: yes. it was you know, in secondary school I think it was  
 we talked about it with the friends that, everything, aimed at that  
 school, at the matriculation exam
- (10)
- Kai: [...] so, so so I think that of course one has to have textbooks  
 of some kind but somehow interesting ones because I think  
 there are such stupid, stuff that is often dealt with that  
 there could be like something that is like possibly  
 could be, interesting what could I say as a proposition, [...]
- (11)
- Kai: [...] if I could choose myself the kinds of textbooks I'd  
 read then they would be could very well deal with like  
 technology and like a lot, and so the kinds of things I  
 would want to learn myself because I'm interested in stuff  
 like this so, of course it is difficult in that sense that of course  
 when there are so many, like different kinds of people that  
 some are interested in certain things and so forth
- (12)
- Mika: of course it is good to take in some textbook, like,  
 the kinds of things that interest everybody, general things. now  
 how would I say that in a rational way it's like, what people  
 discuss in general, nature, people, politics



(19)

Kai: [...] well I think like the best thing is when, particularly if # that's just what I was talking about exercises discussions about, that either with a partner in groups or when everybody together that there'd be sort of general conversation they give you for example a topic, and the group will discuss it in English I think that is the best way to learn speaking, of course, grammar is perhaps best learnt alone but, so if you think about this communication then you have to have many people to talk with

(20)

Kai: [...] I think that is the best way to learn speaking, of course, grammar is perhaps best learnt alone but, so if you think about this communication then you have to have many people to talk with

(21)

Mika: yeah it's, quite true in that, when there's as many people as possible, we get as many ideas as possible and when all the ideas are different, so we can achieve a versatile discussion but then on the other hand, let's think that because not everyone is of course equally, chatty, in that big group so once we, split this big group into small groups so then we get, everyone to talk

(22)

Kai: yeah well, (coughs) it's like maybe, well maybe it would be it depends of course on the group but, either a big

Mika: yeah

Kai: group but anyway that one can discuss in it

Mika: yeah

the most important thing is that there is talk

(23)

Mika: hmm yeah, of course grammar has to be known but the thing that, I think that, like in teaching there's been too much, focus on grammar, [...]

(24)

Mika: [...] there's been too much, focus on grammar, because the grammar it is visible in all the texts anyway, of course one has to know the grammar but the thing that

Kai: yeah

Mika: it doesn't need to be revised like in grammatical-gram-mati-cal teaching but then there has to be,

Kai: yeah

Mika: examples, talk noise

(25)

Kai: [...] of course # the exercises need to be, meaningful like, in some way

Mika: yeah there needs to be creativity it mustn't be like just a sentence, that you

Kai: with routine

Mika: translate but the thing is that you need to get a certain, thing said, and the means is not sort of like important, that it has to be done in a certain way but you need to be

Kai: yeah

Mika: understood, always

(26)

Tiia: it would be a bit like, if someone likes, for example that there's talking, so there would be that and then again another one likes to, for example read or, do in some other way that the rocedures would be a bit different that it's not always the same [...]

(27)

Tiia: [...] that it's not always the same that, the next two sentences and the next two sentences and, I think that in junior high school one learns pretty quickly like, like for example (makes an ironic hum) tenses, and other things, that are like harped and harped on [...]

(28)

Tiia: [...] that it's not always the same that, the next two sentences and the next two sentences and, I think that in junior high school one learns pretty quickly like, like for example (makes an ironic hum) tenses, and other things, that are like harped and harped on they're

Hanna: yeah

Tiia: pretty well like in command that. I don't know then if its just because of that that I know them, so well, that they're been like, harped on, all the time [...]

(29)

Hanna: yeah, and the grammar, somehow. I don't know how it could be.

taught, better I feel that it almost (---) and it should be found somehow. explain, kind of simply and say that okey, now put your hand up those of you who didn't understand this and then possibly explain like

Tiia: hmm  
 Hanna: go it through some more or something. [...]

(30)

Hanna: go it through some more or something. since it was almost like  
 Tiia: yeah  
 Hanna: at least I had it like . the teacher read and showed a transparency.  
 read like here's the rules. there are two thousand  
 Tiia: hmm  
 Hanna: exceptions to it. that was that, and the exam is tomorrow

(31)

Kai: yeah, absolutely, what are teacher's roles and duties like, I think the teacher is the one who manages the situation that she, she keeps the lesson like more or less in control and, of course it is still the teacher's task to pick up the mistakes as well that the, that that side can be improved as well and encouraging is one [...]

(32)

Kai: [...] and encouraging is one that, if there are these more shy people who don't have the courage to, she needs to encourage them to, the delivery and, ability to appear in public and that he has the courage to use that English and use it in front of many people as well, that there won't be anything like, to anyone any traumata, and if someone is doesn't have the courage to speak so, so the teacher should take it into account so that she doesn't like cau-cause any traumatic things like by making him go straight there to the front and he has to speak and then he falls down in some, panic fit and something like this

(33)

Mika: [...] I, I would see perhaps the kind of vision in the future that even in the secondary school level, the teacher would act above all as an expert, and, learning would be, mainly between students, when the students...  
 Kai: communication  
 Mika: yeah, precisely that communication and then of course the teacher follows what is the situation that how things are getting along, [...]

(34)

Hanna: well now we're getting. am mm (---) well well, it depends like, as was said so I mus- think the, teacher should hold the reins, and she should be like a certain. that when she says that this will be done. so the students won't be like

Tiia: hmmm

Hanna: no way, but it will be done

(35)

Hanna: [...], that if the teacher

Tiia: mm

Hanna: would then start to chum up with them there. so it

Tiia: mm

Hanna: so it doesn't work out but now I don't necessarily mean the kind of terrible, like. a tyrant there that who aa

Tiia: mm mm

Hanna: but. anyway, [...]

(36)

Hanna: [...] she had this woman nevertheless sort of that she like kept the kind that, that homework is done. the other one I mean. but she

Tiia: mm

Hanna: seemed nevertheless terribly nice, the kind that I

Tiia: yeah

Hanna: don't know how she then did (laughing) it. [...]

(37)

Tiia: [...] like, she would take new

Hanna: yeah

Tiia: perspectives in, teaching. that she would have the kind of , she would have really worked instead of just like, like okay like these are the things I have to teach let's take these textbooks here they're nice and then let's go these through, [...]

(38)

Tiia: she would like have this big picture in mind, where where she would have thought about the kinds of things that from time to time there would always be some thing which. like. a, people would be really, interested in doing some a little bit like sort of. outside the daily routine. and then like in a way, [...]