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Introduction: Context and Motivation for the Study

The context of the study is the Curriculum Area Meeting (CAM) of the English Language Institute (ELI) at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. The English Language Institute (ELI) is a campus academic unit belonging to the Department of Second Language Studies. The primary purpose of the ELI is “to provide English instruction for international and immigrant students who have been admitted to the university and who do not speak English as a native language, in order to facilitate their academic studies.” (ELI, 2003). The ELI consists of three curriculum areas, i.e. Listening and Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Each curriculum area is divided into two course levels, intermediate (70 level) and advanced (80 level). International students admitted to the university, who have a TOEFL score within 500-600 range and do not meet any exemption criteria, are required to take ELI placement test before their first semester starts and to take the ELI courses according to their placement. The instructors at the ELI are all Graduate Assistants (GAs) pursuing their M.A. or PhD degree at the Department of Second Language Studies (SLS). The GAs at the ELI are made up of both NSs and NNSs of English, with 5 NSs and 13 NNSs in the semester when the study is conducted.

The ELI Curriculum Area Meeting (CAM) is a regular event for the instructors teaching in the same curriculum area, scheduled approximately once a month during each semester, with a normal length of one hour per meeting. An unofficial definition of CAM drafted by the ELI Assistant Director is "A Curriculum Area Meeting is designed to be a regular forum for teachers to discuss concerns, successes, and issues that have arisen in their classes, as well as aspects of curriculum that the lead teacher or ELI administration would
like the curriculum area to address (examples can include clarification or evolution of course-related goals and objectives, materials development, etc.)." (Kenton Harsch, personal communication, April 27th, 2006). Each curriculum area usually has one lead teacher, but occasionally two, who has the responsibility of organizing and leading the CAMs. Each curriculum area usually has four to six GAs including the lead teacher(s). CAMs are not only a place for teachers to discuss curriculum- and teaching-related issues, they are also a venue for lead teacher(s) to perform their duties to promote professional development and to provide mentoring to the teachers, especially to novice teachers (ELI, 2003). Lead teachers are advised by ELI administration to plan and draft agenda for the meetings, send the agenda to the teachers via email in advance, and to ask for any additional agenda that teachers would like to be included.

As an instructor in the ELI listening/speaking curriculum area in the previous two semesters, I have experienced nine CAMs and have obtained an insider’s view of what is usually discussed during the listening/speaking CAMs and how the meetings are operated. I also had a feel of the different group dynamics, participation patterns and language uses that emerged from the dialogues due to the many interweaving identities of the participants from their status (e.g. NS/NNS and novice/expert), gender, ethnicity, and etc. Thus, I am interested in examining one CAM and exploring how identities are represented and negotiated through language use among the meeting participants.

**Research Methodological Approach and Research Questions**

The methodological approach taken for the study is ethnography of communication (EC) at the micro-level, ‘micro-ethnography’, or ‘ethnographic microanalysis of interaction’
method or framework for conducting qualitative, interpretative research in a variety of
settings (Schiffrin, 1994)” (p. 291). EC examines “patterns and functions of
communication, [and the] nature and definition of speech community” (Saville-Troike,
1989, p. 11), among other things, by using outsider (or etic) and insider (or emic)
analyses of communication, with macro- and/or micro-level analyses of discourse (Duff,
2002). First founded by Hymes (1974), EC is now able to draw on and to apply to a
number of disciplines, e.g. linguistics, sociology, anthropology, communication,
education, and etc. Whereas macro-levels of analysis require examining the larger social,
political and historical contexts for speech situations, micro-ethnography could just take
individual discursive elements as units of analysis, e.g. turn-taking, silence, code-
switching, personal pronouns and etc. (Duff, 2002). The fine-tuned micro-analysis of the
cdiscursive elements could also reflect the larger Discourses of the speech community and
speech situations, including the role of identities.

For the current study, one Curriculum Area Meeting (CAM), a speech event (Hymes,
1972), is used as the unit of speech. Its speech community is the ELI instructors, and its
speech situation is the monthly meeting of different curriculum areas. Hymes’ (1974)
SPEAKING tools (i.e. Situation, Participants, Ends, Acts, Key, Instrumentality, Norms,
and Genres) can also be used to analyze the speech event in order to understand how the
meeting participants communicate and how the communication is patterned. Macro-
levels of analysis will not be appropriate here since they require large sets of data and
different sources of data to examine the larger socio-cultural-political contexts.
Nevertheless, micro-ethnography will be a suitable approach to analyze this single speech
event, with any identifiable discursive elements that reoccur in the data to illustrate the communication patterns. In addition, I have been one member of the speech community for a while, have experienced the CAM speech events for quite several times, and have had frequent contact and interactions with the speech event participants. Thus, as an insider taking an emic view, I choose micro-ethnography as the methodological approach for the study.

When examining the recorded CAM, I identified advice-seeking and advice-giving as the reoccurring discursive elements that are illustrative of the communication patterns in the meeting, and thus formulated the following research questions.

1. Who sought for advice during the CAM?
2. Who gave advice to the advice-seeker(s)?
3. What is the role of identity in the advice-seeking and advice-giving routines?

**Methodological Procedures and Participants**

I first selected a listening/speaking curriculum area meeting, since I am most familiar with this curriculum area, its CAMs, and the instructors. I then obtained consent to do the research and to record the CAM from the ELI and the instructors attending the meeting. On the day of the meeting, I tape-recorded the meeting, and sat at a corner, observed the meeting and took notes of some non-verbal behavior, e.g. gestures and eye contact. Afterwards, I listened to the tape-recorded CAM for several times, and identified advice-seeking and advice-giving as reoccurring themes during the meeting.
The identified themes for analysis are closely related to the purposes and content of the meeting and who the meeting participants are. As described above, the purposes of CAMs are for teachers to discuss curriculum- and teaching-related issues, and at the same time lead teacher(s) will perform their duty of promoting professional development and providing mentoring to teachers, especially to new teachers during the meetings.

Therefore, there could be some exchange of advice-seeking and advice-giving, when teachers talk over their concerns of teaching issues. For the current listening/speaking curriculum area, there are altogether six teachers, with two lead teachers, one continuing teacher, and three new teachers. (See Table 1 for the demographic information of each teacher.) The composites of the listening/speaking CAM participants are quite unique, especially in that there are two lead teachers and three new teachers, since normally there is only one lead teacher and one or two new teachers. There is also a combination of NS and NNS, of female and male, and of different nationalities. There are more NNSs than NSs, more females than males, and more Japanese than other nationals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Status at ELI</th>
<th>Status at SLS</th>
<th>NS / NNS</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT1</td>
<td>lead teacher</td>
<td>4th semester</td>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT2</td>
<td>lead teacher</td>
<td>6th semester</td>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT1</td>
<td>continuing</td>
<td>2nd semester</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT1</td>
<td>new teacher</td>
<td>2nd semester</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT2</td>
<td>new teacher</td>
<td>4th semester</td>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT3</td>
<td>new teacher</td>
<td>6th semester</td>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: CAM Participants
Data Analysis

I will thereafter answer the three research questions by analyzing the data.

Who sought for advice in the CAM?

As described above, advice-seeking could be something expected during the CAMs when teachers talk over their concerns in teaching. For this particular CAM, teaching issues for discussion were elicited from teachers when LT2 sent out an email to ask for input for the agenda of the meeting. In addition, the CAM participants included three new ELI teachers, who just started teaching in the ELI about two months ago and may have a number of concerns about teaching.

The only teacher who responded to LT2’s email about the agenda of the meeting is NT1, who is a new ELI teacher, a white female American. NT1 expressed her concerns about giving feedback to students’ work. In the actual meeting, NT1 sought for advice explicitly or implicitly mainly about three issues related to giving students feedback, i.e. 1) how to deal with one student who submitted a paper with huge font; 2) how much feedback she should give to students’ work; and 3) whether she should give feedback on students’ self-evaluation of a project. More than half of the meeting time was spent on the three issues she raised and other related side talks. NT2, another new ELI teacher, who is female Japanese, did not raise any concern about her teaching throughout the meeting and thus did not ask for advice. NT2 also remained mostly silent during the meeting except for a few occasions, but she showed some of her responses by nodding, shaking head, laughing or facial expressions. NT3, the third new ELI teacher at the meeting, who is
male Japanese, did not volunteer to talk about his teaching concerns, but was asked once by lead teacher 1 and thus talked about his concern on students’ participation. In addition, when talking about his concern, NT3 only stated the problem and did not ask for advice. Except for this occasion of being asked to talk, NT3 almost did not speak a word throughout the meeting. The one continuing ELI teacher and the two lead teachers did not raise concern about their teaching and did not ask for advice.

From the data, it appeared that possibly the teachers’ status (new/experienced; lower status/ higher status), the teachers’ NS/NNS status and their gender played a role in whether they would seek for advice. Since seeking advice, to a certain extent, shows the advice-seeker’s lack of knowledge, experience or skills in dealing with a situation or a problem, it is not so much a face-threatening act for novice teachers or teachers at lower status than it is for experienced teachers or teachers at higher status. In this meeting, one of the new teachers actively sought for advice, and neither of the two lead teachers or the experienced teacher asked for advice. In addition, the nature of the event as an organized meeting, a professional activity, and the distance among the meeting participants do not seem to encourage everyone to voice their concerns. The fact that among the three new ELI teachers at the meeting, only the female white American voluntarily raised her concerns about teaching and asked for advice, is worthy of attention. Nevertheless, the sample size is too small to allow analysis and interpretation about NS/NNS status or gender.

*Who gave advice to the advice-seeker(s)?*
Throughout the meeting, there was a lot of solicited and unsolicited advice. The advice came almost exclusively from the two lead teachers and the one experienced teacher. The two new teachers who did not ask for advice did not provide any advice either. Thus in this meeting, advice-givers are teachers who are assumed to have the authority or knowledge to give advice. The new teachers who are assumed to lack the authority or knowledge refrained from giving advice. This may be related to how face threatening to the recipient it is for experienced teachers or novice teachers to give advice. As Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000) indicated, advice from someone with higher power will pose less threat to the recipient than advice from someone lacking power or knowledge. It would seem appropriate or acceptable for the lead teachers and the experienced teacher to give advice to a novice teacher, but it might seem bossy or inappropriate for someone of equal status to give advice. In addition, the quite frequent acts of giving advice in the data may be related to the NS/NNS status of the advice-givers. Both the two lead teachers are NNSs, and the only continuing teacher is a NS but spent most of his lifetime in Japan. Hinkel (1994) reported that NNSs advised their superior or peer more frequently than what would be considered appropriate in the Anglo-American culture. At the same time, it was reported in Hinkel (1994; 1997) that NNSs may use giving advice as a rapport-building strategy for showing solidarity and affirmation, and may not interpret giving advice so much as face-threat.

What is the role of identity in the advice-seeking and advice-giving routines?

Through the general analysis of the data for the last two questions, it was found out that the teachers’ status as either novice or expert played a major role in the advice-seeking
and advice-giving routines at this CAM. Thereafter, the analysis will focus on the question of *how novice/expert status was represented and constructed in the dialogue of advice-seeking and advice-giving*. One long excerpt (See Appendix) about one teacher seeking for advice and other teachers giving advice is used here for careful examination and analysis. The excerpt is initiated by NT1, a new teacher, who was asking for advice on how to deal with one student who submitted a paper with huge font. The whole dialogue was centered on this topic and lasted for about five minutes.

The analysis looks into how advice was asked, how advice was given, and also how the advice was responded to.

NT1, a new teacher, in lines 1-3 and lines 5-6, started stating and describing the problem she had with one student who submitted a paper with huge font. In lines 10-14, the teacher described in more details the paper the student had submitted, and stated that she felt that she could not just ignore the problem since it would not be good to the student. When asked in line 23 by one experienced teacher what she di to handle the problem, NT1, in lines 24-25, expressed directly that she needed to talk to someone about it and she did not know what to do. In describing such an extreme case of student work and directly asking for advice, the teacher was presenting herself as a novice not knowing how to deal with the extreme case. At the same time, by bringing up the problem in the CAM, this novice teacher was positioning some teachers at the meeting as expert who are the “someone” she could talk to and who could give her advice of what to do. Before any advice was given, in lines 29-30 and lines 44-46, NT1 took the turns from others, and explained what she had in mind of what she could possibly do for the problem and her
concerns about these solutions which did not seem to fall into her responsibility. These explanations further established N1 as a novice teacher who did not have a good idea of how to deal with the problem.

When NT1 first stated and described the problem in lines 1-3 and lines 5-6, CT1, LT2, and LT1, who are all experienced teachers, immediately responded at the same time with surprise and disbelief in lines 6-9. However, NT1 and NT2, the other two new teachers, did not give any response. The experienced teachers’ responses of surprise clearly show their status of being expert in the context who could make immediate judgment of the problem as rare and unbelievable. And the other two novices’ non-response showed their lack of expertise or authority to respond. Interestingly, immediately following NT1’s request for advice in lines 24-25, NT2, another new teacher, responded by directing the question to one of the lead teachers who had experienced similar student problem. By directing the question to LT2, NT2 was positioning LT2 as the expert who could possible provide advice, and at the same time presenting herself as someone not having the expertise to offer advice. In line 36 and line 38, CT1, one experienced teacher, by pointing out “Yeah, I got one of those”, was establishing himself as an expert in this context who had a lot of experiences with students.

Up to this point of the dialogue, no specific advice had been given. Advice-giving started in line 48 and line 50 when CT1 asked a question of NT1 about whether NT1 had set standard for the assignment. CT1 used a very indirect way of giving advice by asking questions. At the same time, it showed that CT1 had the expertise to identity possible cause of the problem and to challenge NT1. Following the question, LT1 and LT2, the
two lead teachers, immediately responded with “Yeah. Yeah.” (line 51) and “Um. What to do, right?”, which showed that they supported CT1’s question and acknowledged CT1’s expertise in looking at the problem. Again at this point, there was no response from the other two novice teachers. In lines 53-59, CT1 continued to explain from his personal experience that students could make mistakes because they did not understand the standards for the assignment, indicating that NT1’s student might have been confused by the unclear standards of the assignment and NT1 lacked the experience to identify the students’ needs for clear standards. After this turn, LT1, one of the lead teachers, immediately responded with “That’s a very good point” (line 60), which further showed support for CT1’s analysis and acknowledged CT1’s expertise in understanding the problem. LT1 then proceeded to give her advice by using conditionals (lines 60-62) and drawing on her personal teaching experience (lines 62-67), which are all very polite and indirect way of giving advice. By making the detailed advice with description of personal experience, LT1 was establishing herself as the expert in dealing with student assignment. At the end of LT1’s turn, LT2 and NT3 immediately showed their acknowledgement of LT1’s advice by uttering “Um”.

After getting the advice from CT1 and LT1, in lines 71-73, NT1 partially rejected the advice by pointing out that she had talked about the format standards for every assignment so far and she had not felt the need to mention them again for this assignment. LT2, another lead teacher, immediately took the turn from NT1, and pointed out in lines 74-75 that she noticed that the instructors for undergraduate courses gave “really” specific instructions for every assignment, and later re-affirmed in lines 86-88 the undergraduates’ needs for specific instructions for “every” assignment. LT2’s comments
were largely corrective of NT1’s inexperienced understanding that the students might not need instructions for every assignment, establishing NT1’s lack of experience. At the same time, LT2 introduced another expert-source, the instructors for undergraduate courses, putting extra expert value on the advice. LT1, in lines 83-85, re-affirmed this additional expert-source by recounting her personal experience with the undergraduate course she taught.

NT1, in lines 89-90 and line 92, rejected the advice again by explaining that she thought the student was a PhD student and he should have known what to do. Following this, LT1 challenged NT1’s lack of experience in understanding the issue correctly by giving very direct advice with “you should tell him” (line 94) and less direct advice with “you have the option of giving him no credit for that” (lines 94-95), and by giving the comment of “It is not a writing class.” (line 101) which countered NT1’s displayed understanding in lines 29-30. When giving the advice, LT1 drew on her personal teaching experience again in lines 95-101. In lines 101-104, LT1 offered more specific advice. This turn (lines 94-104) further established LT1 as an expert who can give the advice and NT1 as a novice who lacked good understanding of the issue.

CT1 first showed some support to LT1’s advice in line 107, but then somehow challenged LT1’s advice by suggesting first finding out why the student had felt his work was acceptable. His justifications for the advice and his analysis of the problem in lines 107-109, 112-117, 121-126, showed that CT1 had the expertise to make good judgment of such student problem, and indicated that NT1 lacked the expertise to do so. LT2’s comment in lines 119-120 also constructed her as having the expertise to understand what
the student might be thinking. Then, LT1 resumed her expert status by taking her turn back with the advice of “Maybe a combination of both” (line 129), especially by only referring to the advice she had made (lines 129-132). Following this, in lines 134-135, LT2 made another piece of advice by drawing on her personal experience. And LT1 supported the advice in line 136. For the above several pieces of advice LT1, CT1, and LT2 offered, NT1 responded with “Um.” (line 106), and “Right.” (line 133), ratifying the experienced teachers’ expert status.

The careful analysis of the interactional details allows us to see how novice/expert status is co-constructed in the dialogue of advice-seeking and advice-giving. This could be accomplished through several means in and through the talk. For example, a) By asking for advice from others, one is presenting and establishing himself as novice, and at the same time is positioning and constructing others as expert. By giving advice to others, one is presenting and establishing himself as expert, and at the same time is positioning and constructing others as novice. b) By challenging and correcting a novice’s understanding or practices, one is positioning himself as expert and constructing the novice as inexperienced. c) By accepting or refusing the advice from an expert, a novice is ratifying or discrediting the status of the expert. d) By showing support for another expert, an expert is re-affirming the expertise of that expert. By disagreeing with another expert, an expert is discrediting the expertise of that expert. e) By not responding to another novice’s advice-seeking, a novice is positioning himself as not having the expertise to respond. From these examples, it appears apparent that the novice/expert status is not static, but fluid as the dialogue unfolds with one presenting himself and others constructing him through the talk (cf. He, 2004).
Discussion

Through the examination of who sought for advice, who gave advice to the advice-seeker, and how their status of novice or expert was constructed in the CAM dialogue, it becomes clearer to me that identity is represented and constructed through the use of language in a social context. We can examine the language produced in the real world to see a society and its social relations. The language one person produced can show the many facets of this person’s identities which are socially constructed. One person’s identity can be represented in the language produced by him and others. It can also be negotiated and constructed in and through talks the person has with others.

In terms of what implications these examinations and understandings can have for second or foreign language teaching and learning, one major point I think is that we should not teach language or use language materials that deviate from any social context. The language learning and teaching materials should be situated in certain social contexts and should be able to represent the real world. In this sense, I think authentic materials are useful in presenting the real-world language to the students. Similarly, more learning activities and tasks that resemble real-world situations should be designed, which will help students to develop the language to be used in certain language domains. In addition, when using the authentic materials, asking students to think about and identify the social relations language use can display may also a good way to stimulate thinking and to help students to understand the relationship between language use and society.
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Appendix - Excerpt: One episode of advice-seeking and advice-giving
NT1: >Yeah<. I have a problem with one of my students right now, who uh: (.)
Everyone submitted a paper, a reflection paper. Everyone did these amazing,
unbelievable jobs that I didn’t even expect them to do so well, =

LT2: =um=
NT1: =except for one student who gave me a paper with like seventy five point
font. And like,

CT1: [°seventy five°

LT2: [WHAT?
LT1: [(
NT1: [It’s like a few sentences, you know, like uh (.). And it was it was [complete.
It wasn’t even], [it was], yeah, it wasn’t even [like] [a full sentence, or like]
full thought, or developed thought at all. And I just thought like I can’t just (.). I mean if I just say acceptable and let him (.). slide through? You know that
would be total disadvantage for him.

LT1: [like the size
with that?] ((gesture))

LT2: [hh.]
CT1: [Oh]

LT1: [huh, huh, huh ]

LT2: [huh, huh, huh ]
LT1: [huh, huh, huh ]
NT2: [huh, huh, huh ]
NT3: [huh, huh, huh ]

LT1: What did [you do.]

NT1: [So. ] Well. I, I >just like<, I have to talk to someone. I don’t
know what to do? hnh

LT2: LT2, you had a student like that too, right=

NT2: =um=

NT2: =80 class [(

NT1: [But I am not TEACHING writing. So I don’t really know whether I
can only invite him to go to a writing teacher

NT2: ( ) biology? She have, like, [big fonts.]

LT2: [big fonts.] And like sometimes the margin
is like this big.=

NT2: =[huh

NT1: =[Right

CT1: =[Yeah, I got one of those

LT2: [So the writing is essentially like this. Yeah.

CT1: Yeah, I got one of those last term, for the margin was like two inches (.). on
each side? I was like ( ) some of the toilet paper. I mean it was so thin.

You know=

LT: [uh

NT1: =Right.

LT1: You know what. Um. But, I mean what do I,

NT1: If I tell him to re-submit it, it’s like I am gonna have to work almost like his,
like a tutor. Then like how to write it, [how to] develop it. I don’t have the
time for that. I mean, I don’t even,
CT1: Can I ask a question?
NT1: Sure
CT1: Did you set standard before you give the assignment?
LT1: =Yeah. Yeah.=
LT2: =Um. What to do, right?=
CT1: =Yeah. 'cause I said one inch margins. And the reason that person made a
mistake was that I said one inch margins, so that means your margin should
only be two inches total. And they put two inch (. ) margin on both sides,
‘cause they didn’t understand what I meant. ‘Cause I was like one inch
margin, that means (. ) this here. ((point to margins of a piece of paper))
That’s good. Some people want to put an extra inch (. ) on top. I’m like, NO.
That’s all you get. You know, and,
LT1: That’s a very good point. You know, if you make your criteria very explicit,
not only things about the size of the font. In, on the written assignment itself,
if you have like, at the bottom of your assignment, That’s what I am trying to
do with my bilingual ed class, I tell them the number of pages I require, I tell
them the font size I require, I always give them one to two pages, maximum
two, minimum one, if that’s what I want, And I tell them the criteria I am
going to use for grading. So I tell them good essays, this, this carries so much
of your course grade, and if you want full grade, this is what you need to do.

CT1: Spaces?
LT2: =double spacing, yeah=
LT1: =double spacing, single space
LT2: And I kind of inherited this for my bilingual ed ( ) who’s been teaching.
It’s not something I meant on my own. And it’s primarily an undergraduate
class. =
LT2: =Yeah. So seems that they need that every time they do the assignment. And
they don’t have it, they get confused. Like, oh, I don’t know [how to write this
time.
NT1: [This student is, uh, I think,
he is a PhD student.
LT1: Uh
NT1: He is not an undergraduate. [So he should know ( )
[Are you?]

LT1: NT1, you should tell him. Uh. Uh. You have the option of giving him no credit for that. I don’t know how you negotiated the assignments, but I already told them, at the beginning of the semester, that if you don’t do, meet the course requirements of that particular thing, then I will ask you to re-submit at once. So I just write re-submit, and with my comments, give it back. Then they have the option of giving it back to me. I mean they, it’s not the option. They have, they have to give it back to me, and then I give grade. If they still haven’t done anything. It is not a writing class. You can have a two minute: talk with this person after class, immediately after class, and have the criteria, and say that’s what’s needed. But. Um. And you can always direct him to the writing workshop.

LT2: [the workshop.]

NT1: Um.

CT1: I think that’s that’s a good thing to do, but I mean if there really was seventy five in this paper. And it really was like thirty eight font, or forty five font, or whatever. Then I, I mean, that’s (. ) uh,=

LT2: = That’s [like,

NT1: [It was like four sentences on his paper.

CT1: [That’s like purposeful way, you know, [purposeful way done. There is no way around looking at that again. Well, I thought maybe his assignment was, You know. This person (         ). Yeah. I mean if you think about your assignment, maybe the person thinks the assignment is junk. Rather than attacking the format of the paper, I would first find out why this person feels this is acceptable.

LT2: [Yeah. Yeah.

LT2: Um. [It’s almost like a challenge. You know. He wants to see how you react,

CT1: [You know. Why, why you think this assignment is okay. Yeah.

CT1: Yeah, something, I think something kinda of like too. ‘Cause I don’t (. ) I can’t see how strictly this person is a PhD student, right? I can’t see how they could possibly think that turning in something four sentences on one piece of paper 38, 45 point font is gonna be acceptable, ‘cause it’s an ELI class anyway. It’s here. You know. You said one page. Ha ha ha. Oh, okay.

NT1: Two pages. Ha ha ha.

LT2: Wow!

LT1: Maybe a combination of both. Talk to the person and say this needs to be re-submitted. And this is the envelope I wanted, and if you don’t give it to me, I am sorry, I won’t be able to grade you. You get a non-credit for this assignment. You have to (         ).

NT1: Right.

LT2: I sometimes, like create the guideline or criteria with the paper, the original paper, so he knows, and like underlining,

LT1: That’s a good idea.

LT2: to save time.