Patterns and features of Seminar-like Classroom Discussion:
A Case Study in Thailand

Wenwen Tian[1], Adisa Teo[2] and Monta Chatupote[3]

Abstract

Adopting a sociocultural perspective, this exploratory case study aimed to explore how the learner-led seminar-like classroom discussion (SCD) created learning opportunities for a group of graduate students (GSs) through collaborative interaction in a Thai academic setting. Data were collected through video-taping. A 4-minute-50-second SCD data were selected from a 4-hour data base. An interpretative discourse analysis approach was employed for data analysis. It revealed one main pattern of organization: I-R-F/I(n)–R(n), which enabled ideas to emerge and be negotiated in interaction. This pattern shows GSs jointly organizing and constructing classroom discourse. Meanwhile, unique features of SCD were identified. To illustrate this complex pattern, sample interactions are presented. SCD provides GSs with opportunities to observe and learn through constant meaning negotiation and knowledge building in dynamic interaction. It is implied that this particular kind of meaning-negotiation discussion is facilitative in enabling students to develop their own ideas in discussion. It is suggested that this more complex pattern of meaning-negotiation and co-constructing discourse would be useful to complement conventional language classroom discourse.

[1] Student's the Ph.D. in Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology, Thailand.

[2] Associate Professor, Ph.D, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Thailand.

[3] Associate Professor, Ph.D, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Thailand.

Key words: sociocultural theory, seminar-like classroom discussion, interpretative discourse analysis,

Introduction

The traditional concept that students are receivers of knowledge from instructors has been replaced by a belief that learners should be actively involved in collaborative problem-solving groups in academic learning activities (Wilson. 1989, cited in Basturkmen. 1999; Innes. 2007). Globally, since the contemporary language teaching is becoming increasingly communicative and participatory (Morita. 2000, 2004), the learner's ability to actively and critically participate in academic classroom activities has become a must and a common course objective (Ernst. 1994; Basturkmen. 2002). Although an increasing body of studies has been done on teacher-led classroom spoken discourse, little attention has been drawn to investigate how the learner-led classroom discourse is constructed. From Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective, this paper explores a learner-led seminar-like classroom discussion (hereafter SCD) at graduate level in a Thai academic context. In addition, the value of collaborative interaction for learning opportunities is discussed in terms of dynamic interaction in classroom discourse (Dsnato. 2000; Walsh. 2006).

Research Purposes

The study reported in this paper aimed to invest age patterns and features in SCD and examine how seminar discourse creates learning opportunities for GSs.

Theoretical Background

Patterns of Classroom Discourse

The most common pattern of classroom discourse proposed in literature is a three-part exchange structure, IRF (initiation, response, feedback), as seen below.

Teacher: Where does he live?	**Initiation** (elicit)
Student: Rome	**Response** (reply)
Teacher: Rome, yes.	**Feedback** (evaluation)

(Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992, p. 33)

It is arguable that this triadic structure encourages "illusory participation"—that is, participation that is "high on quantity, low on quality"—because "it gives the teacher almost total control of classroom dialogue and social interaction" (Lemke, 1990, p. 168). However, Nassaji and Wells (2000) found that, even within inquiry-style instruction, triadic dialogue was the dominant structure and, therefore, important to take into account when examining classroom discourse. Basturkmen (2002) identified two main patterns of academic seminar discourse organization in a UK university setting: a simple traditional IRF exchange and a complex IR(F/IR)n(F), where n indicates that the inserted sequence, F/IR, can re-occur any number of times in an exchange. These findings offered one means to analyse and thus evaluate interaction in academic classroom discussion.

Conceptualizing of 'Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory' and 'Learning Opportunity' in SCD

From sociocultural viewpoint, Walsh (2006) illustrates features, approaches, frameworks and learning opportunities through investigating classroom discourse. A common theme in these researches is that competence is co-constructed by the participants through moment-by-moment talk in interaction rather than

being fixed and static. Social constructivism, claiming that higher level of cognitive abilities derive from social interaction, provides a meaningful framework for analysis and discussion of discourse as a mediating tool in the learning-teaching process. Verbal and non-verbal exchanges between more mature and less mature participants may mediate processes from thought to word and from word to thought that allow learners to move beyond their existing level to higher one of their knowledge or skill basis (Vygotsky. 1986, 2002). Vygotskian sociocultural theory attaches great importance to social interaction in learning (Vygotsky. 1978, cited in Lantolf. 2000; Kinginger. 2002). According to Starr (2000), Vygotsky's concept of learning through social interaction is based on 'Socially Mediated Dialogical Learning'. The purpose of dialogical exchange is to provide the learner with enough guidance and support to accomplish learning goals that are impossible without assistance. Under sociocultural theories of learning, dialogue is crucial to mediate learners to sort out their thoughts along talking process (Bruner. 1990, cited in Walsh. 2006) and thereby acquire new knowledge (Ahmed, 1994). Walsh (2006) demonstrates the relevance of Vygotskian sociocultural theory of learning and scaffolding. He recognizes that the value of scaffolding in contexts where learners may have a chance to express themselves and defend their ideas. He points out those conversations in which human beings coming together to talk and listen provide learning opportunities since meanings are negotiated; concepts are explained and understood, opinions are given. Nussbaum et al. (2009) confirms that being engaged in a reciprocal talk of exploring each other's reasoning and viewpoints helps to foster learners' metacognitive awareness. This reciprocal process requires learners to propose and defend their own ideas, and to clarify and justify any ideas they proposed. This kind of reasoned talk where ideas are compared with those of another person in order to co-construct understanding is more complex than simply reaching consensus on an agreed answer and thus may contribute to learners' thinking and communication development.

In this study, **seminar-like classroom discussion (hereafter, SCD),** is conceptualized as a language-mediated interaction among GSs and their lecturers for developing GSs' thinking and communicative abilities.

Participants' Background Information and the Data

The research setting was an MA seminar class in an international program at a Thai university. The participants involved in this study were 11 graduate students (henceforth GSs) (9 Thais, 1 British and 1 Chinese) and 3 Thai teachers. Pseudonyms like GS1, GS2 and T1 were adopted to refer to the participants. The seminar session was launched by Teacher 1(T1) under the topic of *'Problems and Issues in Self-access Language Teaching and Learning'* in the academic year of 2006-2007. Many subtopics were laid for GSs to choose to conduct a case study within three weeks and then present it in the seminar to collect comments and suggestions from their teachers and peers for their final report writing. GSs' oral presentations in the seminar served as input for the follow-up discussion which was the focus of interest in this paper. On the whole, the naturally occurring SCD was treated by the lecturers as a teaching and learning session. The goal of the seminar was to foster the GSs' understanding of the topic as well as their ability to participate actively and critically in academic discussion. The whole seminar session which lasted for 3 hours and 50 minutes was audio/video-recorded. The selected SCD lasted for 4 minutes and 50 seconds with GS5 as the presenter.

In the selected SCD, since the teachers took a back seat as participants, GS5, the presenter and discussion leader as well as the rest of GSs may have to manage the discussion flow largely in SCD, discussion between the teachers and GSs may provide semiotic mediation opportunities that may promote meaning-making, which may lead to some unique patterns and features of SCD discourse. In the following sections, this theoretical framework will be

exploited to unfold a picture of naturally occurring SCD in a Thai academic MA classroom setting.

Data Analysis

The accuracy of the transcripts used was verified by the GSs and cross-checked by the researcher's supervisory team. The selected data used in this paper were fully transcribed (See Appendix A) and an 85-line transcript was generated for scrutiny (See Appendix B). Patterns of exchanges were identified in the transcripts following the approach to analysis of interaction of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992). An interpretative discourse analysis approach was adopted to look for features of SCD line by line.

Findings

Patterns of SCD

The first pattern observed in the data was a complex exchange sequence, namely, I (Initiation)-R (Response)-Follow-up as initiation (F/I R)n. Example 1 depicts the construction of this pattern.

Example 1

Initiation

*GS5: That's all for my presentation. Now(.)time for your(.)

Ideas**((Palm-up gesturing to whole class))** <u>Who</u> and

<u>what</u> can support students to be good learners?   You can

share your ideas with(.)with each question?

Response

GS11: May I ask you a question?=

Follow-up as initiation

*GS5: Yes, please.

Follow-up as initiation

GS11: Do you think the teacher (.) teachers still play an
      IMPORTANT role in self-access centre to help
      students to become more autonomous?

Response

*GS5: Er, ask for my (.) for my (.) for my opinion (2),
      I think the teacher is important to be a guide

Follow-up as initiation

GS11: = ↑ Guide?

Response

*GS5: =A guide:: to(.) ahhh(.) to tell the students to know(.)
      to go to the right way to Er(.)to the right place. But
      every thing must depend (.)must depend on the
      learners(.) they don't be followers So (1) in
      conclusion, I think the learners are very important.

Response

GS11: It's very difficult to balance the degree how to
      guide. If you guide more, that means you tend to
      control your students?=

      It occurred commonly and typically when an interlocutor expressed different ideas with the previous response given to a query or comment and the exchange is extended for more opinions coming up without feedback or evaluation since the lecturers announced that there no black-and white answers for the discussed topics. This pattern was less well-known in language teaching circles. It is illustrated in Example GS5's asked for the audience's suggests after she finished her presentation. This pattern can be summarized as: Initiation-Response-Follow-up as initiation (n)-Response(n) (I-R-(F/I)(n)-(R)(n). This means that there is an initiation, a response, a follow-up to that response which serves to drive the exchange further rather than terminate it.

The organization of SCD talk neither concords with the traditional classroom format (IRE/IRF), nor fits into I R (F/I R)n (F) pattern (Sinclair & Coulthard. 1975; van Lier. 1988, cited in Markee. 2005, Basturkmen. 2002). This finding suggests that SCD provides GSs a learner-oriented and learner-managed academic forum to share their ideas actively. It can be interpreted that this type of pattern of sequential organisation enabled ideas to emerge in discussion and be jointly constructed and modified.

Features of SCD

For an immediate bird's eye view of and a detailed look at the SCD transcript, the identified features are presented and interpreted in the following parts.

A. Management of the SCD Floor

First, an overall interpretation of the SCD tells that GSs are mainly and collaboratively responsible for managing the discussion floor with the teacher taking the double role of participant and facilitator occasionally (lines 55, 61, 70, 81). Discussion floor was open from time to time (lines 1-4, 67-68, and 81-82) for the whole class. At this point, it can be interpreted that within this SCD context, teachers minimize their dominant roles to participate in and allow students to freely and actively interact with one another during SCD. **Extract 1** exemplifies a case of the co-management of SCD floor by GS5 and the T1.

Extract 1

63 GS2: Ok, in my opinion if half of our learners

64   have characteristics as your subjects in your

65   case study they can organize by themselves.

66   It's ok that the teacher just as helper.

67 *GS5: Thank you for you opinions. <u>More</u>

68   suggestions, Or any <u>other</u> ideas?

69   **GSs:**   (3)

70   T1: Ok, what I like to suggest you that (.)in your

71   case Study you should think out not only '<u>who</u> 72 <u>and what</u> to support' but also HOW to support 73   the learner autonomy. So in you report writing, 74   you may like to consider this point. 75 *GS5: **((Nodding))** Ok, thank you very much.

It can be seen that in line 67, after GS5 acknowledges GS2's opinion expression contribution (lines 63-66), she offers the floor to the whole class (lines 67-68). However, GS5's offer receives a 3-second silence (line 69). Seeing the silence gap, T1 comes up with suggestions (lines 70-74). Through the co-management of floor, GSs are exposed and guided through the SCD for what and how to talk with whom. This is grounded by Vygotsky's concept of learning through socially mediated dialogical interaction (Starr. 2000) since the dialogical exchange provides GSs with teachers' guidance and peers' support to accomplish discussion goals. In this sense, SCD as a talking process is conducive to mediate learners to develop subject knowledge and communicative skills (Walsh, 2006).

B. Gaps of Silence

There are two noticeable gaps of silence. **Extract 2** and **Extract 3** serve to show two cases in point.

Extract 2

1 *GS5: That's all for my presentation.Now(.)time for your(.)

2   Ideas**((Palm-up gesturing to whole class))** <u>Who</u> and

3   <u>what</u> can support students to be good learners? You 4   can share your ideas with(.)with each question?

5 **{Whole class}:**   (4)

6 GS11: **((Raising her pencil))** May I ask you a question?=

7 *GS5: =**((Nodding))** Yes, please.

Extract 3

67 *GS5: Thank you for you opinions. <u>More</u>

68   suggestions, Or any <u>other</u> ideas?

69 GSs: (3)

70 T1: Ok, what I like to suggest you that (.)in your

71   case Study you should think out not only '<u>who</u> 72   <u>and what</u> to

          support' but also HOW to support 73   the learner autonomy. So in

          you report writing, 74   you may like to consider this point.

75 *GS5: **((Nodding))** Ok, thank you very much.

    In **Extract 2**, at the beginning of this SCD a 4-second gap of silence (line 5) is noticed after GS5's questions for ideas and suggestions. The silence here can be interpreted as an announcement for yielding the floor for the whole class or a wait time for a response. This can be confirmed by GS11's normative response in form of non-verbal turn-taking and verbal question (line 6) to break the silence and step into the discussion pool. GS11's normative response is further convinced by GS5's acceptance as preferred turn in line 7.

    Then, **Extract 3** shows that a 3-second gap of silence is observed in line 69. Since GS5 finishes her discussion session by saying *'Thank you for you opinions',* but meanwhile mitigating her unwillingness to continue her discussion by strategically stressing *'<u>More</u> suggestions, or any <u>other</u> ideas?'* (lines 67-68), the whole class responds to her with a silent period. As a result, T1 comes up to wrap up GS5's topic with suggestions (lines 70-74). Alternatively, the silence gap can be understood as a floor-opening for more ideas.

C. Competition and Overlapping Turn Taking

Turn-taking in SCD is basically self-selected and there is no instance of turn allocation from Ts or the GS5 as a presenter. Some questions are extended and discussed excessively while some are unfinished because of turn competition. **Extract 4** below contextualizes an example of turn competition and **Extract 5** exemplifies a case of overlapping turns.

Extract 4

8 GS11: Do you think the <u>teacher</u> (.) teachers still play an

9　　　　IMPORTANT role in self-access centre to help

10　　　　students to become more autonomous?

11*GS5: Er, ask for my (.) for my (.) for my opinion (2),

12　　　　I think the teacher is important to be a guide

13 GS11: = ↑ Guide?

14*GS5: =A <u>guide</u>:: to(.) ahhh(.) to tell the students to know(.)

15　　　　to go to the right way to Er(.)to the right place. But

16　　　　every thing must depend (.)must depend on the

17　　　　learners(.) they don't be followers So (1) in

18　　　　conclusion, I think the learners are very important.

19 GS6: **((Nodding and smiling at GS5.))**

20 GS7: **((Leaning forward and watching GS5.))**

21 GS11: It's very difficult to balance the degree <u>how</u> to

22　　　　guide. If you guide more, that means you tend to

23　　　　<u>control</u> your students?=

24 *GS5: = ↑ Yes. It depends on the group. As a teacher, I　25　　　　must know my students well, so I know how (xxx)

26　　　　to use the suitable way for my students. That means

27　　　　Er(.) I cannot (.)I cannot use the (.) Er(.)Er the(.)the

28   same way, because we can notice from her

29   behaviour, her speaking, her actions or everything

30   in the classroom. (.)so the teacher will know.

31 GS3: **((Nodding and leaning forward to GS5.))**

32 GS4: **((Leaning forward and watching GS5.))**

33 GS6: **((Nodding and smiling at GS5.))**

34 GS11: **((Nodding))**

35 GS2: °(xxx)I think it's up to the students (xxx) how

36   much the (xxx)°

37 GS6: **((Racing for a turn))** ↑ But sometime it's quite

38   DIFFIcult because some(.)some teachers have a 39

39   lot of classes, I mean 6 or 7 class per(.)per week and 40 in one

class about30 to 40 students, we (.)(1)

41   sometime we cannot manage the <u>suitable</u> way

42   to(.)to suit the students or all=

In **Extract 4,** GS11 initiates a question in line 8, which is extended from line 11 to line 30 through meaning negotiation between GS11 and GS5. The mere format of this long extension is question-opinion or opinion-opinion. It is noted when GS2 wants to share her opinion in line 35, GS6 comes up with a stronger voice taking over turn to express her ideas from lines 37-42. Consequently, the GS2's initiated topic concerning students' responsibility is left under-discussed.

Extract 5

43 GS5: =Er(.)Er(.) for my experience, as a teacher I focus at

44   most of my students because I cannot wait for all

45   students satisfy for my(.)for all most of my action.

46   So I focus on most of them, and for the rest,

47   er(.)yeah(1)have to follow[

48 GS11: [↑ OHH, >It seems something different from you

49   said just now?<

50 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

51 GS1:   It seemed you said it is not good to be follower?

52 *GS5:   °Yeah° (.)yes(.)sometime[

53 GS9:   [Are you very excited today?

54 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

55 T2:   You made a surprise for me that you suggested

56   before it's not good to be a follower, right?=

57 *GS5:   =°Sometime°, yes, °sometime°, >I think

58   sometime to be a good thinker or a good

59   learner must be a good follower first<.

60 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

61 T1:>Learner-cantered or teacher-teacher-cantered? <

62 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

In Extract 5, two instances of overlapping turns appear (line 47, line 52) which illustrate a dynamic conversation mode rather than a traditional routine classroom. Additionally, turn competitions are noticeable since there is no pause from line 7 to line 68. Most prominently, two explicit non-verbal turn-taking behaviors (line 6 and line 37) are noted in SCD whereas only one instance of explicit verbal turn-taking is observed (line 6). All the rest of turns are taken immediately by directly stepping into the discussion pool after departing briefly from the question-answer turn-taking format in order to add a detail to a description given in the prior turn.

One exceptional instance termed by Markee (2005) as "talk-that-occurs-in-the-classroom" is noticed in line 53, where GS9 says 'Are you very excited today?' which is nonetheless not institutional because GS9 observably orients to the topic nomination and turn-taking conventions of ordinary conversation. This case is accountable in two ways based on CA approach. For *sequential accountability*, a holistic account of the coherence of the text can be constructed in that particular moment relating to GS9's question on GS5's self-conflicting ideas. For *distributional accountability*, a functional explanation as to why this phenomenon occurs is because GSs were given great freedom to manage the discussion flow in SCD.

D. Meaning Negotiation and Knowledge Construction

Overall, there are no intentional repairs at linguistic level even though some errors are quite obvious (e.g. line 11 'for' my opinion; line 37 'sometime'; line 57 'sometime'). Meanwhile, GSs are actively engaged in SCD verbally. The majority of their verbal utterances are information-orientated by sharing their opinions. Moreover, constraints on suitable participation can be observed. For example, the "talk-that-occurs-in-the-classroom" instance (line 53) is nonetheless not expected of the SCD as GS9 slips into a chatting topic, which is viewed as an inappropriate digression of SCD topic and is thereby ignored and laughed down by the class. In this sense, it is apparent that the SCD is information-focused since it seems the lecturers allow a rich space for the GSs to share information and bring up their ideas in the discussion without assessing their language ability. However, other-repair instances do appear at content/information level. In **Extract 5**, GS5's ideas and wording 'follow' (line 47) exactly contradicts her previously mentioned ideas 'they don't be followers' (line 17). At this point, GS11 (line 48), GS1 1 (line 51) and T2 (line 55) imitate other repairs directing her awareness to her self-conflicting ideas. GSs' resistance or arguments of each other's ideas may be attributed to their different levels

of language skills and subject knowledge. Waring (2005) noticed that 'advice resisting is one focal area in which negotiation becomes manifested' (p.142).

E. Cooperative and Supportive SCD Atmosphere

The SCD atmosphere is cooperative, harmonious and supportive with GSs and their teachers appearing friendly and open-minded to one another. This can be supported by the four instances of whole class in laughers (lines 50, 54, 60, 62). In addition, no explicitly expressed verbal or non-verbal disagreement was found in this particular SCD data. It has been established that culturally, Thais prioritize a harmonious relationship of people who are part of the group or the community (Vongvipanond, 1994) and they are more likely to be compromising rather than confrontational in conversations (Niratpattanasai, 2001). Additionally, showing disagreement verbally or non-verbally may be face-threatening to both listeners and speakers bearing in mind that the majority of the participants in SCD are Asian bred. This is in line with Goffman's (1983, cited in Wetherell, Taylor & Yeats. 2001) argument on interaction order which links to face of the participants in interaction and social institutions.

F. Teacher and Students' Identity in SCD

Extract 6 illustrates how teacher and students' identity are constructed and reflected through SCD discourse.

Extract 6

67 *GS5: Thank you for you opinions. <u>More</u> suggestions, or
68　　　any <u>other</u> ideas?
69 **GSs:**　　　(3)
70 T1:　Ok, what I like to suggest you that (.)in your case
71　　　study you should think out not only 'who and what

72   to support' but also HOW to support the learner

73   autonomy. So in you report writing, you may like to

74   consider this point.

75 *GS5: **((Nodding))** Ok, thank you very much.

76 GS2: **((Leaning forward to and watching L1.))**

77 GS3: **((Nodding))**

78 GS6: **((Nodding and smiling.))**

79 GS9: **(Leaning forward to and watching L1.))**

80 GS11: **((Nodding))**

81T1: **((looking around the whole class))**

82   More comments or questions?

83 **{Whole class}: {T2 and T3 say 'no', some GSs shake their**

84   **heads, while some just smile}**

85 *GS5: Thanks for your attention and participation.

In **Extract 6,** it is evident that T2 enjoys his privilege as a teacher who is in charge of the current seminar session to wrap up GS5's presentation and discussion (lines 70-74). Meanwhile, GS5's unconditional acceptance (line 75) and the cluster of GSs' 'nodding' showing agreement or understanding indicate obviously their identity as students and convince T2's role as a teacher (lines 76-80).

It can be seen that, although SCD floor is open for all participants and turn taking is discursive and self-selected, SCD is primarily goal-oriented with clear role boundaries. For one thing, GS5 as the presenter in this specific SCD was the main person collecting suggestions and information and T2 was privileged to clarify some key points through wrapping up the discussion. For another, GS5's acknowledgement for suggestions (line 75) and T1's eliciting questions for more ideas (line 82) can be interpreted as signal for closing the

discussion session as well as foregrounding their roles as a presenter and a teacher in this particular task. The roles of T2 and GS5 as a SCD presenter can be explained by taking the SCD context into account, that is, Thai society attaches great importance to hierarchy and harmony, by which, teachers and discussion leaders are privileged to monitor the discussion flow and with the rest of GSs's support and compromises (Vongvipanond. 1994; Niratpattanasai. 2001).

Conclusion and Implications

Based on an exploration of exchange patterns and features in naturally occurring seminar-like classroom discussion, this paper has indicated that exchanges in naturally occurring discussion at graduate level are complex and involve ideas development and meaning negotiation. The identified features like management of discussion floor, gaps of silence, turn competition suggests a two-folded need for a complementary view of discussion: a) discussion skills which are construed as the language abilities of GSs to jointly negotiate meaning; b) subject knowledge by which ideas and viewpoints can emerge and be discussed thoroughly for a better understanding of the discussed topics. This reflects Vygotsky's theory (1978) that cognitive development occurs as concepts first learned through social interaction are then internalised and made one's own. Although learners may not be able to produce a concept within a single utterance, they may be able to build them through interaction with another speaker and the scaffolding this provides.

Based on the features of SCD, it should be noted that the information-focused SCD provided opportunities for GSs to practice their interactional competence through meaning negotiation and expand their academic horizon through mutual knowledge construction. Seedhouse (2004) documented that 'learning is constructed by the use of interactional resources and to explicate

the progress of their learning and their socially distributed cognition or intersubjectivity' (p.243).

Implications can be drawn from this study that, SCD as a content-based instruction at graduate level is significantly beneficial for stretching learners' academic abilities for the future professional avenue in terms of language and subject knowledge. Learners can be orchestrated to learn what and how to talk appropriately through talk-in-interaction (Kasper. 2006; Seedhouse. 2004). Hopefully, the data analysis in this case study may shed some light on the classroom-based research.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahmed, M. K. (1994). Speaking as Cognitive Regulation: A Vygotskyan Perspective on Dialogic Communication. In J.P. Lantolf (ed.) *Vygotsky Approaches to Second Language Research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Basturkmen, H. (1999). Discourse in MBA Seminars: Towards a Description for Pedagogical Purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 63-80.

Basturkmen, H. (2002). Negotiation Meaning in Seminar-type Discussion and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes,* 21(3), 233-242.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning (2nd ed.) Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Dsnato, R. (2000). Sociocultural Contributions to Understanding the Foreign and Second Language Classroom. In J.P.Lantolf (ed.),*Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp.27-50). New York: Oxford University Press.

Innes, B. R. (2007). Dialogic Communication in Collaborative Problem Solving Groups. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*, 1-19.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond Repair: Conversation Analysis as an Approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83-99.

Kinginger, S. (2002). Defining the Zone of Proximal Development in US Foreign Language Education. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 240-261.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking Science: Language, Learning, and Values.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Markee, N. (2005). The Organization of off-task Classroom talk in Second Language Classrooms. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis.* Basingstoke, England: Palgrave: Macmillan.

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the Use of "triadic dialogue"?: An Investigation of Teacher Students Interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 21(3), 376-406.*

Nussbaum, M., Alvarez, C., McFarlane, A., Gomez, F., Claro, S., & Radovic, (2009). Technology as small group face-to-face collaborative scaffolding. *Computers & Education*, 52, 147-153.

Niratpattanasai, K. (2001). Thai perceptions of expat colleagues-survey results. Bangkok Post: Thailand. Retrieved on March 13, 2008 from *http://www.apmforum.com/columns/thai44.htm*

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. Mch., & Coulthard, R. M. (1992). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse. In M. Coulthard (ed.), Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1–34). London: Routledge.

Starr, L. (2000). Teaching the American revolution: scaffolding to success. Retrieved January 22, 2009 from Education World Curriculum Article Website: *http://www.educationworld.com/a__curr/curr218.shtml*

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986, 2002). Thought and language (13th ed.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vongvipanond, P. (1994). Linguistic Perspectives of Thai Culture. Paper Presented to a Workshop of Teachers of Social Science Organized by the University of New Orleans. Retrieved on March 13, 2008 from *http://thaiarc.tu.ac.th/thai/peansiri.htm*

Wells, G. (1999). Dialogic inquiry: Toward a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.

Waring, H.Z. (2005). Peer Tutoring in a Graduate Writing Centre: Identity, Expertise, and Advice Resisting. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(2), 141–168.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yeats, S.J. (2001). *Discourse as Data*. London: Sage Publications

APPENDIX A

Transcription Conventions

T1, T2, T3	identified teacher
GS1, GS2, etc.	identified graduate student
{ }	several graduate students at once or the whole class
(.)	untimed perceptible pause less than 2 tenths of a second within a turn
(3)	a time gap in tenths of a second
<u>Underline</u>	stress
CAPS	very emphatic stress

↑	high pitch on word
.	sentence-final falling intonation
?	Yes/no question rising intonation
,	phrase-final intonation (more to come)
:	lengthened vowel sound (extra colons indicate greater lengthening)
[	overlapped talk
=	one turn follows another without pause
(xxx)	inaudible utterance (e.g. background noise caused by air conditioner or drowned out by turn competing if it appears at the end of a turn)
°soft°	spoken softly/decreased volume
> <	increased speed
(( ))	researcher's description of nonverbal acts (in bold type)
(***)	whole-class in laugher

Appendix B

Full transcript

(Note: The transcript is genuine, i.e. not edited for grammatical correctness)

Presenter: *GS5

Topic: How does a learner organize his/her SALL?

Length of Discussion: 4 minutes 50 seconds

1 *GS5: That's all for my presentation.Now(.)time for your(.)

2 Ideas**((Palm-up gesturing to whole class))** <u>Who</u> and

3 <u>what</u> can support students to be good learners? You 4 can share

your ideas with(.)with each question?

5 **{Whole class}:** (4)

6 GS11: **((Raising her pencil))** May I ask you a question?=

7 *GS5: =**((Nodding))** Yes, please.

8 GS11: Do you think the <u>teacher</u> (.) teachers still play an

9   IMPORTANT role in self-access centre to help

10   students to become more autonomous?

11 *GS5: Er, ask for my (.) for my (.) for my opinion (2),

12   I think the teacher is important to be a guide

13 GS11: = ↑ Guide?

14 *GS5: =A <u>guide</u>:: to(.) ahhh(.) to tell the students to know(.)

15   to go to the right way to Er(.)to the right place. But

16   every thing must depend (.)must depend on the

17   learners(.) they don't be followers So (1) in

18   conclusion, I think the learners are very important.

19 GS6: **((Nodding and smiling at GS5.))**

20 GS7: **((Leaning forward and watching GS5.))**

21 GS11: It's very difficult to balance the degree <u>how</u> to

22   guide. If you guide more, that means you tend to

23   <u>control</u> your students?=

24 *GS5: = ↑ Yes. It depends on the group. As a teacher, I

25   must know my students well, so I know how (xxx)

26   to use the suitable way for my students. That means

27   Er(.) I cannot (.)I cannot use the (.) Er(.)Er the(.)the

28   same way, because we can notice from her

29   behaviour, her speaking, her actions or everything

30   in the classroom. (.)so the teacher will know.

31 GS3: **((Nodding and leaning forward to GS5.))**

32 GS4: **((Leaning forward and watching GS5.))**

33 GS6: ((Nodding and smiling at GS5.))

34 GS11: **((Nodding))**

35 GS2: °(xxx)I think it's up to the students (xxx) how

36   much the (xxx)°

37 GS6: **((Racing for a turn))** ↑But sometime it's quite

38   DIFFIcult because some(.)some teachers have a lot

39   of classes, I mean 6 or 7 class per(.)per week and in

40   one class about30 to 40 students, we (.)(1)

41   sometime we cannot manage the <u>suitable</u> way

42   to(.)to suit the students or all=

43 GS5: =Er(.)Er(.) for my experience, as a teacher I focus at

44   most of my students because I cannot wait for all

45   students satisfy for my(.)for all most of my action.

46   So I focus on most of them, and for the rest,

47   er(.)yeah(1)have to follow[

48 GS11: [↑OHH**,** >It seems something <u>different</u> from you

49   said just now?<

50 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

51 GS1: It seemed you said it is <u>not good</u> to be follower?

52 *GS5: °Yeah° (.)yes(.)sometime[

53 GS9: [Are you very excited today?

54 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

55 T2: You made a surprise for me that you suggested

56   before it's not good to be a follower, right?=

57 *GS5: =°Sometime°, yes, °sometime°, >I think

58   sometime to be a good thinker or a good

59   learner must be a good follower first<.

60 **{Whole class}**:   (***)

61 T1:>Learner-cantered or teacher-teacher-cantered? <

62 **{Whole class}**: (***)

63 GS2: Ok, in my opinion if half of our learners have

64   characteristics as your subjects in your case study

65   they can organize by themselves. It's ok that the

66   teacher just as helper.

67 *GS5: Thank you for you opinions. More suggestions, or

68   any other ideas?

69 **GSs:** (3)

70 T1: Ok, what I like to suggest you that (.)in your case

71   study you should think out not only 'who and what to

72   support' but also HOW to support the learner

73   autonomy. So in you report writing, you may like to

74   consider this point.

75 *GS5: **((Nodding))** Ok, thank you very much.

76 GS2: **((Leaning forward to and watching L1.))**

77 GS3: **((Nodding))**

78 GS6: **((Nodding and smiling.))**

79 GS9: **(Leaning forward to and watching L1.))**

80 GS11: **((Nodding))**

81 T1: **((looking around the whole class))**

82   More comments or questions?

83 **{Whole class}: {T2 and T3 say 'no', some GSs shake their**

84   **heads, while some just smile}**

85 *GS5:Thanks for your attention and participation.