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ABSTRACT

Conversation analytic studies of classroom interaction have uncovered intricate ways in which classroom talk is organized, demonstrating recurrently observed practices and resources of instructional activities. The scope of these studies includes content and language instruction in a diverse range of monolingual, bilingual, multilingual, heritage, and foreign language learning contexts, but such research has mostly focused on typical classroom formations where only one teacher is present in the classroom.

This dissertation examines an under-researched context of bilingual co-teaching wherein two teachers – an American and a Korean teacher – concurrently use English and Korean to carry out content-based lessons. Guided by the theoretical and methodological framework of Conversation Analysis (CA), this study takes interest in describing the interactional organization of co-taught lessons as well as the semiotic resources that teachers deploy to coordinate an integrated lesson. The study centers on three analytical topics. Initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequences exhibit a distinct interactional structure wherein the co-teachers and students flexibly adapt the IRF to manage local classroom contingencies, coordinate student participation, and achieve the curricular focus of the lesson. Analysis of embodiment unveils how the participants use language and nonvocal conduct to build temporally unfolding participation frameworks and construct socially available resources in the organization of second language (L2) vocabulary instruction. Social asymmetries that emerge in co-teacher interaction are shown to be related to the teachers’ differential access to Korean and English language, entitlement to remedy instruction, and authority to student discipline and classroom management. The dissertation concludes with some recommendations for ESL/EFL co-teaching research and collaborative bilingual teaching practices in Korea.
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TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Based on the system developed by Jefferson (2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>length of silence in tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>micro pause less than 2/10 of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>continuous intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>full rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.i</td>
<td>slightly rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>prolongation of the preceding sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>contiguous utterances, no gap between two turns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>marked stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(word)</td>
<td>transcriber’s unsure hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>unintelligible talk to transcriber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°word°</td>
<td>quieter than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>louder than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhh</td>
<td>audible aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>audible inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;word&lt;</td>
<td>speech delivery that is quicker than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;word&gt;</td>
<td>speech delivery that is slower than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>marked rising shift in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>marker falling shift in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$word$</td>
<td>smiley voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w(h)ord</td>
<td>within speech aspiration, possibly laughingly uttered word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>transcriber’s description of events and bodily movements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS FOR NONVOCAL DETAILS

Adapted from Goodwin (2013) and Mondada (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>onset of gesture, gaze, or action described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td>preparation of gesture, gaze, or action described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>retraction of gesture, gaze, or action described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>gesture, gaze, or action described continues until excerpt’s end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--&gt;&gt;*</td>
<td>gesture, gaze, or action described continues until the same symbol is reached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN INTERLINEAR GLOSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>INJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR</td>
<td>Attributive</td>
<td>INTERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUM</td>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>NML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Committal</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connective</td>
<td>PNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>POL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copular</td>
<td>PROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT:RE</td>
<td>Deductive reasoning</td>
<td>PROS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>PRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Factual Realization</td>
<td>PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARSAY</td>
<td>Hearsay marker</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>Honorific</td>
<td>TOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Informal ending</td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPER</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives

Studies within Ethnomethodology (EM) and Conversation Analysis (CA) have focused on classrooms and educational settings from early on (McHoul, 1978, 1990; Mehan, 1979), but it is especially through the late 1990s and early 2000s that this area of research saw significant growth. Hester and Francis’s (2000) edited volume, Local Educational Order, represents the most current EM perspective in that the collected studies focus on “learning and teaching as it is accomplished and realized in its interactional context” (p. 14), and that is, the locally ordered organization of classroom interaction.

Aligning with this perspective, the present dissertation investigates the interactional organization of bilingual co-teaching in South Korea. Co-teaching in second and foreign language education is increasingly becoming a widespread instructional practice, not only in the United States, but particularly in Asian contexts such as Japan, China, Hong Kong, and Korea (Carless & Walker, 2006; Carless, 2006; W.-H. Luo, 2007; M. Park & Rha, 2009). Despite its prevalence, co-teaching has been surprisingly under-researched in the field of second language (L2) studies, and it is also a classroom setting that has not been commonly examined in CA research (but see Aline & Hosoda, 2006; Y. Park, 2014).

The aim of this study is, therefore, to explicate the underlying structure and interactional relevancies that enable participants in a co-taught lesson to accomplish order in their classroom activities. By observing the micro details of the teachers’ and students’ moment-by-moment verbal and bodily conduct, the presented analyses will also unveil the multimodal nature of the
teacher collaboration, resulting in sensitively-timed activities that promote the joint accomplishment of curricular objectives. Lastly, through the analysis of differential teacher roles as they are enacted in interaction, the study situates itself in the discussion of teacher partnerships in co-teaching research. By meeting these objectives, this study contributes to four areas in the field of applied linguistics and L2 studies: research on co-taught classrooms, simultaneity in cooperative organizational work, multimodality in L2 interaction, and interactional asymmetries in institutional settings.

1.2. Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 2 reviews the literature that directed the focus of the study which includes (a) theoretical assumptions and methodologies used in co-teaching research, (b) principles of CA, (c) CA studies of L2 classroom interaction, (d) embodiment in institutional and L2 classroom settings, and (e) interactional asymmetries in institutional contexts. The chapter aims to make clear the underlying motivation of this study, and the research questions will be presented at the end.

Chapter 3 describes the research context, participants, data collection procedures, and the transcription process.

The data analysis of this dissertation is discussed in Chapters 4 through 6.

Chapter 4 starts with a discussion on initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequences in classroom interaction which defines the focal phenomenon of the analysis. The IRF sequences of co-taught lessons will be examined to unveil the particular interactional structure through which participants make reference to and manage the co-existence of two teachers in the classroom.
Chapter 5 focuses on the embodied nature of teacher collaboration. Building on the earlier studies of nonvocal behavior in institutional and L2 classroom settings, this chapter investigates how the participants use language and bodily conduct to build temporally-unfolding frameworks of participation and construct socially available resources in their organization of L2 vocabulary instruction.

Chapter 6 reviews the literature on co-teacher roles, and how interactional asymmetry paves way to analyze how co-teacher roles are conversationally assembled in and throughout classroom interaction. The chapter explores the co-teachers’ practices of orienting to differential access, entitlement, and authority as they are occasioned in the course of ongoing lessons. It begins with a discussion on the participation framework (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004) and the

Finally, in Chapter 7, the main findings and implications of this study are summarized, and directions for future research are suggested.
CHAPTER 2
BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will first present a brief overview of co-teaching research, address current gaps in literature, and discuss the potential contributions of taking a CA approach. Secondly, I will outline the major principles in conversation analysis (CA) that shape the analysis of this study and discuss the relevance of CA studies that investigate L2 interactions and L2 interactions in classroom settings. Thirdly, I will turn to the significance of taking participants’ nonvocal behavior into account and review studies that have examined the organization of embodied resources in institutional settings as well as L2 interactions. Fourthly, I will discuss the current CA literature on interactional asymmetries in institutional settings, and describe the CA principles in investigating issues of power. Lastly, I will present the research questions that take to focus the sequential organization of co-taught lessons, the embodied accomplishment of collaborative L2 teaching, and the interactional (a)symmetries that are illustrative of the teacher roles, responsibilities, and relationships that are enacted in the temporally unfolding interaction of co-teaching.

2.2 Co-teaching

2.2.1 Definitions and Theoretical Rationales

Co-teaching has been around since the 1970s. As an instructional practice where “two or more individuals [are] delivering substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of students in a single space” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 2), co-teaching initially emerged from the
field of general education in the USA, mainly to provide assistance to disabled students in inclusive classrooms. The widely accepted definition above, therefore, comes from the field of special education, but it is also applied to ESL/EFL contexts to refer to teacher pairs or groups that collaboratively plan and deliver instruction to the same group of assigned students.

The underlying assumption of co-teaching is that the synergy resulting from cooperation will lead to greater educational benefits than an individual teacher working alone (Davis, 1996; Edge, 1995; Nunan, 1992). Co-teaching has cooperative learning theory as its base, presuming that positive interdependence among teachers may result in gains for both the students and the co-teachers (Beninghof, 2012; Edge, 1995). Through mutual planning and sharing of ideas, it is believed that the teachers can supplement each other with their individual strengths and expertise, and the integration of their instructional presentations will lead to more effective teaching and learning in class (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2012). When done well, theoretically, co-teaching also has the potential to lead to higher student achievement (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007).

The actual implementation of co-teaching, however, is not without its challenges. Teachers often report being confused about their shared roles and responsibilities, mostly because specific guidelines are rarely provided by the institution. Co-teaching is often a policy that is imposed top-down from the institution, and it is assumed that teachers can figure out on their own what it involves (Liu, 2008). Meanwhile, communication barriers may cause difficulties among co-teachers, especially when dealing with a partner who hold different teaching philosophies, or more often in EFL settings, when the co-teachers do not share the same first language (Beninghof, 2012). Issues of teacher status and positions may also affect the relationship of co-teachers. According to Flores (2012), ESL teachers particularly in the United States face negative attitudes in that they are viewed as having a lower status than general
education teachers. Reports thus indicate that the teacher partnerships often results in “pseudo-collaboration” where the ESL teachers are marginalized as “aids” (DelliCarpini, 2009; G. McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Although brief, these findings suggest that co-teaching is a sensitive, complex task, and it cannot be taken for granted that collaboration in every teacher pair will occur in its most optimal form.

2.2.2 Approaches and Methodologies

When it comes to co-teaching research, it should be pointed out that the majority of the work has centered on the fields of general and special education. Empirical studies on ESL/EFL settings are relatively scarce, and this is even more the case for bilingual co-teaching where teachers draw on different languages in their instructions. Nonetheless, a variety of approaches and methodologies have been adopted to investigate co-teaching from different perspectives. The approaches and methodologies used in current ESL/EFL co-teaching research are summarized into the following categories:

(1) conceptual discussions on developing frameworks for effective co-teaching (Davison, 2006); (2) interview studies that survey ESL and general education co-teachers’ roles and beliefs (Choi, 2009; Fu, Houser, & Huang, 2007; N. Kim, 2012; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012); (3) discourse analysis or ethnography of communication studies that analyze the planning conversations of ESL and general education co-teachers to explore issues of power (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2002; G. McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010) and different discourse patterns of co-teachers in the classroom (Creese, 2006; S. Lee & Chang, 2011); (4) case studies on the development of ESL and general education co-teaching relationships overtime (York-Barr et al., 2007) or resulting changes specifically due participation in professional workshops (Baecher, 2012); (5) experimental studies on
the effect of co-teaching on student achievement (M. Park & Rha, 2009); and (6) conversation-analytic studies on interaction in co-taught lessons (Aline & Hosoda, 2006; J.-E. Park, 2014).

2.2.3 Gaps in literature

Having presented a brief overview of the main theoretical assumptions and methodologies used in ESL/EFL co-teaching research, I will identify two prevailing assumptions in the current co-teaching literature that deserve further examination.

First, most co-teaching research has treated teacher collaboration as an activity that happens primarily outside the classroom. The majority of co-teaching research emphasizes the planning and reflections stages of co-taught lessons, as well as the attitude, effort, and expectations that teachers hold towards their colleague (Davison, 2006). However, how that teacher cooperation is established and sustained in classroom interaction remains as an empirical question. Despite any teacher planning that may precede a co-taught lesson, the actual delivery is a dynamic and contingent process that requires instructional decisions to be made on-the-fly (Y.-A. Lee, 2007). The complexities of coordinating a bilingual co-taught lesson then involve momentary adjustments that not only advance the instruction, but also lie in mutual alignment with the co-teacher’s actions and expectations.

The second assumption is that teacher collaboration is viewed as an individual product. Dahlman and Hoffman (2012) criticized the treatment of co-teaching as “an individual outcome or product, rather than a multilevel process of collaboration” (p. 43). Like any other social interaction, co-teaching consists of a co-constructed process that is accomplished via constant analyses of the co-participant’s ongoing actions and making appropriate adjustments that jointly promote the progressivity of the activity. In this respect, interview or survey studies succeed in
eliciting the opinions, attitudes, and experiences of individual teachers, but they miss out on the opportunities to examine the co-constructed nature of collaboration as negotiated in interaction. The few studies that do look into co-taught classroom discourse recognize the various roles and actions accomplished by the co-teachers (M.-J. Lee & Seong, 2011; S. Lee & Chang, 2011), but the analyses are reduced into abstract formal categories such as display or referential question, recast, and clarification. While these approaches may be useful in looking across multiple cases, the question remains as to whether and to what extent the pre-established functional categories explicate in detail the multiple layers of interpretive work that the co-teachers and students engage in situ.

In fact, two studies by Aline and Hosoda (2006) and Park (2014) used CA as their methodology to examine the collaboration of one teacher pair delivering an EFL lesson in Japan and in Korea. Both studies move away from subscribing to predestined categories that exist a priori to interaction. Instead, teacher collaboration is conceptualized as a social activity that is accomplished in and through temporally unfolding interaction. By taking a procedural approach to ongoing co-taught lessons, the studies reveal how the co-teachers and students all work together to achieve their common goal of teaching and learning, and at the same time, evoke various institutional roles in pursuit of their immediate interactional and instructional needs.

Both studies illustrate in detail the different participatory roles of the teachers (e.g., bystander, translator, co-learner, non-leading teacher, etc.), but these articles, like any study, is not without their shortcomings. First, a question that remains is how the teachers, in evoking their participatory roles, work around the typical interactional patterns found in single teacher classrooms. Previous CA studies have found routinized structures and systematicities that govern classroom interaction (e.g., initiation-response-feedback sequence), but it is yet unknown how
these sequential patterns are organized in co-taught lessons and what participation opportunities are created for students as a result. A second limitation regards the full nature of the “non-leading” or the “bystanding” teacher’s participation. Focusing only on talk, the non-leading teacher is portrayed as an uninvolved member unless he or she verbally intervenes in the ongoing lesson. On the other hand, it is also likely that the non-leading teacher, although silent, is actively displaying alignment with the lesson-in-progress via simultaneous enactments of bodily conduct (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, eye gaze, etc.). Gaining access to such details would lead to a fuller description of how the teachers are sensitive to the concurrent activities of their partner, coordinating their actions with one another during the course of the unfolding lesson to deliver collaborative and integrated instruction. Lastly, one major interest in co-teaching literature has concerned teacher partnerships, and especially regarding potential imbalance in teacher roles, status, and authority (Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; M. Kim, 2010b). Such issues are not addressed in either Aline and Hosoda (2006) or Park (2014), and to my knowledge, have not yet been examined from an interactional perspective.

Therefore, this dissertation seeks to address each of these shortcomings while taking a similar approach to Aline and Hosoda (2006) and Park (2014) in that it views co-teaching as an interactional, co-constructed, and temporally as well as contingently unfolding accomplishment. Teacher collaboration is located in the in the coordinated management of turntaking (Lerner, 1993), actions and action formation, sequence organization, and stance through vocal and embodied practices (C. Goodwin, 2007b) – all indigenous methods by which members of a team may monitor, orient to, and align with each other’s actions. By tracing the specific interactional practices that co-teachers employ, CA is able to show their coordinated choices and methods in
dealing with local classroom contingencies, and by implication, how teacher collaboration is made visible and consequential in interaction.

2.3 Conversation Analysis

CA originated in the mid-1960’s as a subdiscipline of sociology. The pioneering figure Harvey Sacks, along with his colleagues Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, was largely influenced by the ethnomethodological project of Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel, which led him to view interaction order in social activities as a central topic of sociological inquiry. Sacks (1984) proposed that there is “order at all points” in interaction (p. 22) and through mutually intelligible and coordinated actions, participants produce meaningful orderliness of interaction as an ongoing practical accomplishment. Under this perspective, the CA analyst’s task is to uncover and describe the underlying machinery that enables co-participants to accomplish social organization and order in the micro level of interactional details.

To this aim, CA starts its investigation with a systematic and rigorous explication of the moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn, sequence-by-sequence unfolding of verbal and nonvocal conduct that is captured in recordings of naturally-occurring interactions (Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007b; ten Have, 1999). Instead of applying theoretical assumptions or contextual information \textit{a priori} to the data, CA is strictly data driven in that it points to the precise moment that a turn at talk is delivered, traces how the participants interpret each other’s actions, and analyzes how they display their orientations toward the co-participants (Schegloff, 1998; Zimmerman & Boden, 1991). CA also avoids making premature connections with identity ascriptions such as gender, age, and ethnicity, unless such a category is shown to be relevant.
through the participants’ observable verbal and nonvocal conduct (Kasper, 2009a; Macbeth, 2003; Schegloff, 1991).

CA considers that each turn at talk demonstrates the speaker’s understanding of a prior turn, and concurrently, its delivery and design is a reflection of the speaker’s orientation and sensitivity toward the co-participants. For instance, by producing a response turn, the speaker shows that he or she has understood the previous utterance as a question, and thus orients to the expected sequential trajectory that is generated by the question. In this regard, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) note that “the display of those understandings in the talk of subsequent turns affords both a resource for the analysis of prior turns and a proof procedure for professional analyses of prior turns – resources intrinsic to the data themselves” (p. 729). This is called “the next turn proof procedure” (pp. 728-729) which emphasizes that CA analytical claims be grounded in the participants’ own manifestations of understanding in interaction. Analysts having shared membership knowledge with the participants is a necessary condition that can inform and guide the analysis, and any unintuitive member’s understanding needs to be based on visible evidence that is observed and made relevant by the participants within the interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Kasper, 2009a; Schegloff, 1991). This analytical principle is what serves as the very basis of this dissertation in examining the audible and visible organization of bilingual co-taught lessons as it occurs in classroom interaction.

2.3.1 CA Studies of L2 Interaction

Throughout its history of forty years, CA has expanded into an interdisciplinary approach of studying social interaction that encompasses a wide range of conversational and institutional settings. With the increase of global mobility and communication, one of its gradually emerging interests has centered on bilingual and multilingual interactions wherein the participants are
engaging with languages other than their first language. Ever since Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for an “emic” reconceptualization of SLA research, there are now numerous monographs (Hellermann, 2008; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006), edited volumes (Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Nguyen & Kasper, 2009; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011), and an extensive number of journal articles that employ CA as an approach to research interaction and learning in L2 settings. The cumulative body of research findings on L2 interaction, L2 learning as a social interactivity, and development of interactional competence has led to developments in “CA-for-SLA” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Markee, 2000, 2004) wherein one strand of research focused on explicating the interactional practices by which participants visibly do language learning as a social activity (Burch, 2014; Cekaite, 2008; Hellermann & Cole, 2008; Hellermann, 2007; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Markee, 2005; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Seo, 2011) while another took the direction of examining the development of action formats, participation, and use of interactional resources over time (Cekaite, 2007; Hauser, 2013; Hellermann, 2008; Ishida, 2009; Y. Kim, 2009; Y.-A. Lee & Hellermann, 2013; Markee, 2007; Nguyen, 2011). The former approach is more similar to the traditional CA work on institutional talk; the latter is more of a SLA innovation in that CA has not historically been applied to study topics of socially distributed cognition and learning (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Kasper, 2009b; Markee & Seo, 2009; Markee, 2011). These approaches have furthered our understanding on the distinct choices L2 speakers make in their situated use of language, as well as the developmental changes occasioned by their contingent practices of L2 use.

This dissertation is situated with the interests of describing the participants’ interpretive tasks in the contingently evolving sequence of classroom interaction, but in a context that has not
yet been extensively explored in current CA literature. The aim of this study is to specify the choices, concerns, and relevancies that the participants (co-teachers and students) produce in their use of L2 in co-taught classroom settings with prospect of contributing to the established CA endeavor of uncovering the social organization of L2 classroom interaction.

2.3.2 CA Studies of L2 Interaction in Classroom Settings

While studies in ethnomethodology and CA focused on classrooms and educational settings from early on (McHoul, 1978, 1990; Mehan, 1979), the late 1990s saw significant growth in research on classroom interaction, and especially with studies that examined the pedagogical order and workings of L2 “classroom talks” (Markee & Kasper, 2004). In this vein, the institutional nature of teacher-fronted L2 classrooms and its underlying normative practices for turn-taking (Kääntä, 2012; Mortensen, 2008a, 2009; Waring, 2013), sequence organization (Ko, 2009; Y.-A. Lee, 2006, 2007; Y. Park, 2014; Waring, 2008), and repair (Hall, 2007; Kääntä, 2010; Liebscher & Dailey–O’Cain, 2003; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990) have revealed the social organization of L2 classroom interaction as well as the resources and practices that teachers and L2 learners deploy to construct participation frameworks, accomplish lesson objectives, and by extension, create or obstruct language learning opportunities (Walsh, 2002; Waring, 2012a, 2012c). Other studies indicate their interest in task-oriented, learner-centered pedagogies, describing the interactional dynamics and resources that organize student-initiated learning in the planning and implementation stages of group tasks (Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Mori, 2002) and even off-task behaviors (Markee, 2005).

Regardless of teacher-fronted or learner-centered classrooms, one instructional pattern that has been found to be ubiquitous in classroom settings, and thus have been extensively researched in CA literature is the *initiation-response-feedback* (IRF) sequence (Sinclair &
Coulthard, 1975; cf. initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) in Mehan, 1979). The first turn in the exchange is the teacher’s initiation move (I) which consists of an elicitation, directive, or informative (Koole, 2012a), and this move is followed by a student response (R) in the second turn. Depending on the type of initiation, the student response takes the form of an action or a verbal answer. For instance, if a teacher makes a directive such as “turn to page 5,” the expected response is the student turning pages in the book. The response turn then goes back to the teacher who in the third turn position, offers feedback (F) on the correctness or adequacy of the student’s response(s).

This three-part instructional sequence, despite its continuing prevalence in modern L2 classrooms, have been recurrently criticized as a restrictive practice that retains teacher control over matters of correctness and leaves limited room for student responses that go beyond short and unelaborative answers (Macbeth, 2003; Waring, 2009, 2012b). Y.-A. Lee (2007), however, contends that this view obscures a great deal of the intricate work that teachers engage in to deal with instructional contingencies, provide guidance to students’ reasonings, repair understanding problems that arise, and ultimately, achieve curricular objectives as well as progressivity in classroom talk. In the words of Macbeth (2011), “[t]he power and utility of the three-turn sequence lies in how it writes filaments of understanding into public, witnessable organizations of interactional regularity and coherence” (p. 446). IRF provides a crucial mechanism through which the participants display their interpretative analyses of each other’s turns. That is, as teachers’ questions initiate their search for answers, students display their understandings not only of the question but also the kind of answer that it calls for. The teacher’s third position then involves a diverse range of actions that reveals how the students’ response was understood and marks the adequacy of the answer in relation to the pedagogical focus of the lesson (Hall, 1998;
Margutti & Drew, 2014; Zemel & Koschmann, 2011). It is through this recurrent and routinized process that the participants are provided with a coherent activity chain for L2 use and the engendering of learning opportunities in classroom interaction (Hall, 2010; Hellermann, 2003, 2005a; Koole, 2012b).

CA findings on IRF sequences have familiarized us with the normative sequential organization of classroom interaction as well as the wide range of actions implemented in each turn position. However, one gap in this research is that it has predominantly focused on the standard instructional formats where only one teacher is present in the classroom. The data of this dissertation, which centers on co-taught L2 classroom contexts, similarly indicates the overarching prevalence of IRF, but how the presence of two teachers can be made relevant in the organization of IRF sequences has not yet been explored. As co-taught environments differ from the typical two-party, teacher-student participation structure, it generates distinctive interactional patterns that deserve analytic attention in its own right. The addition of another participant – a co-teacher – opens up an interactional space for a wider range of initiation, response, and feedback moves. Furthermore, when one teacher makes an instructional move, it is likely be a public display of two interpretive frames: an analysis of the students’ responses and an analysis of the preceding instruction that was laid out by the co-teacher. It is within these multiple layers that the co-teachers and students establish the norms and expectations of their roles and the types of instructional actions by which lesson objectives are defined moment-by-moment. Therefore, one goal of this dissertation is to examine the actions served by different teacher pairs and their students, to produce an empirical account on how the participants flexibly work around the typical IRF sequences to deal with their local classroom contingencies. The analysis will focus on the co-teacher actions that are instantiated in each turn position – initiation, response, and
feedback – as well as the interpretive choices and methods through which participants make relevant the co-presence of two teachers.

The next section discusses the current literature on gestures and embodied resources in interaction. Focusing on studies that take a conversation-analytic approach to embodiment, I will first summarize how multimodality has led to a renewed understanding of the organization of social action. I will then move on to review research that examines the use of embodied resources in L2 classroom settings. Lastly, I will argue how an analytical interest on embodied details will promote an understanding of the multimodal organization of bilingual co-teaching as well as the environment for L2 use and learning that it affords.

2.4. Embodiment in Interaction

The interplay of talk and embodied resources in the accomplishment of social action and activity has increasingly been explored in conversation analytic studies of interaction (C. Goodwin, Streeck, & LeBaron, 2011; Heath & Luff, 2012). Whereas the long-standing tradition of conversation analysis concentrated on situated, sequential analyses of verbal talk, these studies argue that social action is not constructed through a single medium, but through the simultaneous coordination of multiple semiotic resources that include gaze, gesture, body orientation, and even material objects. A clear illustration of this approach comes from Goodwin's (2007) archeologists example. In Excerpt 2.1, Ann, a senior archeologist, and Sue, a graduate student are working together on an excavation project. Both are scrutinizing the color patterning of the dirt while Ann tries to outline the shape of an archeological feature.
In line 1, Ann puts out a question to Sue, “wha’ do you think of:.” If attending to talk only, the linguistic structure of the question appears to be incomplete: the “of” prepositional phrase is absent of its object. However, if we consider the embodied details of the interaction, the slot for the prepositional object is filled with a concrete reference. Right after Anne says “of:,” she points with her right index finger towards subtle differences in the color pattern of the dirt. The pointing gesture thus disambiguates what Ann was talking about, and Sue responds by incorporating that recognition not only in her verbal response “does it kinda go aro:und” but also in her corresponding actions of tracing with a trowel exactly that spot Ann had indicated (line 3). Both Ann’s question and Sue’s response are built through the simultaneous use of different semiotic resources (language, gesture, and the trowel), which according to Goodwin (2007b), “mutually elaborate each other to create a whole that is different from, and greater than, any of its constituent parts” (p. 55).
The embodied practices of the participants, however, do more than simply supplying content to the talk. Note that Ann’s pointing gesture is placed at a visual field where Sue’s gaze is already directed at prior to the question. In other words, Ann’s gesture works under the presupposition that her addressee Sue is also attending to a specific place in the local environment that is the focus of their work. It is within this embodied participation framework that interpretations of the “incomplete” prepositional phrase and other indexical, deictic expressions such as “it” (line 3) and “there” (line 4) are made possible (Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000). Participants monitor each other’s embodied practices in order to design their actions towards their recipients, and more importantly, to display their mutual orientation towards each other and their surrounding environments (C. Goodwin, 1981). In essence, embodied practices that organize and sustain participation frameworks create local semiotic environments where participants are able to treat each other as attending to and working within a shared world of social experiences, enabling them to accomplish locally relevant action in concert with each other (C. Goodwin, 2000; Streeck, Goodwin, & Lebaron, 2011).

In fact, conversation analytic studies on multimodality have demonstrated these very points, explicating in detail the way gaze, gesture, and other visible conduct are coordinated with talk to indicate commitment and mutual orientation towards one another. For instance, Goodwin (1980, 1981) as well as Stivers and Rossano (2010) revealed that one way in which participants signal to one another their availability to interact is through subtle shifts in their eye gaze. In medical consultations, Heath (1986) found that patients used their gaze to direct the doctor’s attention to parts of their bodies that needed medical examination. Gestures and body orientation can also be organized in such a way as to convey that a participant is ready for collaborative action or to negotiate participation frameworks. Mondada (2007) showed that pointing gestures
indicate the emergent process of negotiating speakership, making visible the ways in which a recipient orients to an ongoing turn by the speaker. By the same token, Heath (1984) and Goodwin (2002) illustrated how postural shift directed toward a co-participant can display recipiency. Goodwin (2007b), in his analysis of a father helping out his child’s homework, demonstrated that bodily arrangements provide the basis for joint attention, an environment where instrumental, cooperative, epistemic, and affective stances are negotiated. These studies were seminal in that they treated nonvocal aspects of interaction as part of the sequential unfolding of human action. Embodiment is not just a “para” or “extralinguistic” feature that simply re-states or supplements verbal talk. Rather, embodiment in itself carries crucial interactional functions that has immediate consequences for the negotiation of participant roles (C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004), turn construction, design, and projection (Mondada, 2006; Streeck, 1995), as well as interactional stances within emerging and changing participant frameworks (C. Goodwin, 2007b).

2.4.1 Embodiment in Professional Activities

In this vein, multimodal conversation analysis has been applied to study complex work environments, to examine how individuals accomplish professional activities in and through talk and bodily conduct. Charles Goodwin studied the work of various professionals which include archeologists (e.g., Goodwin, 2000, 2007a), oceanographers (e.g., Goodwin, 1995), and airline technicians (e.g., Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996; Goodwin, Halowski, Newman, Ochs, & Schegloff, 1996) to show how more-experienced participants guide their less-experienced interlocutor towards a “professional vision” of their joint institutional activity (C. Goodwin, 1994) – in other words, how they direct the novice’s attention to what needs to be seen and how it should be seen. Others have also examined group medical trainings (e.g., Hindmarsh & Pilnick, 2007;
Hindmarsh, Reynolds, & Dunne, 2011; Svensson, Luff, & Heath, 2009), auctions (e.g., Heath & Luff, 2012), architectural meetings (e.g., Mondada, 2007), and multiparty business negotiations (e.g., Markaki & Mondada, 2012; Streeck, 1996). Such organizational settings involve fairly large multiparty interactions, where the participants are demanded to have mutual orientation to and common understandings of the matters displayed in the local environment. By attending to the details of talk and embodiment, these studies capture how members of a “team,” who may have distinct responsibilities, co-ordinate their activities with each other to accomplish a shared institutional task or goal, and how the very intelligibility of each other’s action relies on the complex and occasioned interdependence of the participants’ talk, visual orientation, bodily conduct, and arrangement of objects in the environment. For members working in the “back stage,” who are thereby silent in talk but displaying participation via use of other semiotic resources, embodied conduct provides the analyst with access to the different levels of collaboration that are co-present in such organizational work (Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000).

There are also those cases where people participate in multiple activities at the same time. For example, Mondada (2007b) has where the participants are performing surgery while explaining the process to a remote audience. In these settings, not only are there different actions that happen concurrently, but there are also different layers of participation that co-occur at the same time. According to Deppermann (2013), it is this added dimension of simultaneity that has been made possible by CA research on multimodality, which complements the analysis of sequencing to explain how participants organize synchronous productions of social actions. Altogether, this growing body of research on embodiment leads us to a rich understanding of human activity within organizational settings, how people interactively draw on a wide range of
semiotic resources to work in concert with other members and to constitute their institutional lives.

In this dissertation, I draw on the framework derived from a multimodal focus of conversation analysis to take into account the simultaneous, embodied activities of participants in co-taught lessons. I apply this model of embodied participation which goes beyond the sequential verbal talk occurring between the speaker and hearer (C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; C. Goodwin, 2007b) to fully analyze not only the activities between the leading teacher and the students, but also the silent but active participation of the non-leading teacher that is performed alongside a simultaneous time frame. It is by considering the concurrent activities of all participants, in addition to sequentially organized actions, that we are given with a more complete picture of the interactional organization of collaboratively taught classroom environments (Deppermann, 2013; Streeck et al., 2011).

### 2.3.2 Embodiment in L2 Interaction

By far, the majority of L2 interaction research has been centered on verbal talk. A reason for this may be that many L2 studies depart from the assumption that students are supposed to acquire the linguistic structures of the second/foreign language, and thereby, only talk is of practical concern to researchers and professionals in this field. Lazaraton (2004), therefore, contended that SLA research has been preoccupied with audio-recorded and written data of L2 discourse, overlooking the significant role that nonvocal behaviors may play in L2 interaction.

Addressing this limitation, there has been a recent growth of studies that focus on the nonvocal aspects of L2 interaction from different perspectives: cognitive perspectives (e.g., Gullberg, 2010, 2013), sociocultural perspectives (e.g., McCafferty, 2002), and conversation analytic perspectives (e.g., Kääntä, 2014; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Olsher, 2004). Most relevant to
this dissertation is the last approach. Conversation-analytic studies have provided accounts of what embodied action in L2 or multilingual interaction accomplishes, how teachers and learners make relevant use of embodied conduct in their L2 experiences, and what participation and learning opportunities emerge as a result.

Advocating the benefits that CA may bring to such research, among the first to address multimodality in L2 interaction was Carroll (2004) and Markee (2004). By making comparisons across two different transcripts, where one did not have any descriptions of embodied details, he argued that CA-informed analyses of nonvocal behaviors in L2 interaction can uncover visible moments when learning is occasioned, which may potentially lead us to a better understanding of the socially distributed nature of cognition. Olsher (2004) specified such learning moments by focusing on “embodied completion” – a practice where L2 learners would often cease to talk towards the end of a turn, but instead, complete the turn through a gesture or other embodied display. In relation, Mori and Hayashi (2006) expanded upon this finding to discover that in casual conversations between L1 and L2 Japanese speakers, embodied completions not only facilitated mutual comprehension among the participants, but also allowed for the L1 speaker to reformulate the L2 speaker’s utterance with a more advanced expression in the target language. Similar episodes were also located in the repair sequences of Olsher (2007) and Seo (2011) where L2 learners added gestures to their previous utterances as a way of enhancing the comprehensibility of their talk. When L1 speakers aligned with the gestures accommodate actual or perceived comprehension difficulties, Seo (2011) argued that embodied repair sequences work to publicly display the moment-to-moment changes in the L2 learner’s lexical knowledge. In sum, these studies demonstrate the L2 learners’ interactional competence in deploying nonvocal
resources to achieve intersubjectivity, which by result, engenders opportunities for the L2 speaker to learn linguistic forms in the target language.

Other studies on the nonvocal aspects of L2 interaction have focused on the embodied conduct of teachers and students in the classroom and their role in the organization of participation structures. For instance, Kääntä (2012) showed that the teacher’s embodied actions such as gaze were crucial in the successful allocation of response turns to the students. For students, when they bid for speakership in whole class teacher-student interactions, body movements were deployed to self-select and claim incipient speakership even prior to a turns beginning (Jacknick, 2011; Mortensen, 2008b, 2009). Students, on the other hand, were also found to decline teacher-nominated turns by means of gaze withdrawal, facial expressions, or headshakes that embody their unwillingness to answer (Sert & Walsh, 2012; Sert, 2013). When it came to student group discussions, single head nods were used by L2 learners to move out of primary speakership (Hauser, 2009). Even learners’ off-task talk was managed via nonvocal resources to artfully mask their departure from the teacher’s instruction while still displaying their orientation to the ongoing class activity (Markee, 2005).

Building upon the current literature on embodiment in institutional and L2 settings, the purpose for incorporating visible conduct into the analysis of bilingual co-teaching is twofold: first, to explicate how different kinds of semiotic resources are used and made relevant by co-teachers in their collaborative organization of the lesson and second, to describe what the co-teachers’ gestures and embodied displays offer for the construction of L2 vocabulary activities. Although conversation analytic studies on embodiment in L2 interaction have shed some light on the role of nonvocal behavior in L2 learner speech, what the teacher’s nonvocal actions do for creating L2 learning opportunities have been relatively less discussed. Allen (2000), in her study
that coded and counted the frequencies of a high school Spanish teacher’s nonvocal behavior, found that emblems, deictic gestures, beats, and affective displays were a fundamental aspect of the teacher’s pedagogical repertoire. Similarly, Lazaraton (2004) also discovered that in episodes of incidental vocabulary learning, L2 learners often receive considerable instruction in nonvocal form, which may specify, modify, and disambiguate verbal utterances to make them more comprehensible to the students. These two studies highlight that nonvocal behavior is a substantial consideration in the L2 classroom, but they both present cases where the gestures are redundant of the teachers’ verbal explanations. The data presented in this dissertation, however, concerns episodes when teachers often produce a lexical term without any verbal explanations, and instead, assist the students to infer its meaning via the teachers’ nonvocal cues. This may possibly be due to the fact that the classes in this dissertation are centered on teachers and young L2 students, thereby involving a greater reliance on gesture and other bodily conduct. In any case, by focusing on such contexts, this study aims at describing how the verbal and embodied resources of the co-teachers interact with one other and with the students, and by effect, how the interactional trajectory leads to constructing shared embodied knowledge on L2 vocabulary terms.

2.5 Interactional (A)symmetries

All social interaction is inevitably asymmetric. According to Linell and Luckmann (1991), “if there were no asymmetries at all between people, i.e. if communicatively relevant inequalities of knowledge were non-existing, there would be little or no need for most kinds of communication!” (p. 4). From this standpoint, asymmetry exists even in mundane conversations, between the current speaker and the recipient of a turn at talk, and more generally, between the
participant that directs the topic of the conversation and those who are not. This is not to say, however, that the asymmetries in ordinary conversation and in institutional interaction are fundamentally alike. The general operation of institutional interaction is tied to institutional roles and identities, which by effect, is inseparable from a particular set of tasks, rights, and obligations (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004a). For example, in healthcare settings, physicians’ utterances consist primarily of questions that limit the scope of the information exchange (Robinson, 1998). Similarly, in journalistic interviews, the interaction is largely constrained by the interviewer-led question and answer sequences (Heritage & Clayman, 2002; Heritage, 1985). It is this kind of asymmetry in institutional discourse that directs the interaction in ways that are distinct from ordinary conversations.

2.4.1 Asymmetries in Institutional Talk

Under the CA approach, the institutionality of interaction and its asymmetries have been categorized into four types (Heritage, 2004b): asymmetries of participation, asymmetries of interactional and institutional knowhow, epistemological caution and asymmetries of knowledge, and rights of access to knowledge. First, asymmetry of participation – most institutional interactions involve some kind of special turn-taking organization that spells out the types of contributions individuals are expected to make. Many of these turn-taking patterns consist of an imbalance of roles and expectations, restricting one party to the initiating of actions (e.g., asking questions) and another party to make appropriate alignments (e.g., responding). As a result, courtroom defendants for instance, may not speak unless addressed, but when they are spoken to they must speak, and what they say must conform to the dominant party’s definition of an acceptable contribution (Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Maynard, 1986).

---

1 See Heritage and Clayman (2010) for different configurations of institutional talk.
For the three other sites of asymmetry – interactional and institutional “knowhow,” epistemological caution and asymmetries of knowledge, and rights of access to knowledge – I will discuss in terms of the recent conceptualizations on epistemic domains. In the field of CA, epistemics has most recently received much attention in that it fuels the progressivity of all social interactions (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Heritage, 2010, 2012a, 2012b). Participants repeatedly orient toward the relevance of who knows, what they know, and what they are expected to know. Consequently, speakers’ expectations of their co-participants’ level of knowledge are reflected, for example, in requests for information (where a recipient is treated as knowing) and news announcements (where the recipient is treated as not knowing). Studies have also shown that speakers are careful about making claims when they suspect co-participants have better access to knowledge of some state of affairs (Heritage & Raymond, 2005), just as they avoid designing a turn as a news announcement to someone they suspect already knows (C. Goodwin, 1979; Heritage, 2013; Schegloff, 2007b).

Another dimension of epistemic asymmetry deals with how knowledge is handled by the participants. The first to address this issue was Pomerantz (1980) who coined the terms “Type 1” and “Type 2 knowables” to capture the participants’ management of their entitlement to knowledge. Type 1 concerns knowables which a speaker may not only have access to and relative rights to know, but also be expected and have a responsibility to know. One’s name is an example of this, as are one’s feelings. Type 2 comprises occasioned knowables that related to specific circumstances. For instance, if one traveled to Egypt, that person is likely to be held responsible for some knowledge about the place. Displays of knowledge are recurrently related to some kind of “ownership,” hence bringing the participants’ rights and responsibilities into play (Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011). The ongoing negotiation of the participants about
who has the primary right to know what indexes epistemic authority and subordination, thus functioning as a resource for participants to construct and establish identities as well as their entailment of moral order in interaction (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Stivers, 2005).

These features play an important role in institutional interactions as professionals work to ensure that the provided information is manageable within institutionally relevant interpretive frameworks and is compatible with the interactional agendas they pursue. For instance, psychotherapists deploy questions embedded with presuppositions to scaffold clients’ information-provision in specific directions (Heritage, 2010) or to disattend to certain types of information provided by the clients (Antaki, Barnes, & Leudar, 2004; Antaki, 2010). The participants’ epistemic displays also entail normative and moral expectations that are mapped on to certain institutional roles and identities (Asmuß, 2011; Mondada, 2011a). Heritage (2004) reports a study in which doctors taking their own children to pediatric consultations put their own expertise on hold in favor of attending to the child’s physician. In public service encounters, as another example, the expectations of clients regarding public services are marked by the way in which they frame their requests (Asmuß, 2007). As such, participants organize and negotiate their displays of relative knowledge, access, and entitlement in interaction, as the appropriate distribution of knowledge and expertise is consequential for the successful accomplishment of the institutional task.

The contribution of this line of research on interactional asymmetries is that institutionality, as well as the differential roles, identities, obligations, and expectations of the participants involved, is not a mere reflection of pre-existing institutional circumstances, but both a process and product that is inherent in the interactional practices of institutions and their
incumbents (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Heritage, 2004a; Schegloff, 1992a). That is, through displays of access, entitlement, and responsibilities, participants build their institutional roles in and through the unfolding course of their verbal and nonvocal actions, allowing the analyst to gain access into the relevancies that are made consequential by the participants themselves.

The distinct distribution of knowledge as well the management of access and entitlement are also recurrent and central themes made relevant by the co-teachers in this study, and further discussion will be presented in Chapter 6. By attending to interactional asymmetries, I intend to produce an empirical microanalytic account of the differentially distributed co-teacher roles, rights, and expectations that are oriented to by the participants as they move through their ongoing course of classroom interaction.

### 2.4.2 Power in Interaction

Aside from the interactional asymmetries that are “normalized” as part of the institutional structure, one challenge for CA analysts has been if and how issues of inequality related to institutional roles, stances, and constraints can be grounded in a fine-grained analysis of social interaction. Schegloff (1991) contended that although social identities (e.g., gender, ethnicity, class, etc.) can be potentially relevant to members in a given setting, an immediate connection between identity ascriptions and any particular episode of interaction is unwarrantable. While Schegloff was not against the possibility of CA addressing sociopolitical issues of power and inequality, he was concerned with analyses that started off with a priori assumptions without regarding what is actually made relevant and consequential in the interaction. According to Schegloff (1997), it is after considering foremost the “orientations, meanings, interpretations, understandings, etc. of the participants” (p. 166, emphasis in original) that any analysis of the
exogenous forms of power and inequality should follow. Until we are able to pin down the very mechanisms by which the participants themselves orient to and make relevant in the unfolding of the interaction, what we are left with is “a sense of how the world works, but without its detailed specification” (Schegloff, 1992, p. 106).

By far, asymmetries in co-teaching have been discussed in terms of power relations that are attributed to imbalance in teacher status, content expertise, teaching experience, and responsibilities (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2010; Flores, 2012; Greg McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Such issues of power, however, have been addressed predominantly through interview studies where teachers were asked to share about the relationship with their co-teacher. Several discourse-analytic studies that looked at the actual discourse of teacher meetings and classroom interaction raise our awareness on the distinct functions and characteristics that emerge from the respective teacher’s talk (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2002, 2005, 2006). For instance, Creese (2002), drawing on semiotic functional approaches, points out that in the classroom, the subject teachers discursively performed ownership over their subject area and classroom authority by using in imperatives, the first-person pronoun I to identify with their instruction and the pronoun you to tell the student to act (e.g., “I want you to look for three things”). Creese argues that such discursive patterns position the subject teacher “as the agent and self-nominated controller of classroom themes and action” in directing the curriculum focus (p. 608), whereas the frequent absence of I in the ESL teacher’s discourse (e.g., “What you must do now”) removes him or her from the ownership of the task (Creese, 2006).

Such research foregrounds classroom settings as a potential site, other than interviews, for investigating power asymmetries in teacher partnerships. However, the data is presented as decontextualized strips of sentences, which obscures the context from which the talk emerged.
Not only are the teachers’ interactions analyzed as disconnected episodes, but furthermore, the connection between the pronoun use in the talk between the teachers and the power structures of the institution remains elusive.

Therefore, strictly adhering to Schegloff’s (1991) theoretical principles, this study examines the interactional relevancies of differential teacher roles and authority as they are invoked by the participants themselves. Despite the fact that numerous interview studies have discussed the existence of power differentials in co-teacher relationships, this study does not preconceive any issues of inequality to bear relevance prior to the analysis of the data. Any type of dominance will be explicited in fine-grained detail based upon the participants’ own orientations. To emphasize this principle, I put the “a” in “asymmetries” in parentheses, to indicate that the asymmetries in interaction are not a given, but one that is grounded in careful analytical examinations (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

2.6 Research Questions

Guided by the theoretical and methodological framework of CA, this study takes interest in the micro interactional organization of co-taught lessons to contribute to an empirically-grounded account of bilingual co-teaching in Korea. The analysis will address two types of classroom interactions, which consist of interactions between the co-teachers and the students, and interactions between the two co-teachers. Focusing on the sequence organization, nonvocal behavior, and interactional asymmetries involved in co-taught lessons, the following research questions will frame the study:

1. How are IRF sequences organized in co-taught lessons?
2. How are verbal and nonvocal resources used by the teachers to coordinate teacher roles, display collaboration, and sustain coherence in the lesson?

3. What are the interactional (a)symmetries evoked in the classroom interactions, and what do they reveal about teacher roles\(^2\), responsibilities, and relationships?

\(^{2}\) I should note that the term “role” has been discussed and reconceptualized in CA literature as “identity” (see Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). Under a CA lens, identity ascriptions are not preconceived labels but constructions that are demonstrably oriented to by participants’ actions in interaction. In a similar light, I use the term “role” in this chapter, not in its vernacular sense, but as a specific type of institutional identity that is being contingently accomplished and distributed within an immediate interactional context. Why I choose to use “role” instead of “identity” is to refer categorical memberships in a narrower meaning than “who people are to each other” (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 6), foregrounding the division of teacher obligations and responsibilities that the co-teachers achieve in and through classroom interaction (e.g., leading teacher, mediator, supervisor, etc.).
CHAPTER 3
DATA AND METHOD

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I start out by providing some background on the co-teaching practices in Korea. I will then describe the research setting as well as the participants of the data collection site. Next, the data collection procedure will be elaborated in detail. Lastly, I will explain how the verbal and nonvocal details of the data were transcribed according to CA’s conventions.

3.2 Research Context

3.2.1 Co-teaching in Korea

Since 1995, the government-sponsored English Program in Korea (EPIK) has actively employed “native speakers” of English to teach at elementary and secondary schools. The EPIK program was modeled after the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program which was initiated earlier in 1987 to improve foreign language education and promote internationalization in Japan (JET Program USA, 2014). Whereas numerous critiques on the category of “native speakers” (e.g., V. J. Cook, 1999; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Rampton, 1990) have led both SLA and CA research to shy away from using this term, *weneminkyosa* (the literal translation being “native-speaking English teacher,” and hereafter used as “NETs”) is nonetheless an emic category term used in Korean school settings to refer to English teachers of foreign nationality (N. Kim, 2012). The motivation for recruiting NETs is to promote the students’ development of communicative language skills, provide opportunities for cross-cultural learning, improve English teaching materials and methodologies, and enhance teacher training opportunities for

In 1996, the EPIK program recruited a total number of 632 native speakers of English from the U.S., U.K., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and South Africa to teach in local school settings. As of April 2010, this number increased to 8,556 NETs working in Korea (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2010), where 2,008 of them were recruited through the EPIK program and the rest were employed through other resources (e.g., Ministry of Education, municipal governments, autonomous districts, independent school contracts, and Fulbright scholars). Considering that this number is limited to public school settings, without including private schools, the total number of NETs working in Korea currently consists of a much larger pool. The presence of NETs is thereby no longer uncommon in English classes of Korean elementary and secondary school settings (M. Kim, 2010a).

The growing number of NETs has also resulted in the increase of co-teaching situations, as they are often partnered up with English teachers of Korean nationality to carry out English lessons in the same classroom. The current English program in Korea promotes co-teaching between Korean English teachers and NETs (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2006), and as stated on the EPIK website, such teaching partnerships require the NETs to “assist Korean teachers with their English classes, and/or jointly conduct English classes with Korean teachers, and/or extracurricular activities or English camps” (EPIK, 2014b).

The common rationale for co-teaching in the Korean context is if the native English speaking teacher’s language and cultural expertise can be combined with the Korean teacher’s expertise.

---

3 Below are the reported number of new NETs that were recruited since 2010 (EPIK, 2014c):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total NETs Placed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010.4</td>
<td>Total 2,008 EPIK teachers placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.4</td>
<td>Total 3,193 EPIK teachers placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.4</td>
<td>Total 3,477 EPIK teachers placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013.4</td>
<td>Total 3,066 EPIK teachers placed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
familiarity with teaching local students, the complementarity will result in English lessons of higher quality. Teacher-teacher conversations can provide students with an authentic model of communication in the target language, and the availability of two teachers would lead to more possibilities for individualized attention to the students. In addition, the entire process is also considered to be an opportunity for professional development for the Korean teachers, as they can enhance their English proficiency and learn different teaching styles from their native-speaking colleague (M. Kim, 2010b; M. Park & Rha, 2009; S.-H. Park, 2009).

One important note is that the native English speaking teachers, although they may be given equal “titles” with the Korean teachers (whether it is in terms of being homeroom teacher or a comparable English teacher status), their official visa and employment status is pocokyosa (“assistant teacher”). Therefore, in certain school settings, native English speaking teachers are not allowed to teach alone. Furthermore, their visa and employment contract is based upon renewal every one or two years, while the Korean teachers are usually employed with a tenured status.

3.2.2 Setting

The data for this study comes from a Christian private elementary school (K-6) located in Gyeonggi province, South Korea. This school can be considered as an elite bilingual program and their English education program has maintained a high reputation in the community for their innovative approaches. They had native English speakers teaching English to their students since the early 1990s when it was less common to teach English to elementary students, and until the late 2000s, they were one of the very few elementary schools in Korea to implement English immersion practices in their classroom.
In 2009, the school changed their program’s name from English immersion to the broader title of bilingual education. When the program was called English immersion, math, science, art, and English language arts were taught by an American teacher, and social studies as well as Korean language arts were taught by the Korean homeroom teacher. Physical education and music were taught by specialized Korean teachers. The same format and curriculum was maintained in the new bilingual education program, but the major change was in their introduction of a dual instructional system.

First, each class changed from having only one Korean homeroom teacher to having two homeroom teachers: one Korean teacher, and one American teacher. Also, whereas the non-Korean subjects (math, science, art) were taught only in English before, the bilingual system required them to be co-taught by Korean and American teachers. The program no longer enforces the exclusive use of English in these subjects but instead, promotes the use of Korean and bilingual co-teaching “to provide a safe and supportive bilingual environment for students,” especially for those students with low academic and English proficiency.

The data was collected over two terms – the summer of 2012 and the fall of 2013 – and within that year, drastic changes took place at the site. When I visited the school in 2012, science and math was being co-taught by the Korean and American teachers. However when I returned to the site in 2013, math was eliminated from being a co-taught subject, and the program coordinator explained that the subject was too difficult for the teachers to manage in English. Instead, math became a subject that was only taught by the Korean teacher. An additional change happened with science. Although officially, science was also designated by the program as a co-taught subject, only two classes out of the ten classes in the first and second grade were able to maintain their co-teaching initiatives. What most of the teachers were doing was more of a

---

4 This is a direct quote from the institution’s teacher manual that was distributed for the academic year of 2014.
division of labor, where science and English was taught by American teachers alone, and the
Korean teacher took responsibility of the remaining subjects. As a result, less discussions or
meetings occurred between the two homeroom teachers regarding the lessons, which was another
change that had happened overtime.

This program is not alone in experiencing such changes. As briefly discussed in Chapter
2, with co-teaching often being a top-down imposition from the institution, teachers from both
ESL and EFL contexts have frequently reported the challenges resulting from the lack of specific
guidelines, clear set of expectations and goals, teacher role definitions, and institutional support
for teacher training sessions on co-teaching (Carless & Walker, 2006; M. Kim, 2010b; N. Kim,
2012). Establishing continuity of co-teaching practices in a program necessitate enabling features
that consider the teachers’ pedagogic, logistical, and interpersonal needs which cannot be
achieved overnight (Beninghof, 2012; Carless, 2006). Therefore, I consider the challenges that
the institute was facing as part of an integral process involved in the experimental stage of any
language program, and in this regard, I situate this study as a potential aid towards informing the
participants with an understanding of their current practices.

3.3 Participants

A total of six teacher pairs and 132 students participated in the study. However, the
Korean teachers and students from the first grade classes in 2013 were the same group with the
second grade classes in 2014. Only the American teachers had changed, due to the termination of
their employment contracts, which resulted in new teacher partnerships. So fairly speaking, the
study looks at 4 Korean teachers and 6 American teachers. Table 3.1 summarizes the gender,
nationality, languages, and teaching experience of each teacher. The Korean teachers are
abbreviated as KT and the American teachers as ET. The numbers in subscript indicate the different individuals.

Table 3.1 Participant background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>nationality</th>
<th>language(s) spoken</th>
<th>teaching experience on site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KT₁</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT₂</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT₃</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT₄</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₁</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>English, Chinese</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₂</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean-American</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₃</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean-American</td>
<td>English, Korean</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₄</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean-American</td>
<td>English, Korean</td>
<td>1 year &amp; 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₅</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>German-American</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET₆</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Canadian-American</td>
<td>English, intermediate level of Korean</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection

The first set of data was collected in the summer of 2012 from two first grade classes. In the following year, the larger set of data was collected over the fall semester focusing on the science lessons of two second grade classes and the theme-based lessons from two kindergarten classes that were collected over the fall of 2013. In total, six teacher pairs were observed.

In the first and second grade classes, the co-taught subject *science*, was scheduled once a week and ran for two class periods (80 minutes). Because of school events (festivals, sport days, field trips, etc.) and holidays, the total number of science classes during the fall 2013 semester amounted to six or seven classes. The length of teacher talk for each 40-minute lesson (i.e., talk that addressed instructional business) ranged from 14 to 21 minutes. The rest of the class time was reserved for student work on individual worksheets, group activities, games, or student presentations.
On the days that science lessons were scheduled, I set up three cameras in the classroom to record the lesson from different angles. One camera was placed in the front of the classroom, one in the back, and one was angled at one of the student groups. Two audiorecorders were also placed on the two of the students’ group desks to capture the talk in their small group interactions. Both the camera and audiorecorders were left there for the entire school day. When necessary, I also collected and took pictures of the students’ handouts and artifacts. Although this dissertation focuses only on the co-teaching in science class interactions, the videorecordings also include other settings such as morning routines, lessons in other subjects, break time, and lunch time interactions. I was mostly present during the science lessons taking field notes while also providing assistance with the lesson.

The kindergarten classes on the other hand were not divided by subjects, but by themes (e.g., sports, family, thanksgiving, etc.) that were co-taught during one class period almost daily. I was given permission to record starting from mid-October and only one class period a week (50 mins). Therefore, I was not able to record or observe any other interactions outside of the lesson. Table 3.2 summaries the total hours of videorecorded data collected from each class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER 2012</th>
<th>FALL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6/13 – 7/17)</td>
<td>(9/12 – 12/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First grade</strong> (Math &amp; Science)</td>
<td><strong>Second grade</strong> (Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT₁ ET₁</td>
<td>KT₂ ET₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19h 29 min</td>
<td>11h 23 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 96 hours 38 min</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Transcription

Out of the 97 hours of data, the video recordings were reviewed repeatedly to identify teacher-student as well as teacher-teacher interactions during the lessons. Other student group activities, recess, and lunch time were excluded from the focus of the study. This led to approximately a total of 9 hours of data which was transcribed according to the standard CA transcription system for English (Jefferson, 2004) and Korean (Y. Kim, 2009). The Korean transcriptions include a three-tier system that involves Yale romanizations of Korean, interlinear glossings, and idiomatic translations.

After transcribing the verbal details of the data, the participants’ nonvocal behavior was added on a separate line above the vocal line of the transcript (ten Have, 1999). The transcription of non-verbal behavior was adapted from the work of Goodwin (2013) and Mondada (2011) which includes textual descriptions of gaze, posture, facial expression, gesture as well as frame grabs of the videorecordings. Because it is impossible and even impractical to transcribe every single aspect of the participants’ embodied behaviors, only visual details that were notably relevant to the participants and critical to the analytical interests of this study were documented as part of the transcript.

An important point to be made here is that a transcription is never complete (see Jefferson, 1996 for "transcriptional stereotyping"), and it is always a representation, not an object that substitutes the interactional event recorded. Transcripts are inevitably selective, motivated, and open to changes as one moves through the analytical process (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Psathas & Anderson, 1990). In this regard, the transcripts in this study is viewed as the analyst's tool for “pausing” the interaction, as a way of observing and noticing recurrent features, sequences, patterns, and events (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Zimmerman, 1988). Transcripts are

---

5 See preface for transcription conventions, abbreviations for glossings, and a list of short hands.
also a convenient resource in that it provides a common ground between the audience and
analyst and allows the readers to have access to the focal phenomenon described (Silverman,
2006).
CHAPTER 4
INITIATION-RESPONSE-FEEDBACK IN CO-TAUGHT LESSONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter brings into view the organization of initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequences in co-taught lessons. To this aim, I will start out with a review of CA research that examines the structure and systematics of IRF sequences in classroom interaction. Next, I will discuss what conversation analytic studies have revealed in regards to the impact of IRF sequences on student participation and learning opportunities in the classroom.

This discussion sets the background for the analysis that is divided into three sections. The first section of the analysis focuses on the first turn position (initiation) of IRF sequences, especially joint teacher initiations that occur across adjacent, overlapping, and interruptive turns. In the second section, of primary interest are cases when the co-teacher enters the second turn position (response) of the other teacher’s IRF, a space that is normally reserved for student responses in single-teacher classrooms. Lastly, the third section concerns the third turn position (feedback) wherein the respective teacher assessments and follow up turns display moment-to-moment convergence and conflict of the co-teachers’ agendas across the IRF sequence.

This analysis marks IRF in co-teaching with a distinct type of interactional structure where the co-presence of the teachers is made relevant through the participants’ actions and orientations. By explicating on the details of these practices, this chapter leads to a deeper understanding on how co-teachers and students work around the structure of IRF sequences to manage their local classroom contingencies, coordinate student participation, and ultimately, to move towards achieving the instructional focus of the interaction.
4.2 Organization of IRF in Classroom Interaction

A central finding of early CA studies is the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; cf. Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) in Mehan, 1979), a sequential feature of classroom discourse that is widely known among applied linguists and education scholars. The first turn in the exchange is the teacher’s initiation move (I) which consists of an elicitation, directive, or informative (Koole, 2012a), and this move is followed by a student response (R) in the second turn. Depending on the type of initiation, the student response takes the form of an action or a verbal answer. For instance, if a teacher makes a directive such as “turn to page 5,” the expected response is the student turning pages in the book. The response turn then goes back to the teacher who in the third turn position, offers feedback (F) on the correctness or adequacy of the student’s response(s).

This type of sequential pattern is quite prevalent in teacher-fronted whole class discussions (Nassaji & Wells, 2000). Out of the three-part sequence, the types of questions initiated in the first turn and their impact on student responses have been examined, leading into controversial interpretations of the teacher’s “known-answer” questions (Hall, 1998) or namely, the “display question” (Long & Sato, 1983). Display questions in the first position slot have long been criticized for restricting the scope of student responses and for imposing the teacher’s own knowledge as the correct way of thinking (Macbeth, 2003; Seedhouse, 2004; Waring, 2012c). Teachers have been encouraged instead to use more “referential questions” (Long & Sato, 1983), which in contrast, ask for answers that the teacher does not know and may promote genuine information exchange (Carlsen, 1991; Ellis, 1994).

Y.-A. Lee (2006), however, argues that the categorical terms of display and referential questions do not do justice to what teacher’s initiation turns do in classroom interaction.
Sequential analyses of ESL classroom interaction reveal that teacher’s display questions are important resources for clarifying meanings and connecting students’ commonsense knowledge to topics that are specific to the lesson (Y.-A. Lee, 2010). Questions used in the classroom are situated accomplishments where the actions and interpretations of them are contingent upon the sequential environment (Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Y.-A. Lee, 2007), and thereby the participants’ analytical work of constructing the instructional activity deserves careful procedural descriptions.

The third turn position has also been of particular interest because it is where the teacher displays his/her understanding of the preceding student’s response as well as the pedagogical focus of the lesson. For instance, Hellermann (2003) demonstrated how teachers employ prosody in their feedback turns to mark a student response as less than complete and irrelevant to the topic of their question. Third turn repeats also commonly occur in IRF sequences and depending on the context, they serve the dual function of confirming the student answer or on the contrary, initiating repair to display the inadequacy of the response (Margutti & Drew, 2014; Y. Park, 2014). Often, the teacher’s third-turn evaluation is not an optional expansion of the initiation-response pair. The conditional relevance of relevance of the teacher turn is observed by students selecting the teacher as the next speaker via their gaze after they complete their responses (Hellermann, 2005b). When there is an absence of a feedback move, students are found to treat it as a negative assessment by offering alternative responses (Koole, 2012b; Macbeth, 2004). As such, it is the participants that reflexively invoke evaluation as a crucial component of the instructional sequence.

According to Y.-A. Lee (2007), on the other hand, the third turn position does more than evaluation or feedback. It is used by the teacher to perform a diverse array of actions such as
breaking down a question into several sub-components, moving the sequence towards the
lesson’s objective, giving hints on preferred answers, and managing the class (Hall & Walsh,
2002; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In performing these actions, the third
turn may also consist of a yes-no question rather than a declarative assessment. Below is an
extract from Y.-A. Lee (2008). The teacher and students have been discussing a reading passage
that described the different types of instructional methods for reading in East-Asian countries,
and the teacher had just quoted part of the text that said, “respect for classics as opposed to the
vernacular form”:


751 T: she talks about classics, what are the classics.
752 S1: uh::
753 (3.0)
754 S6: "it’s like uh::: [classical.]
755 T: [Eddie, is that you? you are talking, (.).] to yourself,
756 S1: old style,
757 T: what Jungkim?
758 S1: old style.
759 T: old styles, so are they respected?
760 →T: old styles, so are they respected?
761 S1: yeah.
762 T: yeah, okay, we say (.). classics (.). respected?
763 [(Writing on the overhead)]
764 T: now what do you think about Ameri-
765 in American (.). classrooms,

The teacher’s third turn occurs in line 760 after S1 provides old styles as an answer to the
teacher’s definition request. Typically, this would be a slot where an evaluation such as yeah or
very good would come in. The teacher’s third turn, however, begins with a repetition of the
student’s answer old styles, and it is followed by a question in the form of a yes-no question are
they respected?. Note that the word respected refers back to the reading text that the teacher had
quoted earlier in the interaction. Here, by means of casting the yes-no question, the conversation
is brought back from a word clarification sequence to the point about respecting classics. In
other words, the yes-no question works as an interpretive resource that connects the definition search with understanding the major point of the class discussion: classics represented as *old styles are respected* in East-Asian countries. These yes-no questions are then not just about confirming or eliciting content knowledge, but about putting together resources that “call for and point to the knowledge required of the student” (Y.-A. Lee, 2008, p. 258, emphasis added).

Although previous studies have acknowledged the ubiquity of IRF sequences as well as the pedagogical work achieved in its respective turn positions, relatively little consideration has been given to the interactional organization of co-taught lessons. Co-taught classrooms generate distinctive interactional environments that deserve analytic attention, mainly because the interaction between another teacher and students, as well as the interaction that occurs between the two teachers create additional layers to the classroom participation framework. When one teacher makes an instructional move, it is likely be a public display of two interpretive frames: an analysis of the students’ responses and an analysis of the preceding instructions that were laid out by the co-teacher. It is within these multiple layers that the co-teachers and students establish the norms and expectations of their roles and the types of instructional actions by which lesson objectives are defined moment-by-moment.

Furthermore, whereas IRF in the typical classroom is limited to a two-party teacher-student interaction, the presence of a co-teacher opens up an additional interactional space for a wider range of initiation, response, and feedback moves. The first turn position, for instance, can consist of multiple initiation turns that map on to different teachers. The second turn position may also differ in that the potential recipients of the initiation turn include not only the students, but also the co-teacher’s participation as well. Lastly, the aligning or diverging third turns of the
co-teachers can also illustrate the practical and procedural details of co-teaching that leads to a
disclosure of the teachers’ respective interactional and curricular agendas.

Therefore, one goal of this chapter is to examine the actions served by different co-
teaching pairs and their students, with the interest of describing how the participants flexibly
work around the typical IRF sequences to deal with their local classroom contingencies. The
analysis will focus on the co-teacher actions that are instantiated in each turn position – initiation,
response, and feedback – and to reveal the interactional particularities through which the
presence of two teachers are negotiated among the participants. It is important to note, however,
that IRF is not the only type of interaction that takes place in the classroom. The purpose of
referring to IRF is to frame the analysis with a basic point of comparison, to bring into view the
method of contingent actions that teachers and students display (Y.-A. Lee, 2007; Waring, 2009),
and to highlight how co-teaching interaction may resemble or deviate from one-teacher
classrooms.

4.3 IRF and Student Participation

Research on classroom interaction have focused on connecting teacher’s actions and their
potential impact on learner participation, and by extension, learning opportunities (e.g., Hall,
1998; Lyle, 2008; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Waring, 2012a, 2013). Several practices from the IRF
sequence have been identified as being facilitative towards student participation. Lerner (1995),
for example, focuses on the ways that teachers design their turns with unfinished TCUs (cf.
“designedly incomplete utterances” in Koshik, 2002). By leaving out the last item of a sentence
(e.g., “a Door knob IS?”) or making use of unfinished lists, students are invited to provide their
own contributions to completing the turn, and consequently, their participation is guided in a very specific direction.

Teachers may often delay the evaluation slot to allow multi-turn responses for extended student production (Ko, 2009), or they may also substitute third turn assessments with a revised version of the sequence-initiating question (Zemel & Koschmann, 2011). As IRFs are built in series, students are engaged in a Socratic dialogue where students are called on to check how their reasoning fits within the route to a correct answer (Y.-A. Lee, 2008; Margutti & Drew, 2014). The routine nature of IRF helps maintain the flow of the instructional activity, and the teacher’s constant monitoring promotes active involvement and precision of language on the part of the learners (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Waring, 2009). Along this line, IRF is particularly useful in engaging student interest in pedagogical activities such as quiz games (Hellermann, 2005b). Regardless of the correctness of the student’s response, teacher’s feedback in quiz games are brief, and they occur in the same low pitch and falling intonation which treat both correct and incorrect answers as if they are equal. The evaluative nature of the teacher’s feedback move is lessened as a result, and students who normally do not participate would do so in quiz games because of the lower risk of being corrected.

Whereas IRF provides its own learning opportunities, there have also been concerns in regards to its rigid and controlling nature. IRF may ensure the efficient undertaking of a preplanned, teacher-designed activity, but the evaluative nature of it is sometimes criticized for retaining teacher control over matters of correctness, which places certain constraints on student participation (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Lyle, 2008; Mercer, Dawes, & Staarman, 2009). For instance, Waring (2011) describes that yes-no questions in the evaluation slot tend to project a critical stance but in a way that does not offer students equal alternatives to consider. Usually the
question itself will convey an assessment, and the students, instead of coming up with their own opinions, are faced with the task of inferring and aligning with the teacher’s stance. Teacher’s use of explicit positive assessment (e.g., “very good”) is another practice that may restrict student participation. Waring (2008) argues that within certain contexts, these assessments can obstruct students from contributing alternative answers or concerns by terminating the sequence as “case closed.” Similarly, teacher’s understanding checks that occur in the third position turn are also oriented to by both teachers and students as preferring a “no problem” response, thereby acting as an activity-closing device rather than a true invitation for questions (Waring, 2012a). When students are invited to depart from IRF sequences, however, they raise learner-initiated questions that enable them to discuss understandings and important issues that would not have emerged otherwise (Waring, 2009, 2011).

Such critiques have led scholars to search for ways to find a balance between utilizing the benefits of IRF and maximizing student learning opportunities (Walsh, 2002, 2006). One solution for enhancing student engagement has been the use of dialogic strategies. Instead of simply evaluating student responses in the third turn, the greater use of “genuine” questions combined with other forms of third-turn receipts such as comments (Wells, 1993), requests for elaboration or justification (Hall, 1998; Nassaji & Wells, 2000) and uptakes (Nystrand, Wu, & Gamoran, 2003) make extended discussions possible and contribute to higher levels of student participation that are more conducive to learning. Opportunities for learner-initiated questions may also be increased by the sensitive use of routine understanding checks such as “Any questions?” Waring (2012a) suggests that these checks be built into the ongoing interaction of an instruction rather than limiting its use only within activity boundaries. The instructional practices of checking understanding and activity closing need to be accomplished separately, and
thus, alternations to the sequential placement and format of these understanding checks are necessary for the optimal monitoring of potential understanding problems.

Despite recent measures that encourage teachers to adopt more innovative and dialogic classroom interaction styles, the IRF format and third-turn evaluations are still predominantly used in pedagogic activities, and this applies to the co-taught lessons of this study as well. The studies described here is by no means an exhaustive list, but they serve to illustrate how CA work has illuminated our understanding of what teacher talk accomplishes, how it is done, and how it leads to promoting or suppressing student participation. Along this line, the analysis of this chapter will examine the IRF sequences deployed in co-taught lessons with an equal interest of observing not only the co-teacher actions but how their unfolding collaborative instructions impact the nature of student participation. As the chapter will present a wide range of practices used in co-teaching IRF sequences, generalizations on a specific turn design or question format would be difficult to reach and will not be considered as the main purpose of the analysis. Nonetheless, the analysis should point to issues of student participation that require attention and thus, further exploration. It is anticipated that such understandings, in turn, will be a step leading toward usefully informing pedagogical practices in co-taught classrooms.

4.4 Analysis

The IRF sequence consists of three related sequential “positions” (I, R, F), but not necessarily of three turns (Koole, 2012a). Therefore, the main interest of this analysis is the multiple turns of each turn position that instantiate the co-presence of the two teachers and characterizes IRF sequences in co-taught lessons with a distinct type of organization from single-teacher classrooms. The first section of the analysis focuses on the joint initiations of co-teachers
that occur in the first turn position of the IRF sequence. The second section then describes the cases where the co-teacher enters the second turn position of the other teacher’s IRF. Lastly, the third section centers on the co-teachers’ juxtaposition of third turn positions through which the teachers display their respective agendas toward the lesson.

4.4.1 Initiation: First turn position

This section analyzes the initiation turn positions of IRF sequences in collaborative co-teacher instruction. In CA studies of single-teacher classrooms, the initiation turn has been examined with the interest of discovering the types of actions that teachers deploy and what impact they have on the student responses (Koole, 2012a). The same focus applies to this section except that it illustrates how co-teachers make conjoined initiations by means of entering the other teacher’s move across adjacent, overlapping, or interruptive turns. The resulting analysis shows the relationship of these joint initiations in the elicitation of student participation, formation of curricular focus, and establishment of teacher agendas in the co-taught lesson.

Co-initiation in an adjacent turn

The first extract is a case when a co-teacher enters in a consecutive turn to the other teacher’s initiation move. The excerpt is taken from a second grade science lesson on the topic of sink or float. In small groups, the students were given a chunk of modeling clay and a beaker full with water. The objective of this lesson is to have students discover how a material that is denser than water (modeling clay) can be shaped to become a floatable object. The following interaction occurs near the final stage of the lesson when the students have already finished experimenting with different shapes of the clay in their small groups. Here, Chanho, as the representative of his
group, is being called to place his clay in the beaker that ET is holding. This is a way of
assessing whether his group has accomplished the mission of making the clay floatable.

4. 2 [2H-131023-3-37:01] drumroll

145 ET₄: alright Chanho. +five:
146 KT₂: try::
147  +((alternates both fists up & down))
148 >+twukwu twukwu twukwu twukwu<

ET’s initiation turn consists of a directive that does not request a verbal response but a
corresponding action from the nominated student (Hellermann, 2003). In the case of this extract,
Chanho is expected to come up to the front of the classroom and demonstrate the task in front of
his peers. In doing so, ET marks the onset of the initiation turn with an alright, summons Chanho
by his name, and performs a hand gesture to show that she is counting down from five (lines
145-146). This gesture embodies a time constraint and demands for Chanho’s immediate
compliance to the proposed activity. Chanho, however, shows his reluctance by remaining in his
seat and delaying his entrance to the front of the classroom. As there is a stall in the expected
second turn action, KT steps in a contiguous turn to downgrading the imposition with a verbal
encouragement try::. (line 147), which she then follows up with a sound and gesture that indexes a drumroll (line 148).

Here, we see that the co-teachers jointly instantiate an extended initiation turn in pursuit of getting Chanho to present. Each teacher, however, differs in their stance as they attempt to elicit Chanho’s participation. ET’s count-down is an embodied instructional directive that operates upon a time limit (He, 2000). In a way, ET creates a pressured environment where failing to comply with the instruction within the given time would be a breach of Chanho’s obligation as a student. KT’s drumroll, on the other hand, invokes a different stance. Aronsson and Cekaite (2011) in their study of parent-child negotiations document that parents may downgrade a directive in the face of non-compliance. In the case of this extract, the drumroll occurring after Chanho’s hesitance categorizes his entry to the stage as a moment of a “grand opening,” and it highlights the existence of an awaiting audience that is looking forward to his presentation. As a result, the collaborated initiation is downgraded from ET’s imperative to KT’s invitation, re-framing the presentation activity from being a student obligation to one that is socially desired by the members of the classroom.

The consequences of this drumroll are made evident in the ensuing interaction. First, we see that ET aligns with KT’s stance by summoning Chanho in an elongated manner (line 149). The slight rising intonation of ET’s solicitation makes it hearable as a cheer, which lies in contrast with the brevity and falling intonation of her earlier summon in line 145. Second, we see that the other students also cooperate with KT by co-participating in the drumroll (line 150). As all of this goes on, Chanho finally walks up to the front with a smile (IMG #4.2.1), and an upshot of the cheer is provided by another student as he shouts out Chanho’s name (line 151). After all,
the teachers’ joint initiation is met with the support from the student peers, which in combination, succeeds in transforming Chanho’s delayed compliance into a moment of willing participation.

A similar case of encouraging student presenters occurs in the next extract. This time, it is a kindergarten class and the leading teacher ET has just finished reading a storybook called *Daddy is Strong*. In the following extract, ET tries to recruit a student to take the Daddy role and read the book together with her in front of the classroom.

4. 3 [KSUN-131001-1-20:59] *I envy you*

4. 3.1 

```
21 ET₅: okay Somi? +(0.3)
22 since you’re my prayer and day helper
23 can you role play?=
24 KT₅: oh::: coh-keyss-ta:
      happy-DCT:RE-DC
“oh I envy you”

25 Minji: c[+o:h-keyss-ta!
      happy-DCT:RE-DC
“i envy you”

26 ET₅: come on in::: ++sit:::
27 Ss: ((giggling))

28 KT₅: +(puts a flannel shirt on Sophia))
      +here we go dad:::
```

Like Excerpt 4.3, ET’s request in the initiation turn asks for Somi to come up to the stage and be the presenter in front of the class. ET summons Somi by her name, and after they establish
mutual gaze (line 21), ET makes a request that appeals to Somi’s helper role of the day (line 22-23). Similar to what we saw in Excerpt 4.2, the presentation is categorized once again as an activity that the student is obliged to do. Before a response comes from Somi, however, KT enters in a consecutive turn and inserts an affectively-charged assessment *oh↑::: coh-keyss-ta:* that is marked with a pitch leap and prolonged word-final vowels (“oh I envy you” line 24). In order to analyze KT’s action here, one needs to consider the spatial position of the two teachers in the classroom. While ET is on the stage embodying a teacher role, KT is in the back row of the students facing ET. In a way, KT shares with the students the same visual field as an audience, one that observes the teacher as well as the presenter that is about to appear on the stage. This seating arrangement, therefore, allows KT to shift “footing” (Goffman, 1981) into a bystanding student peer and to animate the voice of a non-presenting student that desires to be selected by the teacher.

By far, being appointed for the role play has been characterized as an appealing and coveted position, and this effectively opens the way for ET to cast an additional embodied invitation (IMG #4.3.1). Somi does not respond yet, but the attractiveness of the presenter role is further confirmed as another student Minji recycles KT’s envying stance in an exclamatory tone (line 25). Following the positive comments coming from both the co-teacher and a student peer, ET produces another verbal invitation, and it is finally at this point that Somi stands up and begins to move to the stage (line 26). The other students display their entertainment with their giggles (line 27), and the current extract comes to a happy end as Somi accepts the Daddy role of the book by putting on the flannel shirt (line 28).

Both extracts demonstrate the conjoined efforts of the teachers in eliciting the participation of a student presenter. In doing so, the initiation moves consist of the juxtaposition
of two turns, each coming from different teachers and displaying distinct but complementary stances. Whereas ET constructs the presentation activity as a student responsibility, KT and the aligning stances of the student peers succeed characterizing the presenter role as an appealing position.

**Co-initiation in an overlapping turn**

In the next extract, the initiation turn is similarly occupied by both teachers, but this time, the other teacher comes in an overlapping turn. Excerpt 4.4 is extract taken from a kindergarten lesson where the students are learning to sing Beethoven’s symphony No. 9, *Joyful, Joyful We Adore Thee*. Some context information that is relevant to this setting is that this co-teacher pair has been working together for the third year, and the students are also the same class that have carried over from the previous year. Also, the ET has an intermediate level of Korean proficiency so she is able to comprehend the Korean coming from KT and the students to a certain extent. So far in this lesson, KT has been explaining in Korean the meaning of the lyrics: *melt the clouds of sin and sadness.*

4. 4 [KDS-131119-3]  *what does melt mean*

```
22 KT₁: e::: (. ) kuntay, sin-ilang sad-ka melt-han-tay
      yeah but -and -NOM -do-QT
23    melt-{ a | m}wusun {ttus-iya -NOM what meaning-INTERR
      “Yeah. But it says that ‘sin’ and ‘sad’ melts. What does ‘melt’ mean?”
24    → ET₁: [.h!] {what’s melt?}
25    Suyeon: [pak-hyess-na? stuck-PST-INTERR
              “were they stuck?”
26    Juri: [cwe: ( . ) cis[-ko sin commit-and
27    KT₁: [tulepo-n-cek isse-yo [melt? hear-ATTR-time exist-POL
              “have you heard the word ‘melt’ before?”
28    → ET₁: [do you [remember
29    Suji: [ney yes
30    → ET₁: in term [one\(^6\)]?
```

6 “Term one” is used to refer to the previous school year when the students were in the lower grade.
The initiation turn starts with KT reading a phrase of the lyrics (line 22) and asking the students to provide the meaning of *melt* (line 23). While ET proceeds with the question, ET also enters in an overlapping turn to produce a sharp in-breath and ask the same question in English. What ET appears to be doing with the in-breath is indexing a stance of surprise, possibly as a type of instructional performance that highlights the target word as one worthy of attention. The in-breath falls on the nominative marker *-ka*, which is precisely the timing when KT finishes saying *melt*, and ET launches her own initiation as an “choral co-production” (Lerner, 2002) before KT reaches the full completion of her turn. The sequential placement and matching content of ET’s query displays that ET is in anticipation of KT’s agenda and thereby capable of producing an aligning and relevant initiation turn. Furthermore, by entering in a concurrent turn, ET orients to her right as a co-teacher to produce an overlapping co-initiation. Consequently, the co-teachers simultaneously accomplish the same action of requesting a word definition, just in different languages.

Two students attempt to answer the teachers’ question in self-selected turns (lines 25-26), but instead of giving any recognition, KT produces another follow-up initiation (line 27). This time, KT’s question changes from an open-ended definition inquiry to a yes/no question that asks if the students have heard the word before. Depending on the students’ response, KT is bound to

---

7 K1 can be understood as an equivalent term of “term one.” The kindergarten is divided into two grades: K1 and K2. K1 refers to the six-year-old students, and K2 refers to the seven-year-old students.
take two different tracks. If the students answer yes, KT can treat the vocabulary item as a repeated encounter and follow up with instructions that touch upon the students’ existing knowledge. If the students say no, the word will need to be taught as a new type of knowledge.

Before the students address KT’s question, however, ET enters once again and occasions another yes/no question in a transitional overlap (Jefferson, 1984). In this turn, ET reformulates KT’s question from an issue of hearing to an issue of memory recall and by pointing to a specific time frame of the school year (“term one” line 30). These “do you remember” questions require a display of “having known prior to the question” (Koole, 2010), and for a student to publicly announce not remembering a previous lesson is a morally-accountable behavior that is susceptible to a teacher reprimand (Sert & Walsh, 2012). Therefore, ET’s question is designed so that it prefers a yes response, while KT’s initial question is less likely to entail such moral consequences. Here, not only does ET manage to align with KT’s initiation move, but she also narrows down the different possibilities of student answers in pursuit of eliciting the expected response, thereby enabling the teachers to move the lesson forward (Margutti & Drew, 2014).

In what follows, students answer with a “type-conforming” yes in line 31 (Raymond, 2003), and ET self-selects to continue with the sequence. She recites several lines from a book called It’s Melting that the class read together in the preceding school year (lines 32, 34, 36). While KT had initially started the IRF, we see that ET now takes lead of shaping the sequence, and KT adopts the secondary role of repeating after ET’s recitation (lines 33, 35). Together, the two teachers work to contextualize the target word by means of recalling a shared reading text. After this collaborative recitation, ET asks if the students remember the passage (line 36), and across two incremental turns, re-specifies when the students first encountered this book (line 38). Term one, K1, and the year when the students were six are time formulations that all refer to the
same period. Finally, Juri in a self-selected turn succeeds in providing the definition of melt in Korean *noku-nun-ke* (“thing that melts” line 39).

This lengthy initiation turn involving overlapping shifts between KT and ET is a sequential feature that departs from the typical IRF found in single-teacher classrooms. The precise exact timing of the respective teacher turns display monitoring of each other’s actions, sharing of the curricular focus, as well as mutual orientation to their co-teacher roles. Through the joint initiation, the co-teachers revise and adjust the scope of each other’s queries, leading the students to the preferred answer that most efficiently contributes to the progressivity of the lesson (Stivers & Robinson, 2006).

Excerpt 4.5 shows another IRF sequence where the same kindergarten teacher pair is initiating first position queries in overlapping turns. In this kindergarten lesson, ET starts to talk about the meaning of *miss* and *misses*, and how these two titles are different in their usage.

4. 5 [KDS-131021-2-04:45] *miss or misses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>ET₄: misses? (<strong>writes on board “Mrs.”</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Juyeop: kyelhon? = marry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>KT₄: =yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>ET₄: means₄ (0.4) marri:ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>mi::ss, (<strong>writes on board “Ms”</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Miss Amy or Miss Heidι (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>means no::t married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>S?: ah kyelhonha-n-ke-lako= oh marry-ATTR-thing-QT “oh it means she’s married”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Juri: =Hong Ahrang sensayngnim-un (name) teacher-TOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>e yopun-cwu-ey kyelhonhay-ss-e DM this week-at marry-PST-IE “Hong Ahrang teacher um she got married this week”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>→ KT₄: e Hong Ahrang sensayngnim kyelhonha-sye-ss-unikka yes (name) teacher marry-HON-PST-because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>kulem wuenlay-nun [miss, then originally-TOP “yes since Hong Ahrang teacher is married, she was originally miss,”]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This extract starts with ET’s explanation on *misses* and *miss*. As ET pronounces and writes the word *misses* on the board (line 353), Juyeop displays his understanding of the word definition by saying *kyelhon* (line 354). This answer is latched with KT’s affirmation *yes* (line 355), and ET in the next turn, also confirms it by providing the definition of the word (line 356). Following a 0.6-second pause, ET continues to explain *miss* through verbal and visual presentations of the word (line 358). Miss Amy and Miss Heidi are the names of ET and KT that the students use to address their teachers, and that both teachers are single is shared knowledge with the students. Therefore, these address terms are used by ET as an appropriate illustration of the word (line 359) and in connection, she emphasizes by means of a prolonged and accentuated *no::t* that *miss* is a
contrastive category to *misses* (line 360). In what follows, one unidentified student displays her understanding with a change of state token *ah* (Heritage, 1984) along with her own interpretation of the target word (line 361). Juri then comes in a latched turn and announces that a kindergarten teacher of another class just got married.

It is unclear whether Juri is displaying her understanding of the vocabulary or if she is simply orienting to the topic of marriage that has been repeatedly mentioned by the teacher and students. Regardless of this ambiguity, KT considers it as an opportunity to commence an initiation turn of a new IRF. By means of using the casual marker *nikka* (line 364), KT re-announces the information provided by Juri and transforms it into an instructional example that invites logical reasoning from the students (Y.-Y. Park, 1998). In the next phrase, KT foregrounds the teacher’s recent marriage, but by means of using *kulem* (“then”) and *wuenlay* (“originally”), the information is topicalized as a contrast to the past when teacher used to be a *miss*.

The continuing intonation of *miss* (line 365) shows that KT is still in the process of finishing her turn, but this is when the ET enters in an overlapping turn without any specific elicitation coming from KT’s part. ET asks *which one* and accompanied with verbal and gestural deictics, she directs her gaze to the words written on the board (line 367, # IMG 4.5.1). Simultaneously, KT also continues to complete her initiation turn in overlap. KT repeats that the married teacher would have been called *miss* in the past, and the use of the contrastive marker *nuntey* clearly marks this as background information for her main question (line 368). Then, KT topicalizes the time frame of *cikum* (“now”) and launches her main question: *what is she now* (line 369). While Harim appears to be giving an incorrect answer (line 370), KT immediately latches a turn that reminds the students with the two options. As a result, the students produce the
answer *misses* in unison which ET and KT confirm with verbal and nonvocal positive assessments (line 372).

In brief, this extract shows how the two teachers initiate in overlapping turns separate questions that at the end, seek for the same student answer. What is noteworthy about this co-initiation is that ET’s question *which one* (line 366) is issued even before KT arrives at her main question *what is she now* (line 368). Having a moderate level of Korean proficiency, ET may have been able to register the projected action in KT’s prior turns (line 364-365) and thereby anticipate the focus of KT’s initiation. While KT transforms Juri’s announcement to an opportunity for further instruction, ET adds a visual context to the activity by directing the students to the words on the board and indicating the restrictive scope of the question to two possible answers.

As ET continues to alternate her pointing between the two words (lines 368, 370), KT also proceeds to complete her initiation in overlap with two turn-constructional units of ET’s turn. In a way, this interaction departs from single-teacher classrooms, but more generally the basic design feature of talk-in-interaction, namely the “one-party-at-a-time” principle of turn taking organization (Sacks et al., 1974). Yet, at times, participants may speak in a fashion where they are not aiming to produce a separate turn at talk or even a distinct utterance among other simultaneous contributions. The interaction is rather driven with the purpose of establishing mutual orientation to the interactional project more or less in unison with the other participant (Lerner, 1996; Schegloff, 2000). Along this line, the teachers’ co-initiations display their interest in the production of aligning initiation turns and in collaborative pursuit of eliciting the “correct” student responses. Whether or not these turns occur in overlap is not constructed as a major business that asks for a resolution.
The last excerpt is a different case from the prior interactions: while one teacher is in the process of delivering an initiation turn, the other co-teacher comes in an “interruptive turn” to insert a sidetracking IRF sequence. In Excerpt 4.6, the second grade students are preparing for sports day. ET has led a lesson on vocabulary words for different sports and introduced the concept of a cheer. Then in small groups, the students have been instructed to create their own cheer for the class. The following interaction occurs toward the end of the lesson, and ET has just announced that each group will present their class cheer in front of the class. It should be noted that the student groups are named after flowers, so when ET says Tulip or Daffodil, she is referring to a particular student group.

4. 6 [2C-131004-1-FR-52:14] I will not judge others

512 ET₂: let’s see who goes: (.) first
513 tulip::p.
514 (3.2)
515 tulip you can:,(0.6) stand there?
516 or you can stand here.
517 Sun: there:!
518 ET₂: okay everyone stand up.
519 (0.8)
520 → ready. shh=everyone?
521 →KT₁: [sonppeek sey-pen cipcwung!
522 clap three-time concentrate
523 “clap three-times and pay attention!”
524 Ss: ((claps three times)) cipcwung
525 concentrate
526 ((4 lines omitted, KT and Ss repeat this two more times))

527 KT₁: daffodil-un:, (. ) daffodil::
528 -TP
529 (0.3) cal salphyepwaya-ci well look around-COMM
530 kulay yayksok hal-key iss-e-yo okay promise do-thing exist-be-POL
531 maikhu microphone
532 “Daffodil- Daffodil you should pay attention well okay there’s something you should promise me. Microphone”
533 Ss: maikhu microphone
534 KT₁: Sungmin twi-lo nao-seyyo (name) back-to come-POL
Whereas in other extracts, KT and ET oriented to a shared agenda and objective, this excerpt takes on a different interactional trajectory as KT inserts a separate agenda into the initiation turn. After ET appointed the Tulip group as the first ones to present (lines 512), she organizes the standing placement of the group (lines 515-517) and issues a directive that tells the group members to stand up (line 518). ET then embarks on an initiation turn that prepares the presenting students while settling down the other students into a listening mode (line 520). Before ET issues the “go” cue for the presenters, however, KT inserts a turn that initially appears to align with ET’s silencing actions. He then leads a routine chant that asks for the students’ attention and continues to hold the floor by repeating it three times with the students (line 523). Consequently, the main floor shifts to KT while ET’s initiation of the presentation activity is put to a temporary hold.

Why KT decides to come in at this point is revealed in the interaction that follows. After KT asks the Daffodil group to pay attention (line 527-528), he announces that the students will
be making him a promise (line 529). He then says *maikhu* (line 530) which is repeated by the
students in the next turn. The students’ automatic repetition treats the sequence as a well-known
classroom routine (Björk-Willén, 2008; Kanagy, 1999) where the normative pattern of the
*maikhu* chant requires the students to verbally replicate not only the word *maikhu* but also what
the teacher says afterwards. So far, we can see that the attention-getting chant was not intended
to be an aligning action to ET’s business. Rather, the chant, promise announcement, and the
*maikhu* sequence are packaged as a pre-sequence to highlight the delivery of a separate business:
the issuing of a rule statement *phyengka ha-ci anhnun-ta* (“I will not judge others” line 535).

Young children are known to have a different orientation to preference structure, and thus
are more likely to verbalize negative comments in a direct, non-mitigated manner (M. H.
Goodwin, 2002; Stivers, Sidnell, & Bergen, 2014). Therefore, KT appears to be taking a
preventive measure by spelling out the moral conduct that is expected by a supportive student
Audience. Notice here that KT does not offer any apologies nor does he mark his incursion as
dispreferred or disaffiliative move (Pomerantz, 1984; Stivers, 2008). By inserting his own IRF
before the completion of ET’s initiation turn, not only does KT treat the establishment of
classroom order as a prerequisite that secures the smooth progression of the student presentation
activity, but he also establishes himself with high entitlement that allows him with the right and
authority to launch this additional instructional move. Once KT terminates the sequence with an
acknowledgement (line 539), ET immediately picks up from where she left off (line 540) and
gets the tulip group to present the class cheer (line 542). Unlike the previous extracts, the
interaction in Excerpt 4.6 is different in that the co-teacher disaligns with the current business of
the leading teacher, and thus interrupts the flow of the ongoing lesson. While the leading
teacher’s initiation is temporarily suspended, the students were directed towards related moral issues that served as the basis of successfully carrying out the leading teacher’s activity.

**Interim summary**

In this section, I have analyzed cases where the first position turn consisted of conjoined initiations – an interactional phenomenon that is particular to IRF sequences in co-taught lessons. The teachers’ co-initiations were first found across adjacent turns wherein the different but complementary stances of the teachers collaboratively encouraged the students to volunteer as class presenters. When occurring in overlapping turns, the precise timing and coordination of the initiation turns displayed the teachers’ tight orientation toward mutually-shared lesson objectives. The students, as a result, were guided along a very specific path to respond with an expected answer. The last excerpt centered on a case of the co-teacher “interrupting” the leading teacher’s ongoing initiation turn. Although the inserted IRF diverged from the focus of the ongoing main instructional business, the students were directed towards related moral issues that served as the basis for successfully carrying out the leading teacher’s activity.

**4.4.2 Response: Second turn position**

In IRF, the response turn is discussed in terms of the students’ participation. The student responses may consist of answer provided by an individual student, or it may also occur in unison (Ikeda & Ko, 2011) as well as multi-turn units (Ko, 2009). However in co-taught lessons, the turn is not necessarily a space that is reserved solely for the students. A co-teacher is also likely to respond to the initiation move of the other teacher in various interactional formats and with different action imports on the instructional sequence.
The most easily imaginable scenario of the teacher entering the response turn would be in the form of co-participation as illustrated in the following:

4. 7 [2C-120613-11:21] *can we spell it together*

```
23 ET₁: can you spell it- (.)
24 Ss: can we spell it together=ready? el:
25 →KT₁: [a:y vee: a:y en: gee
26 ET₁: can you say liv (.). ing
27 Ss: li [ving
28 →KT₁: [li ving
29 ET₁: liv (.). ing
30 Ss: [living
31 →KT₁: [living
32 ET₁: everybody lou:der >one two three go<
33 Ss: LI VIN:::G!
34 ET₁: so good one more time?
35 Ss: LI VIN:::G!
```

In Excerpt 4.7, the students are looking at a Powerpoint slide that has two words: *living* and *nonliving*. Having made the target vocabulary visually accessible to the students, ET requests the students to spell the first word all together. As the students align with ET’s initiation turn by producing the alphabetical spelling of the word in unison, we see that KT also participates in the activity by coordinating overlapping turns in a simultaneous onset (lines 27, 29) or in a one-syllable delay that is not ahead of the students’ response onset (line 29).

4.8 [2C-120513-BK-4-23:47] *everyone say*

```
47 ET₂: ev:everyone say where do you want to go:?
48 Ss: [where do you want to go:?
49 →KT₁: [where do you want to go:?
50 ET₂: who [do you want to go: with?
51 Ss: who [do you want to go: with?
52 →KT₁: [do you want to go: with?
53 ET₂: what do you want to see: there
54 Ss: [what do you want to see there
55 →KT₁: [what do you want to see there
```
Extract 4.8 also shows a related example. ET leads the students through a sequence of choral repetition, and KT is discovered once again as self-selecting himself as a co-respondent to the activity. One observation is that KT enters in either simultaneous onset (lines 27, 32) or a delayed onset by one syllable (line 29). As such, by entering the second turn of an IRF sequence, but not coming ahead of the students, the co-teacher orients to a similar role with the students and shares the responsibility to produce an expected response to the other teacher’s initiation move. The responding teacher is thus established as a co-participant of the student turn.

However, verbatim repetition in overlapping turns with the students is not the only type of action that a co-teacher can accomplish in a second turn of an IRF sequence. When the leading initiates a question in the first turn position, the co-teacher is equally as likely to contribute to the second turn with an independent response. In the next sections, therefore, I will analyze the co-teacher’s second turn actions that follow two types of questions in the initiation turn: yes-no polar questions and open-ended WH questions.

**Second turn to yes-no polar questions**

In the next extract, it is KT enters the second turn position of the IRF in a separate, non-overlapping turn. While in Extract 4.7 and 4.8, KT was simply repeating along with the students, the teacher’s second turn in the following interaction deploys a different type of instructional action. It is a science lesson taken from a second grade class where ET is trying to introduce a new vocabulary word *soggy* to the students.

4. 9 [2H-131120-5-BK-00:31] *soggy waffles*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ET₂: who likes waffles? <em>(raises hand)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ho: [me::!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ss: [((most of the Ss raise hands))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ET₃: yeah:=but! (.). do you like waffles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extract starts with ET asking the students if they like waffles in general. After students show their preference through choral verbal affirmations (line 32) and raising their hands (line 33), ET immediately latches it with a yes-no polar question. This time, the scope of the question narrowed down so that the students are asked to indicate their opinion on a specific type of waffle – one that is old, soft, and wet, and in other words, soggy. Notice that the polar question is prefaced with an emphatic but and micro-pause that not only mark a clear disjunction in topic,
but they also foreshadow that in contrast to the prior question, the upcoming talk may convey a negative reaction (line 34). The exaggerated elongation of the adjectival descriptions as well as the ET’s squinting facial expression also work as contextual hints (IMG #4.9.2), framing the question as one that prefers a no-response (line 35). Apparently, ET’s yes-no question is a “cued elicitation” (D. Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Margutti, 2006), a type of question in which the teacher provides heavy clues to make the candidate answer obvious to the student. The restrictive nature of this question also shows that it functions not too much as a genuine exchange of opinions, but more as a “pre-sequence” (Schegloff, 2007b) that feeds into a vocabulary lesson on soggy.

As the question is addressed at the students, one student Ho successfully delivers an answer no that fits with the negative polarity of the question. He says it with a rising intonation, suggesting that his answer is in need of a confirmation (line 36). In a latched turn, however, we see that KT also self-selects as a respondent to the question and produces the same type-conforming answer no:: in line 37 (Raymond, 2003). KT’s no utterance follows a student response that occurs in the second turn position of the IRF sequence, but several observations imply that KT’s turn is more than a second pair part to ET’s question.

In most question-response sequences, the recipient of a question is likely to sustain mutual gaze with the question-initiator during the turn of addressing a response (Rossano, Brown, & Levinson, 2009). In this sequence, however, right when KT commences her no-turn, her gaze shifts from ET (IMG # 4.9.1) to the students (IMG #4.9.3). With the students being the primary selected recipients of ET’s question, KT’s gaze withdrawal, on the other hand, constructs KT as a non-recipient of ET’s question. KT is exempt from the obligation to direct her gaze to ET. However, what KT does is more than a simple gaze withdrawal. The precise timing of KT’s gaze
shift treats the students, not ET, as the recipient of her no-turn. Furthermore, not only does the immediacy of KT’s latched turn mark her answer as a preferred response (Pomerantz, 1984), but the elongation and falling intonation of the no also shows that KT is occupying a knowing stance (Heritage, 2012a). KT’s no is thereby established with a high epistemic ground, and accompanied with a head shake, her action comes off as an explicit confirmation, a corroborating display of the correct answer that is designed for the sake of the students.

As the answer has been made public, ET treats the sequence as “case-closed” without further due (cf. Waring, 2008). ET does not solicit any other student answers, but instead, issues a confirmation of Ho and KT’s response (line 38) and immediately moves on to reveal the curricular focus of the sequence; that is, to introduce the new vocabulary soggy (line 39). By proceeding to the next item on the agenda right away, ET displays that the no-answer is correct not only for its factuality, but because “it is exactly the right stepping stone to move ahead in the larger sequence” (Margutti & Drew, 2014, p. 444).

In this extract, the second turn position of the IRF consists of not just a student answer but also a co-teacher contribution. KT’s no, although placed in a response-relevant turn position, performs more than a simple responding action. KT’s gaze direction, embodied conduct, and epistemic stance explicitly mark her utterance as a confirmation of the expected answer. Consequentially, KT’s turn paves the way for the co-teacher to terminate the sequence, obstruct further student contributions, and successfully transition into a new sequence of achieving the lesson objective. KT’s second turn contribution and ET’s treatment of the turn reveal that the co-teachers share a mutual orientation to the curricular goals as well as an interest in the efficient dealings of less important sequences to move the lesson forward.
A similar case occurs in the next extract, but this time the teacher enters the second turn position prior to the student’s arrival. Extract 4.10 is a second-grade science lesson and the following interaction is a pre-activity that is supposed to lead into the topic of fall fruits. ET is the leading teacher and she is asking the students to share their favorite fruits as a whole class. KT is also standing in the front of the classroom, but she does not take upon a leading role in this interaction.

4. 10 [2H-131023-4-16:10] cucumber

15 ET: okay (1.4) tell me, fruits that you like.
16 (.)
17 >raise your hand and tell me<
18 ((points at Sieun))
19 Sieun: banana
20 Suk: broccoli?
21 ET: banana ((points at Chan))
22 Chan: apple
23 ET: apple ((points at Ain))
24 Ain: coconut
25 ET: coconut ((points at Jon))
26 Jon: mango
27 ET: mango. hho!: mine too=
28 ((points at Kaeun))
29 Kaeun: peach
30 ET: peach! Teri?
31 Teri: kiwi
32 KT: .hh! ((smiles))
33 ET: [kiwi:: (points at Han)]
34 Ho: oi!
35 ET: huh?
36 Han: OI= cucumber
37 KT: =cucumber
38 ET: is that (. ) a fruit?
39 →KT: No:::
40 Han: [yes!
41 (0.4)
42 ET: I think that’s a vegetable:::
ET nominates the next speaker by means of pointing gestures (e.g., lines 18, 21) and calling the students name (line 30). The selected student provides a fruit item which is then acknowledged in the third turn with ET’s repetition (e.g., lines 21, 23). By reproducing the exact linguistic content of students’ responses, ET ratifies their answers as expected and correct (Hellermann, 2003). In the case of mango, ET not only endorses the correctness of the student answer but makes an affiliative comment that aligns with the student’s preference of fruits (line 27). During this instructional sequence, KT occupies a withdrawn position where she only makes subtle displays of evaluative stances as in the in-breath and smile that indicate positive confirmation of the student answers (line 32).

The recycling of IRF sequences continue until Han says oi (“cucumber”) as one of his favorite fruits (line 34). Han’s answer is problematic for two reasons. First, according to the
teachers, *oi* is classified as a fruit item, and second, it is not an English word. ET orients to this trouble by initiating a repair which results in a side sequence to the lesson (line 35). Han repeats the same answer *oi* once again, and the louder quality of Han’s follow-up response shows that he is treating ET’s repair as a problem of *hearing* rather than a problem of *understanding* (line 37). KT thus intervenes to give the English translation to resolve the issue of intersubjectivity, which enables ET to follow with a yes-no question that asks Han whether cucumber is a fruit (line 38).

Han is clearly the designated recipient of ET’s question, but it is KT that self-selects herself as a respondent and says *No::* slightly before Han produces his answer in overlap (line 39). Being in a side sequence, notice that ET has not made an assessment on Han’s response yet. It is after Han provides another incorrect response (line 40) that ET finally issues a correction by saying that cucumber falls under the collection of vegetables (line 42). ET’s display of knowledge on the categorical belonging of *cucumber* implicates that ET’s initial question in line 38 was not an information-seeking one but a pre-correction that provided Han with the opportunity to reconsider his answer before the teacher’s evaluative turn. In the classroom context, interrogatives are used to not only to elicit or retrieve information from the students, but also to repair inappropriate or wrong answers (Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990).

Then, by choosing to produce an answer to ET’s pre-corrective question before the arrival of Han’s turn, KT can be seen as accomplishing more than a “response” action. Considering the amplified and elongated quality of the *No::*, not only does KT answer in a manner that suggests the topic is within her epistemic domain, but KT’s turn is also hearable as a preemptive assertion that attempts to make the information available prior to Han’s response. Another observation is that neither of the teachers, in fact, actually offers an explicit negative assessment against Han’s response (e.g., that’s wrong). Margutti and Drew (2014) reveal that in
classroom interactions, explicit negative assessments amount to only 10% of all teacher evaluations (see also Seedhouse, 1997). Instead, non-positive evaluations take the form of commenting on the inaccuracy or inappropriateness of the student answer as in the teachers of this extract. The total package of ET’s question, KT’s second turn, and ET’s follow-up correction work to display their conjoined evaluative stance and concurrently, to provide a collaborative account for discounting Han’s answer.

In this case however, the teachers’ correction is rejected by Han, and he shows his disagreement quite assertively with an elongated no token and an assertion delivered in accelerated speech (line 43). Regardless of the resistance, however, ET orients to the moment as a suitable time for transition. She immediately provides a shift-implicative token alright in overlap, moves her gaze to a different student group, and nominates another student as the next speaker (line 44, IMG # 4.10.1). While the lesson proceeds, Han’s disagreement is dealt by KT in a schisming one-on-one side sequence (Egbert, 1997). KT moves in front of Han (line 43), kneels down (line 45), and repeats that cucumber is a vegetable (line 46, #IMG 4.10.2).

Both Extract 4.9 and Extract 4.10 show instances where KT joins the second turn of the IRF. While the sequential placement of KT’s contribution occurs where it is typically the student’s response turn, the actual import of KT’s action is more than a plain response. By means of producing self-selected answers to the co-teacher’s initiated question, we see that KT displays the type of knowledge that is expected of the students, projects an evaluative stance, and thereby collaborates with ET in establishing the curricular focus of the lesson. Interestingly, in both extracts, the KT’s second turn contribution is followed by a sequence-closing action from ET, without eliciting further answers from the students. ET appears to orient to KT’s contribution as a relevant and appropriate moment for transitioning activities – moving from pre-sequence to the
announcement of the curricular focus, and from a side sequence of correcting a faulty student answer to the resumption of the main activity.

**Second turn to open-ended (WH) questions**

The next two extracts are cases when the teacher enters a second turn following an open-ended (WH) question in the other teacher’s initiation move. Open interrogatives, unlike the polar questions analyzed in the previous extracts allow for a wider range of replies. This poses different constraints on the answers and furthermore, on the options that teachers have at their disposal to develop the interactional trajectory of the lesson.

The first extract is a second grade science lesson on the topic of fall crops. ET is the leading teacher of the lesson and she has been going through the Powerpoint to review vocabulary items that the students had learned in a previous session. Each slide has a picture of fall crops, and the students are asked to identify each item. In order to understand the interaction, it should be noted that *wheat* has been incorrectly translated by the teachers as *poli* (“barley”) whereas the correct Korean translation should have been *mil* (“wheat”). Regardless of the teachers’ mistake of equating wheat with barley, the focus of the analysis is on the participants’ emic practices of organizing the instructional sequence.

4. 11 [2H-131023-4-32:33] *what can we make with wheat*

277  ET₁:  next one=what was this
278  Chan:  food food!=
279  Jimin:  =wheat
280  ET₁:  wheat: very nice Jimin:: wheat
281  (0.5)
282  now one more click?
283  ((different picture of wheat appears on slide))
284  ET₁:  wheat looks like this
285  =it’s more like a fall crop than::
286  (1.3) other things
287  okay [one more: [next on--
288  KT₂:  [yay-tul-a [yay-tul-a
           kid-PL-VOC kid-PL-VOC
           “kids, kids”

75
wheat-ulo what can we make (0.5) with wheat.

- with

ET looks at KT) --->

Hyuk: [+rice

Ho: [+POLI CHA! (0.4) poli cha.

barley tea  barley tea

(0.9)

sikhyay?

rice juice

KT: hehe wheat? like like (0.5) poli.

barley

ET: so we can make (.) ↑ttek::↓ rice cake

KT: poli: ttek? lik= like ttek?

barley  rice cake  rice cake

Jua: sensayngnim [kuke ppengthwiki-to mantul-canha-yo teacher that Korean popcorn-also make-COMM-POL “teacher you know we make popcorn too”

KT: ↑ttek and: boil water: (.) rice cake

kwul- kwul kkuli-l sswu-to iss-ko:: water water boil able to-also be-and “we can also boil barley water”

Suk: ppengthwiki “popcorn”

KT: ↑AH!=

Jua: =sensayngnim ppengthwiki teacher Korean popcorn

KT: >ppengtwiki ppengtwiki< yeah:.

Korean popcorn  Korean popcorn

Mini: ku taum-ey cha that after-at tea “then there’s also tea”

KT: cha!: tea

ET: very +good-next one what is this

The IRF starts with ET’s question that asks the students to identify what is on the Powerpoint slide (line 277). Out of the two student responses, only the correct answer wheat is confirmed by ET with a positive assessment (line 280). After ET shows another picture of wheat and gives a brief commentary on the photo, ET attempts to close the sequence with a transition-implicative token okay and an announcement to move on to the next vocabulary item (line 287). The potential sequence-closing, however, is impeded by KT as she launches a post-expansion in an overlapping turn. KT summons the students in Korean (line 288) and self-repairs what originally
appears to be a Korean utterance *wheat-ulo* to an English question that asks about the use of wheat (line 289). As a result, what may have ended as a simple IRF exchange of recalling a vocabulary item expands into a brainstorming activity that encourages students to think about real-life applications.

Having initiated the new sequence, KT is established as the leading teacher of this IRF, and the second turn is left open for students to contribute their answers. Two students say *rice* and *poli cha* (“barley tea”) in lines 290 and 291, but KT does not confirm either of them as correct. There is then a 0.9-second silence, and this is when ET joins in with her own token of thought *sikhye* (“rice juice”) in line 293. What should be noted here is that ET says *sikhye* with a rising intonation while maintaining her gaze at KT. Unlike the previous extracts where the KT’s second-turn response displayed an evaluative stance of the students’ answers, the ET’s turn implicates a confirmation or correction from KT. *Sikhye* is a sweet drink made out of rice, a food item specific to Korean culture. Therefore, ET may be appealing to KT’s cultural expertise and authority to confirm her answer as a relevant contribution to the topic in hand. ET’s second-turn response places herself in a relatively “unknowing” position (Heritage, 2012a), and consequentially, just like the students, her response awaits KT’s approval in the third turn position.

Unfortunately, *sikhye* is made out of rice and it is an incorrect answer that does not fit the topic. KT orients to ET’s response as problematic by issuing a laughter token, re-specifying the target of her question *wheat*, and providing her Korean translation of the word (line 294). Given the correction, ET suggests another item *ttek* (“rice cake”) as a second attempt of addressing a relevant response (line 295). It is ambiguous here whether ET has properly understood KT’s correction because the word *ttek* can be used to refer to both regular rice cake
and rice cake made out of barley. In any case, KT is the one that reformulates ET as an acceptable answer *politek* (“barley rice cake” line 296) and ratifies it by incorporating it in the following turn (line 298).

The usual norm in IRF sequences is that the next turn of a teacher question is reserved for a student’s response. However, in this extract, it is ET that initially answers the question and takes an active role of contributing different ideas to the discussion topic. ET displays her interpretation of KT’s curricular focus by saying the items in Korean and concentrating only on the uses of barley that are specific to Korean culture. Furthermore, while answering the question, ET concedes to KT the epistemic authority to confirm the relevancy of her answers. Meanwhile, KT aligns with the asymmetry of topic-relevant knowledge created between the two teachers by providing feedback on ET’s answers in the third turn position. In this teacher-teacher dialogue, not only do the co-teachers put on a public performance of doing brainstorming, but as they proceed through their own IRF sequences, the resulting interaction simulates that of a teacher-student exchange.

With ET entering the second turn position, the two teachers demonstrate a joint interest in coming up with a list of relevant answers. If we shift the focus to student participation, however, we see that the student responses are unattended to until line 300. In addition to *rice* (line 290) and *poli cha* (“barley tea” line 291), another student Jua proposes a candidate response *ppengthwiki* (“Korean popcorn” line 297) and by use of the nonchallengeable model *canha* (Kawanishi, 1994; K. Kim & Suh, 2004), she displays epistemic primacy to her answer. No recognition is given to this response, however, as KT overlaps it with her own sharing of ideas. Once the teacher-teacher interaction reaches an end, Suk repeats *ppengthwiki* after Jua which is finally acknowledged with a response token (line 301) and a confirmation by KT (line 303).
also says cha (“tea” line 305) which was a previous student answer unrecognized by the teacher. This time, both KT and ET confirm it respectively with a repetition (line 305) as well as a positive assessment (line 306). The sequence is then closed as KT changes the Powerpoint slide and ET moves on to the next item on the agenda.

So far, we see that KT’s open-ended inquiry is met with ET’s alignment in the second turn position. The interaction in the next extract, however, unfolds in a different manner. In response to an opened-ended question, the co-teacher enters the second turn once again, but it results in revealing her misalignment with the other teacher’s initiation move. Excerpt 4.12 is a second-grade science class. The topic of the lesson is on fall fruits, and ET is going through the target vocabulary words by using PowerPoint images. The students are now looking at a slide with an acorn, and they have just completed repeating the word after ET.


| 152 | ET: | who likes acorn |
| 153 | KT: | I love acorn (0.4) [totholi |
| 154 |  | [totholi: acorn |
| 155 | KT: | who loves totholi: ((raises hand)) |
| 156 | Hyu: | talamcw: squirrel |
| 157 | KT: | totholimwu::k acorn jello |
| 158 | ET: | ((to KT)) >oh yeah< people eat acorn I forget(h)t |
| 159 | Hyu: | talamcw: squirrel |
| 160 | ET: | what kind of animals: (0.3) eat acorn |
| 161 | Hyu: | ttalamcw: ((mocking English pronunciation)) squirrel |
| 162 | Ss: | squirrel! |
| 163 | ET: | squirrel. thank you |

ET, as the leading teacher of this lesson, puts forward an open-ended question: who likes acorn (line 152). Before the students answer, however, KT self-selects as an immediate recipient of the
question, produces an assessment about acorns (“I love acorn”) and continues on to provide the Korean translation of acorn totholi in an increment (line 153). The grammatical syntax of KT’s turn is hearable as a sufficient second pair part to ET’s question, but observations of the sequence indicate that this turn is more than a simple response. The first evidence is that KT’s second turn is a “modified repeat” (Stivers, 2005) that involves an upgrade from like to love. The semantic content of this utterance orients to ET’s question but the reformulation also works to project the beginning of a new unit. In what follows, KT launches a question who loves totholi: (line 155) that involves the recycling of love and totholi from her previous turn and thus invokes the same frame to author her new question (line 155). Considering this transformation, we can see that KT’s second turn is not designed as response to ET’s initiation, but is enacted more as a “pivot” turn (Jefferson, 1993; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1979) that assists the commencement of her newly authored question.

The consequences of KT’s new question are made evident in the ensuing interaction. Initially, ET’s question was a display question in search for the answer squirrel, but KT transforms it into a referential question that asks for the students’ own preferences on eating acorns. As a result, the reference of the acorn-eater is changed from animals to people, which instantiates cultural information specific to Korean cuisine. Acorn may be reserved as food for animals in many cultures, but KT’s question indexes the fact that Koreans use acorn powder for common dishes like totholimwuk (“acorn jello,” line 157). The conflicting focus of the teachers’ questions is clearly revealed when the ET turns to KT, stating that she had not originally considered people as a possible answer to her question (line 158). This account occasions the relevance of different cultural assumptions that were invoked to frame the respective teacher’s

---

8 One note is that it is only ET that treats this information as culture-specific. KT and the students do not problematize acorn belonging to the category of food items, and as a result, ET’s comment in line 158 is unattended to by the other participants although it was addressed to KT as an account.
question. Consequentially, ET incorporates this understanding in her next turn by reformulating her question so that the target of the question projects as an answer a category in the collection *animals* (line 160).

In the midst of these shifting questions, the students pursue to obtain the teacher’s ratification for their answers. With KT entering the second turn position, the student responses are temporarily put on hold, but shortly after KT initiates the new question *who loves totholi*, Hyu offers the answer *talameci* (“squirrel”) in a self-selected turn (line 156). Here, Hyu’s response aligns with ET’s original question in terms of content, but having said it in Korean, ET is unable to register it as an appropriate answer. KT, on the other hand, is able to understand Hyu’s response, but *squirrel* misaligns with KT’s search for *people* that like eating acorns.

Having failed to address the focus of either of the teachers, both ET and KT withhold their third turns even when Hyu repeats her answer for the second time (line 159). The only modification that Hyu makes occurs after ET re-initiates her revised question (line 160). While maintaining the same Korean term, Hyu provides an upshot that alters the pronunciation of *totholi* in a way that mimics English phonology. By sensitizing her response to the language spoken by different teachers, Hyu demonstrates that it is her lack of English lexical knowledge that prevents her from providing the expected answer. Finally, the other students provide the correct answer *squirrel* in English (line 162), and ET marks the end of the sequence with a positive assessment *thank you* (line 163).

In the case of this data piece, KT flexibly used the space offered by the response turn to provide a candidate answer, translate the target vocabulary into Korean, and re-initiate the IRF in a way that reflected her own interpretation of ET’s initial question. In other words, what KT initially provided as a response turn acted as a pivot toward a different set of activities which
includes the initiation of a newly formatted question. Although a mismatch occurred in ET and KT’s agenda, the resolution of it led ET to narrow down the scope of her question, and thus succeed in eliciting the correct answer from the students.

**Interim summary**

In this section, we observed cases where the response turn deviates from the typical IRF sequence in that it was the unsolicited co-teacher, not the students, who responded to the leading teacher’s question. By entering the second turn position, the co-teacher accomplishes a wider range of actions that extend beyond “responding.” The evaluative stance that is embedded in the teacher’s second turn works to display the type of knowledge that is expected of the students and in effect, effectively contributes to the collaborative accomplishment of the lesson objectives. Conversely, the second turn can also act as a “pivot” for the co-teacher to launch a first turn initiation that disaligns with the other teacher’s original focus. All in all, despite momentary mismatches, the co-teacher’s contributions are deployed alongside a shared orientation to elicit correct student responses and to achieve the progressivity of the lesson in an efficient manner. The impact of these second turns on the students’ participation resulted in immediate closings of the IRF sequence (Excerpts 4.9, 4.10), thus obstructing further student contributions, and reduced attention to the emerging student responses (Excerpt 4.11, 4.12).

**4.4.3 Feedback: Third turn position**

The third turn position is probably the turn that has received the most attention in CA studies of the IRF sequence. By examining the third turn in IRF sequences in co-taught lessons, this section seeks to identify the interpretive choices and methods that co-teachers contingently display as they manage their respective assessments, stances, and agendas in the unfolding lesson.
It is in through these procedural aspects of interaction that we find the practical enactment of the teachers’ collaborative pedagogical work.

Excerpt 4.13 is a second grade science class, and ET is showing PowerPoint slides that have different pictures of fall fruits. The focus of this analysis is on the teachers’ third position evaluations that follow the nonsensical responses coming from the students. In this extract, the teachers’ third turns share a mutual focus and are in alignment with another.

4. 13 [2H-131023-4-20:36] guam

77  ET₄:  let’s see (.) what’s this.
78  Ho:   ah:[]:
79  Ss:   [kam: persimmon
80  ET₄:  oh what is it in English
81  Chan:  GAₐm:
82  ET₄:  $GAₐm:$ persimmon
83  Ss:   ahhuha
84  S?:   gum
85  ET₄:  gum:?
86  Ss:   (shouting different answers))
87  ET₄:  what is it? it’s orange!
88  Chan:  GAₐm:
89  →ET₄:  GAₐm? guam is a- is a island hheh
90  Ss:   guam is not- hh
91  →KT₂:  ya guam-un s(h)em-ilum-i-ya hhe
92  “hey Guam is the name of an island”

The goal of this interaction is to elicit the English vocabulary item *persimmon* from the students. In doing so, ET first launches the sequence with an identification question *what’s this* (line 77). ET’s pedagogical focus, however, is misaligned with the students as a large number of them provide the name of the fruit in Korean (line 79). Here, the students succeed in producing the expected task of supplying the fruit item, but not in the expected language of the instruction. ET
displays her recognition of this mismatch with a change of state *oh* (Heritage, 1984) and reformulates her initial question as one that demands an English answer (line 80).

Nonetheless, ET’s revised question fails to elicit correct responses from the students once again. Instead of saying *persimmon*, the students maintain their answers with the Korean fruit term *kam* (“persimmon”) but with an alternate pronunciation. Chan, for instance, changes the word-initial consonant of *kam* from a /k/ to a /g/ (line 81). Because Korean phonology does not have word-initial /g/, Chan’s answer is clearly hearable as a mock pronunciation of English, and thus treated as a laughable matter by both ET and his peers (lines 82-83). In the following turn, another unidentified student says *gum*, an English word that resembles Chan’s “anglicized” version of *kam* (line 84). This answer is not ratified by ET as she repeats it with a questioning intonation (line 85), re-issues the initial question, and provides a hint to probe student answers that are related to an *orange* fruit (line 87). In return, Chan says *guam* which is entirely irrelevant to fruits, but it is a type of phonological format tying (C. Goodwin, 2006) that creatively combines the previous responses of *gam* and *gum*.

Children in their L2 use often make playful use of intertextual substitutions based on phonetic resemblance (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004), and they do so by orienting to the constraints and possibilities set out by the teacher’s initiation. It is within this sequence of collaborative language play that the co-teachers’ evaluative turns emerge. ET’s correction in the third turn position first targets Chan’s response, explicitly indicating that *guam* falls under the collection of *islands*, not fruits (lines 89-90). The laughter embedded in her correction also orients to Chan’s answer as humorous which may have led other students to repeat *guam* in unison despite the fact that ET has already marked it as an irrelevant answer (line 91). This is when the KT also steps in. She first casts a vocative, and in Korean, repeats ET’s correction that *guam* is a name for an
island (line 92). As indicated by the laughter tokens, KT also aligns with the joking nature of the interaction. However, while ET’s third turn correction was directed at the faultiness of Chan’s answer, KT’s turn is located after the deliberate attempts of the other students to extend the humorous language play by means of recycling Chan’s pun. In addition to its corrective import, the informal vocative *ya* and the informal ending particle -*ya* makes KT’s turn hearable as a gentle reprimand that intends to put an end to the mislabeling language behavior and re-establish the focus of the IRF. This lays the ground for ET to proceed with the IRF, and ET goes on to nominate the next speaker (line 92).

The IRF in this extract occasions joking phonological recyclings where the students momentarily re-frame the routine task with the interest of entertaining their teachers and their peers. So far, the analysis shows that in dealing with this sidetracking business, the co-teachers stay in alignment with their third-turn position assessments. Both teachers orient to the humorous commentary of the students through embedded laughter tokens, while at the same time, placing sanctions on nonsensical responses by means of explicit corrections. As a result, the leading teacher is able to resume the curricular focus of the IRF, thus promoting the progressivity of the lesson. The displayed alignment between the co-teachers is to the extent that without the participant labels, the IRF sequence simulates that of a one teacher classroom where KT’s turn in Korean (line 92) might as well have just been a single teacher’s codeswitch. The next extract, however, involves a different trajectory where the difference in co-teacher stances emerge via the third position turns, and thereby marks the IRF in co-teaching with a more distinct type of interactional structure.

Extract 4.14 is a second grade science lesson on fall crops, and this time the students are looking at a picture of wheat. It is the first time that the students are learning this word, and ET is
questioning to see whether the students are able to identify the picture in English. In the meantime, KT is sitting by the computer desk to click through the Powerpoint slides.


138 ET: what’s this= 
139 S: -pye:: rice crop
140 Chan: rice!
141 Sumin: *rice*
142 ET: rice (.) ri:ce is [there:: this is called::
143 Ho: [corn=corn=corn! (.) >corn! corn!<
144 ET: corn?
145 Suk: ssal! rice
146 S?: ri[ce!
147 S?: [rice!=
148 Yeop: =poli! poli! barley barley
149 ET: what is it in English?
150 S: (shouting out answers))
151 Chan: yellow rice=yellow rice
152 → ET: yellow rice? uh::: no:::
153 → KT: good job who said yellow rice?
154 ET: [Chan did
155 Jisu: [=Chani-ka-yo (name)-NOM-POL
“Chan did”
156 → KT: oh::: creative=very good
157 ET: alright let- let’s see what it-
158 wheat
159 S: wheat

A variety of responses comes from the students. First, rice is corrected by ET as referring to a different picture (line 142) while the other answers are left without any type of ratification. Thus, the students treat the absence of explicit teacher feedback as a negative assessment by offering alternative responses that include corn, rice, and barley (Margutti & Drew, 2014). As some of the student answers were in Korean, ET reformulates her initial question so that the expected language of the answer is clearly stated (line 149). Consequently, Chan supplies an English answer yellow rice (line 151), and it is this context that gives emergence to third turn assessments from both of the teachers.
ET orients to yellow rice as an incorrect answer by repeating the word in a rising intonation and then producing an elongated negation token no:: (line 152). KT, however, disaligns with ET’s explicit negative assessment. In the following turn, KT evaluates the student’s answer with a complimentary assessment good job and asks for the contributor of the answer (line 153). That the student provided a substitute answer for an unknowing vocabulary is thereby characterized as a commendable attempt. Then, by prefacing her turn with an assessment rather than with the question “who said yellow rice,” KT legitimizes her turn as a third-position action and thereby establishes her co-teacher status by aligning with the ongoing activity. As ET and another student names Chan, KT accounts for the creative quality of the answer and provides an upgraded compliment very good in a latched increment (line 156).

Unlike Extract 4.13 where the third-turn assessments of the two teachers were in total alignment, we see here that the evaluative stances of each teacher project different agendas in characterizing an acceptable student answer. ET’s negative assessment shows that she is in search for the students’ provision of accurate English vocabulary terms. According to this criterion, yellow rice is an incorrect, disaligning response. KT, on the other hand, positively frames Chan’s answer as a creative student effort. Combining already known words to name a newly introduced object in the L2 is thus constructed as a desirable student behavior.

What we see here is that the third turn assessments of the co-teachers are contiguous in their sequential placement, but the actions that they accomplish are quite distinct from one another. Rather than viewing the dual action as being in conflict, the co-assessments appear to lie in a complementary relationship that allows for the concurrent management of correcting the inaccurate content of the student response while also encouraging positive student efforts and participation. On one hand, it should be noted that ET’s correction may have normally resulted in
an extended sequence where either Chan is incorporating the correction in an alternative answer, the other students bidding to answer in behalf, or the teacher providing an account for categorizing the response as incorrect (Koole, 2010; Y.-A. Lee, 2007). As the KT’s positive assessment subverts the corrective property of ET’s action, however, such negotiating processes have been made unnecessary, and furthermore, ET terminates the question-answer sequence by revealing the correct answer.

Extract 4.15 is another example of the conflicting co-teacher assessments occurring in the third turn position. The following interaction is from the second grade class where the students have been presenting the class cheers that they created in preparation for sports day. One group has been nominated to share their cheer, but the disappointing quality of it is met with different reactions from the two teachers.

4. 15 [2C-131004-1-FR-01:00:36] it was so short

{(student group stands up to present)}

812 ET: >okay ready set go.<-
813 KT: =ready {0.5} set (. ) go.
814 Ss: +{(claps twice)}
815 KT: °go go +{name of class}°
816 Ss: oh:::=
817 → ET: =ve:- v(h)ery short {and good!:}
818 → KT: [could you-
819 +{(holds up left index finger)}
820 ET: could you +repeat {(looks at ET)}
821 KT: one more time:=-
822 ET: one more time {please
823 [it was so short}
824 KT: do it loud {0.5) ready=
825 ET: =ready= 826 KT: set {0.4) go
827 ET: +{(claps twice)}
828 Ss: go go +{name of class}
829 KT: mh]he
830 ET: [hahahe
831 KT: you look so sad {(lethargically claps twice})
832 → KT: kuke-lul {0.4) sey-pen panpok hap-nida=sey-pen that-AC thre-e-time repeat do-POL thre-e-time
833 cwenpi: {0.3) ready=takathi ready all together
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The two teachers jointly invite the student cheer, but the succinctness of its presentation meets with different third turn assessments from each of the teachers. As soon as the students finish the cheer, KT provides a response cry _oh::: _that displays his disappointment with the presented cheer (line 816). Contrary to KT’s stance, ET comments on the brevity of the cheer and categorizes the student presentation with a positive assessment _good_ (line 817). This may be due to the tendency for teachers, especially novice teachers, to overuse positive assessments with the intention to strengthen the student’s confidence in their academic abilities (Cekaite, 2012). ET’s good intentions, however, lie in conflict with KT who outright deploys a negative evaluative stance towards the inadequate student performance.

The distinct nature of the teachers’ third turn assessments comes to a mutual alignment as KT demands that the students repeat the cheer one more time (lines 818-819). KT’s action has several consequences on the ensuing interaction. Whereas ET’s positive assessment may have resulted in a premature closing of the sequence (Waring, 2008), KT’s follow-up request acts as post-expansion that reverses the polarity of ET’s evaluation. It publicly announces that the current student cheer is one that requires instructional intervention, and thus carries corrective import. Also, as KT speaks in English and turns his gaze to ET before finishing his sentence, ET is invited as a co-participant in initiating the repair. Consequently, KT’s third turn not only
works to remedy the insufficient student product, but it also leads ET to revise her evaluative stance and to join in a co-initiated effort of improving the student cheer.

It is from this point on that ET mutually aligns with KT’s agenda which is first made visible in her repetition of KT’s turn one more time please (line 820). ET also comments on the brevity of the cheer (line 822), but unlike her previous compliment, it is framed under a negative light as it is coupled with an imperative that dictates the desirable volume of the presentation (line 823). As a result, the cheer is no longer characterized as one that is good but one that needs to be revised in terms of its length and volume. Not that ET also recycles only part of KT’s earlier turn. Through the selective recycling of KT’s request and transforming it into an imperative, ET manages to ratify her previous third turn assessment while also aligning with KT’s stance. This provides a mutual ground for the two teachers to jointly initiate a repetition of the student cheer (lines 823, 824).

In response to the teachers’ requests and evaluations, the students repeat the cheer in a slightly louder voice but it is still said with a dull and monotonous tone (line 826). The self-contradictory nature of the cheer is first met with laughter from both teachers (line 827-828). ET then evaluates the cheer by calling it sad and imitating the lethargic clapping of the students (line 829). Both teachers display through laughter and evaluative comments that the student cheer is in need of instructional remedy, and this is when KT directly steps in and issues an intervention. This time, he requests the students in Korean to repeat the cheer three times in a row (line 830), and he invites the other students to participate in saying ready set go as a whole class (lines 832-833). Through the collaborative initiation of the cheer, the student group accomplishes saying the cheer three times in a consecutive manner, which finally meets with positive ratifications from both teachers at the end (lines 838-839).
This extract shows the trajectory of different third-turn teacher assessments moving toward mutual alignment. What may have ended with a positive assessment is transformed to an extended sequence of re-initiating the student response turns. Through the teachers’ collaboration in remedying the unsatisfactory student response, the student group was able to produce a more acceptable and desirable outcome at the end. This process also involved the socialization of ET from KT’s part. KT’s intervention acted as a prompt for ET to revise her initial positive assessment and to follow up with evaluative remarks that helped the students improve their products. After ET makes her attempt of eliciting the student’s presentation for the second time, KT enters at the end to issue a final remedy to the situation which after all, leads to a happy closure of the sequence.

The third turn positions in the next extract take an opposite trajectory to Excerpt 15. The teachers’ third turns appear to be in alignment in the beginning, but gradually, we see that they evolve to project different actions. In Excerpt 4.16, the lesson topic is on fall crops, and the students are looking at a Powerpoint slide with pictures of raw peanuts. After ET familiarizes the students with the word *peanut*, she moves on to ask whether they have tried eating peanuts without taking off the shell. This is a moment when the lesson shifts from “focus on form” (vocabulary) to “focus on meaning” to instantiate a conversational exchange that touches upon the students’ experiences (Seedhouse, 2004).

4. 16 [2H-131023-4-21:53] *peanuts with the shell*

| 222  | ET₄: | can anyone eat peanuts like this? |
| 223  | Ss:  | ye[:s! |
| 224  | ET₄: | [with the shell |
| 225  | →   | .hh! you do? |
| 226  | →KT₂: | you DO::?: |
| 227  | ET₄: | that was a surprise people eat it like that |
| 228  | Kyu: | you can eat it? |
| 229  | Kyu: | me |
| 230  | ET₄: | with the shell? |
Eating peanuts with the shell, for many, is considered as a questionable behavior. So in this extract, when several students say that they do so, the third turn positions of ET and KT jointly indicate surprise. Both teachers respond with sudden in-breaths (lines 225, 251), amplified volume (lines 226, 231), surprise tokens (lines 231, 237, 251), and “ritualized disbeliefs” (lines 225, 226, 230, 232) that display their skepticism toward the truth value of the students’ claims (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006).

Although initially, it appears as if the teachers are sharing similar assessments of the students’ answers, the evolving interaction reveals that the degree of surprise differs between the
two teachers. After ET checks with several students that they do in fact eat peanuts with the shell (lines 225, 228), she registers the information with a reaction token \textit{wo::w::} (line 231). She then turns to KT and verbalizes that she was aware of the possibility that \textit{yes} could be an answer to her question. Eating peanut shells is not entirely new information for ET but a joint set of knowledge that is shared with the students (line 233). It is from this point on that ET transitions from being a co-assessor of the student answers to a co-respondent that aligns with the students. Furthermore, notice here that ET’s report is occasioned as a third turn action that orients not to the student responses, but it is aimed at dealing with KT’s reaction \textit{↑REALLY?} (line 232) instead. The shifting target of ET’s third turn indicates that ET positions herself in less of a teacher role than a co-defendant that provides support to the shell-eating activity.

Contrary to ET’s position, KT’s displays a stance that is one of extreme and sustained disbelief as indicated in the high pitch (lines 234, 237, 251) and amplification of her voice (lines 226, 232, 249). Therefore, she continues produce third turn assessments of doubt to ET and the student responses. First, she initiates a confirmation request whether the target of the discussion is indeed about the peanut shells (line 234). Although given a joint affirmation from both ET and Kyu, KT now questions whether the students had correctly understood ET’s question. KT thus rejects the factuality of the students’ responses with a prosodically marked surprise token \textit{oh ↑no!!↓} (line 237) along with three consecutive \textit{no’s} (line 239), and by extension, she attempts to clarify potential misunderstandings through a third position repair (Schegloff, 1992b) by re-stating that ET’s question was directed at eating the outside part of the peanut (lines 239-240).

KT’s clarification, however, is met again with affirmations not only from the students (lines 241, 244-246) but also from ET (line 243, 248). ET, who had originally shared with KT her surprise to the students’ responses, shifts to a position that sides with the students. Whereas
the source of her previous claim was left somewhat ambiguous (“some people eat like that,” line 233), ET upgrades the credibility of her justification by characterizing the peanut shell-eating activity as a first-hand experience that she herself had witnessed before (“I saw,” line 248). One of the students even provides an upshot saying that it was delicious (line 254). Eventually, KT registers the information with a change of state in line 253, and the resolution of the controversy opens way for ET to move on to the next item of the lesson (line 256).

In this exchange that intended to depart from a “known-answer” IRF sequence (Heritage, 2012a; Macbeth, 2003), we see here that the third turn was deployed by the co-teachers to display their stances toward the student responses. The two teachers initially started as co-assessors where they both pulled off a shared performance of surprise and asked follow-up questions for students to address. However, while ET gradually gravitated towards displaying affiliation with the student answers, KT’s persistent disbelief resulted in the co-teachers taking diverging paths. The third turn positions were no longer deployed in an equal manner by the teachers as ET transformed from a co-assessor of the students’ responses to a co-defendant that spoke in behalf of the students’ experiences. While KT’s third turn continued on as a follow-up turn to the student responses, ET flexibly transformed the third turn to provide accounts toward KT’s disaligning reactions. Consequently, what started as a teacher-student IRF became restructured alongside a new “interactional team” (Gordon, 2003; Kangasharju, 1996) where ET’s conjoined participation with the students accomplished a joint defense against KT’s suspicion.

**Interim summary**

The third position turns analyzed in this section show cases that range from co-teachers displaying mutual alignment in their orientations to instances where the two teachers reveal
distinct interpretations of the preceding student response turns. Thus, the third position turn of co-taught lessons is an interactionally rich space that allows us to gain access to the different instructional choices, methods, and agendas that the co-teachers deploy in the evolving sequence of collaborative classroom interaction. As a result, students obtain differing types of assessments from the teachers which we saw resulted in the simultaneous exposure to complementary and disapproving assessments, guidance towards revising their final products, and siding with one teacher to issue an argument against the other.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have examined IRF sequences of co-taught lessons to reveal their interactional structure that makes reference to the co-existence of two teachers in the classroom. The findings of the analysis demonstrate that the first, second, and third turn positions of the IRF sequence are occupied with multiple turns that involve the conjoined participation of three parties: the co-teachers and the students. The jointly initiated turns in the first position show the teachers’ close monitoring of each other’s actions as well as a mutual orientation toward accomplishing the curricular focus of the sequence. When entering in an incursive turn to the other teacher’s initiation move, we also saw that the co-teacher makes relevant a side-tracking agenda that lays out a precondition to the main activity. The co-initiations in this chapter contributed to the elicitation of student volunteers, provision of specifically-designed guidance as students attempted to arrive at the expected answer, and the establishment of moral rules that served as the basic ground for class activities to take place.

The co-teacher actions emerging in the second turn position opened up another space where the teachers’ alignment to the lesson objective could be observed. Whereas the second
turn had been solely reserved for the students in single-teacher classrooms, the data excerpts of this chapter illustrate the range of instructional actions that are occasioned via the co-teacher’s second turn entries. The interactional space is exploited for the teacher’s collaborative displays and evaluations of the expected response in the sequence, but on one hand, it also offers the possibility of a topic shift – a “pivot” turn (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1979) that acts as a springboard for launching an additional teacher initiation. While we could see that the co-teacher’s use of second turns secured a display of teacher collaboration and a joint effort of effectively promoting the progressivity of the lesson, some pedagogical concerns revolved around its sequence-closing nature as well as the proclivity to dismiss student contributions when a co-teacher was simultaneously involved in the turn.

Lastly, the analysis of the third turn position turns documents the contingent interpretational choices that co-teachers make throughout the development of the lesson. Current CA studies on the third turn in single-teacher classrooms have led insights to the routine practices and methods that teachers use to display their understanding of student responses (Y.-A. Lee, 2007; Margutti & Drew, 2014; Y. Park, 2014; Seedhouse, 1997; Waring, 2008). The analysis presented in this section not only adds to this set of literature, but it also illuminates an additional dimension – the teachers’ analysis of each other’s turns – that is realized in collaborative instruction. Students, alongside these layers of co-teaching instruction, are exposed to various assessments, stances, and agendas that address their contributions.

This chapter does not claim to address all of the methods and practices that teachers and students deploy in co-taught lessons. However, by examining the contingent actions involved in different IRF sequences and their inherent turn positions, the analysis conveys an empirical account of co-teaching interaction that differs from a two-party, teacher-student classroom. Such
findings not only pinpoint to moments where teacher collaboration is instantiated and made visible to the analyst, but it also produces a deeper understanding of the interactional mechanisms of co-teaching interaction and illuminates what collaborative instruction does for the accomplishment of curricular objectives, management of classroom contingencies, and the organization of student participation.
CHAPTER 5
EMBODIED TEACHER COLLABORATION & L2 INSTRUCTION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the relevance of embodied conduct to the organization of bilingual co-taught lessons. To this end, I examine how teachers utilize language and bodily conduct to build temporally-unfolding frameworks of co-participation, and explore ways in which they utilize such frameworks as resources to accomplish collaborative instruction. Along this line, I will first focus on the nonvocal behaviors of the non-leading teacher to reveal how through simultaneously enacted embodiment the teacher manages to align with the ongoing actions of the leading teacher while also inserting her own instructional concerns. The second section of the analysis then looks at instructional episodes focused on L2 vocabulary activities, exploring how publicly observable conduct provides a socially available resource for participants to organize interactionally sustained series of negotiating word meaning.

5.2 Collaboration as an Embodied Phenomenon

While the long-standing tradition of CA studies started with an analytical focus mainly on talk-in-interaction, the embodied conduct of participants have also been examined early in the frameworks of C. Goodwin (1981), Heath (1986) and Schegloff (1984). These developments opened the way for viewing the entire range of multimodally coordinated, simultaneously enacted, and sequentially organized participant behaviors in interaction, which in particular, inspired CA studies on workplace settings to employ video analysis in the investigation of institutionally collaborative activities. Various contexts such as surgical teams (Heath, Svensson, Hindmarsh, Luff, & vom Lehn, 2002; Hindmarsh & Pilnick, 2002, 2007), clinical training
(Hindmarsh et al., 2011), underground control rooms (Heath, Jirotka, Luff, & Hindmarsh, 1995; Heath & Luff, 1992), telecommunications control centers (Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000), airplane operation rooms (C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996), and archeological excavation sites (C. Goodwin, 1994) have been studied to describe the situated and socially organized character of cooperative work. The ability to collaboratively coordinate institutional tasks, as well as the process of interpretation and perception it involves, relies upon a publicly available set of practices and reasoning, an embodied social organization that is mutually shared among the participants.

Other than the work of Charles Goodwin, Christian Heath is another leading figure that has been influential in combining CA’s methodological rigor with video analysis to study the social and bodily coordination of collaborative activities in workplace settings. His studies reveal a rich set of details that explicate the interactional production of concerted team effort, as well as the tacit embodied practices through which the participants recognize and produce appropriate conduct that is sensitive to their relative roles. Below, I present one example from Heath et al. (2002) to illustrate this phenomenon. The data comes from a London teaching hospital where an anaesthetist, surgeon, and two nurses are involved in an operation. The complexity of this interaction is that the anaesthetist and the surgeon need access to the patient’s trachea at the same time. That is, the surgeon needs to look inside the trachea with a microscope to perform the surgical procedure while the anaesthetist also needs access in order to ventilate and pump oxygen into the patient’s lungs. How this is done in this operation is that the ventilation tube is regularly removed to allow the surgeon access to the trachea. When an alarm is activated, however, the ventilation tube is replaced by the anaesthetist when there is a pause in the operation and the gas is pumped into the patient’s lungs by manually squeezing a reservoir bag. Of interest in the
following extract is the way in which the participants display different orientations to the alarm, and how during the surgical procedure, the anaesthetist (Michael) delicately encourages the surgeon (Sean) to replace the ventilation tube during a pause in the operation.

5.1 (Heath et al, 2002, p. 336)

Here, we see that with the first alarm indication, the anaesthetist (Michael) turns his body away from the patient to face the anaesthetic monitor behind him. As this is followed by another alarm, he directs his gaze toward the nurses behind him and Mary (who is not visible in the framegrabs) informs that she will provide him with another tool. Meanwhile, the alarm is unattended to by
both the nurses (Jerry and Peter) as well as the surgeon (Sean), and they continue on with their conversation regarding the character of the surgical tools. What is noteworthy about this particular fragment is that the alarm has different relevancies for the participants. Furthermore, while the alarm is being disregarded by the nurses and the surgeon, the anaesthetist does not bring it to the attention of the other participants as an urgent business. His actions are restricted to momentary glances to the monitor, and he does not display the need for this matter to be addressed by the other participants at the moment.

In the next extract, fifteen seconds have passed, and with the third alarm indication, the anaesthetist finally takes action.

5.2 (Heath et al, 2002, p. 337)

As the anaesthetist turns to face the surgeon, he discovers that the surgeon has momentarily withdrawn from performing the surgical procedure, and that the ventilation tube has not been
reinserted yet. However, rather than producing any type of verbal request, the anaesthetist produces a quiet utterance *yeah*, makes a body torque toward the surgeon and moreover, moves the ventilation bag so that it is within the surgeon’s visual field. The anaesthetist does not interrupt the ongoing operation, but instead, makes use of the ventilation bag so that the surgeon can notice and take into account the necessity for reinserting the tube. As the surgeon registers the bag’s placement with his gaze, he immediately places the tube into the patient’s trachea.

According to Heath et al.’s (2002) analysis, the subtlety and delicacy of the anaesthetist’s actions reveals the differential status and responsibilities of the participants. The primary activity of concern is the surgical procedure, to which the anaesthetist is relatively restricted to a supporting role to the surgeon. Therefore, the anaesthetist displays his careful orientation of not interrupting the surgeon’s conversation with the nurses and employs instead his bodily conduct as a resource for making the emerging concerns of ventilation noticeable to the surgeon. Here, by considering the simultaneous, multimodal activities of the participants, we begin to reveal how cooperative work within institutional tasks involves sensitivity not only to the activity in process but also to the participants’ concerns and responsibilities. It is through this multimodally organized process that the participants are able to coordinate collaborative action through interaction and ultimately, work toward a joint accomplishment of their institutional task.

Given the interdependence of activities within the multimodal level of coordination, this chapter also views the collaboration occurring between co-teachers as an embodied phenomenon. By providing different kinds of semiotic materials in different positions (i.e., leading teacher vs. non-leading teacher), both teachers can contribute in consequential ways to the organization of an ongoing lesson. The first half of the analysis will thereby show how the simultaneous, concurrent organization of the non-leading teacher’s action builds temporally-unfolding
frameworks of co-participation, and how the different concerns and teacher roles are made relevant through their synchronous productions of social actions.

5.3 Nonvocal Resources in the L2 Classroom

CA with the focus on multimodality has also been applied to research in L2 settings. The main agenda has been to provide an adequate account on how embodiment in L2 interaction actually works (Olsher, 2004; Seo, 2011), how teachers and learners make relevant use of embodied conduct in their understanding and production of L2 talk (Kääntä, 2012; Markee, 2005; Mortensen, 2009), and what participation and learning opportunities emerge as a result (Eskildsen & Wagner, 2013; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Sert & Walsh, 2012). According to Markee (2004), CA analyses of nonvocal behaviors in L2 interaction can also uncover visible moments when learning is occasioned, which lead us to a better understanding of the socially distributed nature of cognition (Kääntä, 2014; Markee & Kunitz, 2013).

Whereas CA studies on the nonvocal aspects of L2 classroom interaction have focused on the observable conduct of teachers and students and their role in the organization of participation structures, the second part of this chapter takes interest not only in the participants’ embodied resources used to orient to different participant roles, but the symbolic actions used to represent word meaning in L2 vocabulary explanation. Lazaraton (2004) found that the teacher’s nonvocal behaviors are important forms of input to classroom L2 learners in that they can supplement important information to the verbal explanation given. These nonvocal behaviors largely consist of an array of finely coordinated multimodal resources, but how the participants organize their verbal and nonvocal conduct to actually work towards achieving a locally constructed understanding of L2 vocabulary – especially by making relevant the co-presence of two teachers – is relatively unexplored. Furthermore, what Lazaraton described in her data were gestures
accompanied by verbal explanations, which is not the case in this chapter. In my data, teachers often produce a lexical term without adding it with verbal explanations, but instead, assist the students to infer its meaning via the teachers’ nonvocal cues. To study nonvocal conduct as only an aid to the teacher’s instruction thus obscures the embodied knowledge that the participants bring to the L2 classroom. The nature of embodied vocabulary instruction is an empirical matter that needs to be revealed through careful analysis of the meaning-making structures that are enacted, transformed, and sustained across the participants’ language and nonvocal conduct.

The second half of the analysis of this chapter, therefore, will show that in addition to verbal talk, consideration of the participants’ nonvocal conduct is necessary in order to account for the entire cluster of resources involved in L2 vocabulary activities. By describing in detail how the two teachers and students appropriate and reproduce the gestural signs constructed by others, the chapter intends to reveal the interactional and largely embodied processes that are occasioned by instructional explanations of L2 vocabulary meaning.

5.4 Analysis

The analysis is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on the embodied conduct of the non-leading teacher, revealing her joint efforts in building a coherent lesson. In this sense, the non-leading teacher’s embodied actions range from producing exact duplications of the leading teacher’s nonvocal cues, projecting the trajectory of the leading teacher’s agenda, and inserting related concerns alongside the main activity in progress. The second section then zooms in on the instructional episodes that involve L2 vocabulary activities and explanation. Of interest here is the progressively unfolding deployment of vocal and visual conduct and how it is used as resource for constructing shared embodied vocabulary knowledge among the participants.
5.4.1 Embodied Collaboration of the “Non-leading” Teacher

The first extract is taken from a co-taught kindergarten lesson where the students are learning to sing Beethoven’s symphony No. 9, *Joyful, Joyful We Adore Thee*. The analytic focus of this data is on the non-leading teacher’s (ET) activities, on how she designs her verbal and nonvocal conduct to display sensitivity to the leading teacher’s (KT) ongoing instruction. In the following interaction, KT tries to explain the meaning of the lyrics: *drive the doubt of dark away*.

Excerpt 5.3 [KDS-13119-3-side 07:16] joyful joyful

In this extract, we see the two teachers embodying distinct participation frameworks in the classroom. KT is standing up, which makes visible her leading role in the lesson. ET, in contrast, is seated down on the floor. In line 1, the sequence begins with KT reading the lyrics on the screen. She directs the students’ attention to the lexical items *drive* and *dark*, verbally through the use of demonstratives *ceki* (“there”) and gesturally, by pointing at the words on the screen.
While KT is establishing a reference point for vocabulary instruction, ET also co-participates in a similar deictic activity by means of using her laser pointer (IMG #5.3.1). The screen is not in the frame grabs, but ET is pointing at the target words as they are read by KT. As a result, ET is able to perform instructions that are within the students’ visual field, while still conceding the main floor to KT. Another way that ET jointly participates in the presentation of vocabulary items is through repetition. After KT finishes reading off the slide, ET echoes the target word dark in a latched turn (line 3). ET’s verbal and novocal contributions display that she is carefully monitoring the actions of KT by precisely coordinating her activities with appropriate timing and in sequential positions that are in tune with KT’s instruction. Concurrently, the peripheral design of ET’s activities also reflects her sensitivity to minimize perturbation on KT’s talk, thus recognizing KT’s instruction as the principal line of action in this sequence. All together, ET manages to perform teacher actions that are secondary and in alignment with the current project of the leading teacher.

The next extract is another case where KT is taking the lead, and this time, the focus is on the teachers’ deployment of gestures and their visible effect in embodying their participatory positions in the sequence. This kindergarten class has been learning about different countries in the world, and KT has just announced that there will be a quiz next week. In the following interaction, KT is explaining how the students should prepare for the quiz.

**Excerpt 5.4 [KDS-131021-3-16:33]**

603 KT₄: kule-11ye-myen cip-ey ka-se!
do-in order to-COND home-to go-and
“in order to do that, you should go home,”

106
KT emphasizes that the students should be reading their books at home (line 602). Notice that a palm-opening gesture, a motion that depicts an opening of a book, arises in this context (IMG #5.4.1). Studies on the relationship between language and gesture have shown that the deployment of a gesture frequently precedes its unit of talk or “lexical affiliate” (McNeill, 2005; Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1995). Pre-positioned gestures as such foreshadow the word that the gesturer intends to vocalize, and in this sense, KT’s deployment of the hand-opening gesture notably creates a “projection space” that anticipates the semantic content of her next turn (Schegloff, 1984, p. 267).
While KT produces a gesture that contextualizes the directionality of her speech, ET also collaborates in the sequence by shifting her gaze from KT to the students and reproducing the same hand-opening movement (line 606, IMG #5.4.2). Through the gaze shift, ET displays that her action is designed for the sake of the students, thus enacting her role as a co-teacher to reinforce the given instruction. Another notable feature is that the onset of ET’s gesture is tuned with the exact timing when KT says ilk-ko (“read”), a verb that directly corresponds with the semantic meaning of the gesture. Whether this was deliberately planned for or not, ET’s actions not only work to reflect her recognition of KT’s embodied movements, but she also makes public her mutual sharing of the current instructional agenda by replicating KT’s actions in a tightly coordinated manner. Lastly, we see that the recycling of the gesture is also used as a preface to ET’s own turn. In lines 609 and 611, ET says study twice which reformulates KT’s description of yeylsimhi ilk-ko (“read hard”) under a more institutionally-relevant theme. The gesture thereby affords ET with the space to contribute to the ongoing instruction by complementing it with her own interpretation of the gesture, assigning her own stance toward what is involved in preparing for the quiz. ET’s actions do not demand a response from KT nor do they interrupt the activities of the main course of instruction. All in all, we see that the gestural followings function to structure the aligned roles of KT and ET, revealing their shared agendas as well as their collaborative buildings of the interaction.

Whereas the previous examples showed the non-leading teacher embodying alignment through duplicative gestures and verbal repetitions, Excerpt 5.5 is a different case in that the non-leading teacher produces an independent gesture alongside the ongoing co-teacher’s instruction. Here, this kindergarten class is about to have an arm wrestling competition among the students.
KT has been explaining in Korean the proper manners, posture, and rules that govern arm wrestling games. Meanwhile, ET is sitting across from KT, assisting her with the demonstrations.

Excerpt 5.5 [KSUN-131001-1-31:01] arm wrestling

611 KT: son-ul cal kamssa-cwe-yo  
hand-ACC well cover-give-POL  
“cover the hands nicely”

612 waynyamyen + ilehkey ha-kena  
because like this do-or  
“because if we do like this”

613 + ani+myen kunyang +++ilehkey ha-myen-un?  
or just like this do-if-TOP

614 nehuy-ka him-ul:.(.  
you-NOM power-ACC

615 manhi patki-ka himtul-e  
a lot receive-NOM difficult-IE  
“or if you do just this,  
it’s hard for you to give your full strength”

616 → ((ET nods))
KT is describing the most optimal form of arm wrestling through verbal directions and a physical demonstration of the correct posture with ET. After KT states and shows the right way of grasping each other’s hands (line 611), KT switches her hand position two times. First, she only grabs on the tips of ET’s fingers (line 612, IMG #5.5.1), and then, her hand moves to cover the outer part of ET’s fist (line 613, IMG #5.5.2). The reason for showing these different grips is not verbally stated until in line 614, KT explains that the latter ways of holding hands are negative examples that the students should avoid.

As KT occupies herself with the delivery of arm-wrestling tips, ET co-participates by making her bodily resources available for the demonstration. ET orients to her subsidiary role in the interaction through silent performances of appropriate hand positions that are in concert with KT’s directions. Although conceding the leading teacher position to KT, ET’s embodied movements convey a role that goes beyond a simple prop. After KT holds the end of ET’s fingers to illustrate an incorrect arm-wrestling grip, ET shifts her gaze from her hands to the students, makes a stern face, and follows it with a visible head shake (IMG #5.5.2). This gaze shift indicates that her action is recognizably designed for the students (C. Goodwin, 1979; Rossano, 2013), and considering that KT has not yet characterized the alternative hand grips as bad examples, ET’s head shake and facial expression comes off as a preemptory evaluation of the grip. By producing unsolicited embodied conducts as such, ET publicly displays her negative stance toward the demonstrated activity, and the interactional effect of it results in a premonition that contextualizes and projects KT’s emerging explanation (Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1995). Action projectors and stance markers as such are categorized as “pragmatic gestures” that display what the current utterance is designed to do at the moment, the stance that the speaker
takes toward that content, and how the upcoming course of talk is to be taken by the recipients (Kendon, 2004; Streeck, 2006).

Studies on embodiment have used terms such as “forward-gesturing” (Streeck, 2009a) to describe prefatory bodily conduct that foreshadow upcoming actions or linguistic content, and most of these discussions have focused on it as being the current speaker’s project. Mondada (2007) and Mortensen (2009) are exceptions in that they describe forward-gesturing involved in emerging speakerships where recipients are competing to claim an imminent turn, but these practices are still different from what ET is doing in this excerpt. That ET is a non-speaker in this interaction implicates a distinct participation framework wherein ET is acting in a concurrent time frame to KT’s ongoing talk. In this sense, the embodied practices of a gaze shift, head shake, and stern facial expression afford ET with the resources to “silently” qualify her propositional attitude and accomplish a pre-alignment to KT’s activity without interrupting the main course of the instruction (Streeck, 2009a). By embodying her commitment to the projected line of KT’s actions, ET is able to enact an alignment of stances, and by extension, a public display of shared instructional goals.

In Excerpt 5.6, KT continues to explain about the way to arm wrestle. ET participates again by means of deploying her nonvocal resources, but this time, the interactional import of her embodied action not only projects but directs the next step of KT’s instruction. One contextual note that should be made is that when KT says Miss Alice, it is referring to ET.

Excerpt 5.6 [KSUN-131001-1-31:49] tsk tsk camera
“if you make your body closer, it'll be easier. Do you understand?”

“so before we start, Miss Alice will take a photo of the players, to leave a record of who is competing with whom”
Understandings checks often occur at activity boundaries, when the teacher is about to move on to the next agenda of the lesson (Waring, 2012a). Thus, when KT says *al-keyss-eyo* (line 631 “do you understand”), she signals a potential activity closing. It is this moment that ET produces a tongue click (line 662) which is accompanied with a hand gesture that portrays the pressing of a camera button (IMG #5.6.2). ET’s gaze shift shows that KT is addressed as her recipient, with the tongue click possibly used as an attention-getting device. The meaning of the camera gesture, however, remains ambiguous at this point. M. H. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) argue that the interactional importance of a particular gesture is shaped by the participants, and the understanding of it requires a detailed analysis of the sequential activity that they are engaged in. In this sense, the significance of the camera gesture can be properly understood by virtue of considering KT’s contiguous actions.

First, KT produces a consecutive turn that starts with a connective *kelayse* (“so”) which builds a connection with her previous talk (line 664). She then highlights the time frame that precedes the start of the arm wrestle, and while she announces that ET is going to take photos of the competitors (lines 665-667), she simultaneously recycles the camera gesture that was previously provided by ET (IMG #5.6.3). Here, KT makes available her construal of ET’s embodied movements. ET’s camera gesture is an iconic rendition of taking photos, but its meaning and function is specific to the context of this lesson. That KT is able to unpack the exact meaning of ET’s gesture – the teachers’ plan to do a photo-shoot of the arm-wrestling students – evidences that this understanding is in fact a shared agenda between the two teachers.

ET, then, by inserting a gestural sign alongside KT’s talk, comes across as having enacted her co-teacher role to project the next step of the instruction. Foreshadowing an action that is not yet realized in the current speaker’s talk is a way for participants to show their mutual
orientation and entitlement to the activity in the strongest manner (Lerner, 2002). By projecting the next line of development in behalf of the speaker, ET demonstrates that she is closely monitoring the unfolding details of the interaction wherein the embodied resources affords her with the interactional resources to insert an instructional reminder of a shared plan while minimizing her interference with KT’s leading role. The enactment of the camera gesture also operates under the assumption that its indexed meaning is readily available to KT, and consequently, it invites her to follow with a turn that marks receipt of the projected agenda. As KT produces a gestural alignment in her ensuing talk, ET’s contribution is ratified as a relevant matter to the moment, which after all, works to reveal the teachers’ shared orientation to the activity.

The last data segment of this section is the same second grade science class with Excerpt 4.2 that is on the topic of sink or float. As a reminder, the goal of the lesson is to transform the shape of a piece of clay so that it can float in water. Excerpt 5.7 occurs mid-point into the lesson after the students have been given some time to work in their groups, but none of the groups were able to successfully accomplish the activity. In order to solve this problem, ET has just announced that she will give two more minutes for each group to give it another try, and in what follows, she also states that she will provide the students with a hint.

Excerpt 5.7 [2H-131023-23:50] boat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>ET&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>I’ll give you a hint=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>KT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>=ah!: teacher will give you a hint=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>ET&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>=hint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>KT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;:</td>
<td>how can you make it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 70   | ET<sub>4</sub>: | hint (. ) is that you need to [sh- | *(ET looks at Yumi)* |-->
|      |         | {{hwan+tha!}} |-->
|      |         | fanta |
| 71   | Yumi:   | *{(KT looks at Yumi)} |-->
|      |         | *{(hwan+tha!)} |-->
| 72   |         | *{0.5}* |
KT₂: uh-oh.
(0.7)
+(ET looks at SS) --> ++(KT looks at ET) -->
ET₄: +you need to change ++the shape
think about it
SS: ah:
ET₄: +you know a boat that you see? (turns to whiteboard)

→ KT₂: +boat boat! (0.3) ++shape
ET₄: [this is ++water:

→
→
+(ET draws bottom part of boat)
→
+(ET draws in the air with right hand)

ET₄: but how [ does +the ] [boats:++]
KT₂: [think about it]<++
Minwoo: [ai know::

→
+(ET keepings drawing)
→
+(ET’s right hand swings back & forth x2 in a ♯ shape))
ET₄: +stay::
→
+(ET’s right index finger swings back & forth)
+(both hands swing back & forth)
After a brief interruption from one student (lines 71-74), the hint-giving sequence resumes with ET stating that the students need to change the shape of the clay. The specific shape of the clay is left unelaborated (line 76, “think about it”) although ET takes the step of adding the relevance of a boat (line 77). While a chunk of clay may seem abstract and ambiguous in its floating capabilities, this move contextualizes the hint by making associations with a familiar object that is known for its buoyant character.

Right when ET turns to the whiteboard to put up an illustration, KT directs her gaze to the students and initiates a turn that displays her co-participation in the hint-giving activity. KT first makes a verbal alignment by repeating boat and then shape (line 79) which selectively re-states and emphasizes the important points in ET’s hint. Concurrently, as KT says shape, she also produces a gestural movement that traces the shape of a boat (IMG #5.7.1). KT’s actions are “co-operative” in that they partially replicate the language structure provided by ET in the last turn, but they are also “transformative” in that the hint is embedded within an added layer of a gestural configuration (C. Goodwin, 2013). As a result, both teachers display a shared interest in providing visual aids, but the depictions between the two teachers occupy different modalities – drawing versus manual gesturing – and as we can see in the interaction that follows, they also frame their hints with different levels of directness and specificity.

First shown in ET’s continuing talk as well as her drawings is a spatial reference of water and ocean which focuses on constructing the landscape where boats are typically found (lines 80-81). By starting with a scenic depiction, ET’s hint comes across as a holistic representation of
boats that does not particularly highlight the relevant features related to their floating capabilities. KT, on the other hand, produces in a simultaneous time frame a clear embodied sketch that strips away all the unnecessary details and foregrounds only the container shape of the boat (IMG #57.2). This gesture is not a mere depiction but a very specific tracing that directly visualizes the solution to the assigned activity.

The contrast in directness between the teachers’ clues is made even clearer in the following turns. ET’s hint continues to remain relatively ambiguous as she states a generic question how does the boat stay and accompanies it with a drawing that shows the boat in its full figure (line 82, 85). While this approach presents the entire image of the boat, even including the sail, KT’s manual tracing becomes further simplified in that she repeatedly swings her hand in a pendulum motion. Although her verbal directive is a generic think about it (line 83), the enhanced specificity of KT’s gesture serves to highlight the bowl shape of the boat, and thus works as a straightforward hint that represents how the clay should be molded. An upshot to this gesture is provided in line 86 as KT re-states water and shape and changes her manual depiction from using one hand to both (IMG #5.6.3). The dual hand gesture leads to an upgrade of the motion’s visibility, which evidences KT’s repeated efforts of making the embodied shape clear to the students. Consequently, the directness of KT’s clue may have contributed to facilitating the students’ brainstorming process and thus possibly led the students to resume their discussions even before ET finished drawing the boat on the whiteboard.

In this excerpt, we see that KT aligns with ET’s lead of providing hints for the students. Considering their verbal utterances, the two teachers share a similar interest in encouraging the students to think further, especially as KT’s turns are repetitions of what ET said before. When observing their simultaneously enacted embodied conduct, however, each teacher portrays
different aspects of the hint with diverging degrees of specificity. KT’s actions are not simple replications of ET’s previous turns. Instead, KT selectively appropriates parts of the linguistic structure provided by ET and embeds them in a subtly different gestural frame that conveys a more direct insight into the answer of the assigned activity. The embodied details consequently reveal the straightforward nature of KT’s contributions which conflicts with the indirectness of ET’s clue. It is by considering the embodied details of both teachers that we gain a fuller picture of their shared and varied orientations to the activity, their joint but subtly different efforts in pursuit of assisting the students’ brainstorming process.

Interim summary

This section showed how the embodied resources afforded both KT and ET to visibly organize their respective participant roles and display their orientation to achieving a mutually-shared instructional objective. By providing different kinds of nonvocal materials in structurally different participatory positions, we saw the non-leading teacher contributing in consequential ways to collaboratively construct the main course of the instruction. Such actions consisted of the non-leading teacher repeating the semiotic structure provided by the other teacher, displaying a premonitory action of what is yet to be produced, and embodying depictive hints that facilitated the progress of the lesson. The nonvocal details of the non-leading teachers’ activities captured their silent but active co-participation through sensitively timed and coordinated activities to the other teacher’s project.

5.4.2 Gestural Alignments in L2 Vocabulary Instruction

The second section describes the co-teachers’ embodied actions as they are delivered within the course of L2 vocabulary instruction. The focal point of the analysis lies on the instructional series of defining vocabulary items wherein the teachers collaboratively invoke
visible bodily conduct as a symbolic resource for making word-meaning associations. I will first present the cases where the non-leading teacher is replicating the representational gestures of the leading teacher. Then, I will move on to analyze a data fragment where both teachers are contributing to a vocabulary explanation with different gestures, and how those embodied materials become consequential for the students’ responses.

The first segment is a second grade class where ET is teaching the English terminologies for compass directions. In Excerpt 5.8, ET introduces a mnemonic device for remembering each of the terms – *Never Eat Soggy Waffles* – where the first letters of each word represent the acronym used for indicating compass directions (NESW, North, East, South, West). As the gaze direction appears to be significant detail in the analysis of this extract, the embodied actions of the teachers are transcribed in a separate line above their verbal talk.

**Excerpt 5.8 [2H-131120-5-BK-00:31] what’s never**

| kt | looks at ET & board --> |
| et | looks at Ss |
|    | ++looks at board --> |
|    | ++(writes “never” on board) |
| 43 | ET: so ṣẹnːɪːː, ++(1.1) we’re gonna say never |
| 44 | what’s never? |
| 45 | (0.3) |

---
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The extract starts with ET unpacking the first letter “N” of the acronym. ET states that the “N” stands for *never* and writes the word on the board (line 43). Then upon writing, ET poses a question *what’s never* which seeks for a student response that states the definition of the word (line 44). Meanwhile, KT, although standing in front of the classroom, occupies a spatial position in the right corner. That she remains in silence with her gaze directed at ET and her activities embody her secondary observer position in this instructional sequence.

ET’s definition request is not immediately aligned with by the students as indicated by the 0.3-second (line 45) and 1.3-second pause (line 46), and before the students provide candidate answers to the question, ET brings her gaze from the whiteboard to the students and
crosses her hands in an “X” shape below her chin (IMG #5.8.1). This iconic gesture recognizably symbolizes the semantic content of never, and embodied cues as such are strategies used by teachers to elicit word meanings from the students instead of the teacher giving the definition (Sert & Walsh, 2012).

Shortly after ET produces the never sign, KT closely follows ET’s gestural lead by also configuring her hands into a clear “X” and sustaining it across her following turns (IMG #5.8.2). KT’s orientation to produce an aligned gesture is reflected in her gaze pattern which swiftly moves from the students to ET. It is worthy to note the different visibility of the two gestures. ET, as she is carrying a handout in her right hand, is limited in her ability of making a clearly identifiable sign. Her “X” involves only from the wrist up and because of the paper covering her left arm, the sign is relatively less noticeable in its shape. KT’s “X,” by contrast, overlaps directly in the midpoint of her arms, and her firmly extended fingers exhibit extra effort in her performance of this sign.

Here, the matching and slightly enhanced gesture not only displays KT’s recognition of the gesture’s referent, but it also allows KT to assist the leading teacher in a conjoined fashion. This “gestural matching” (Lerner, 2002) results in a collaborative public display that communicates to the students the notable relevance of the gesture to the answering of ET’s question. Notice that one of the students also participates in the gestural mimicry by crossing his hands in the same fashion (IMG #5.8.2). The duplicate gesture is then sustained by both teachers until the end of this extract (IMG #5.8.3), serving as a visual backdrop while ET pursues to elicit aligning answers with an elongated repetition of the word (line 147). It is within this environment that a correct Korean translation celtay arises from one of the students without either of the teachers providing any verbal explanations or cues. The dual embodiment of the
target vocabulary occasions a sensitively-timed performance of teacher collaboration as well as a publicly visible and coordinated symbolic structure that allows the students to make inferences of the target vocabulary in question.

Excerpt 5.9 is another example where KT enacts a matched gesture in alignment with ET’s instruction. The sequence similarly involves ET asking the students for a word definition. The target phrase is *less than*, and in fact, it is the very first time that ET is introducing this term into the lesson.

**Excerpt 5.9 [2H-120712-MOV062-20:00] less than**

30 ET₄: is less than (0.4) big or small.
31 Doyun: small (0.6)
32
33 ET₄: [(cupping motion)]
34 KT₂: [((puts both palms facing each other)) -->
35 ET₄: can’t hear [you
36 Doyun: [small!
37 Ss: small!
38 ET₄: yes small

With the objective of introducing the expression *less than*, ET produces a question that asks the students to choose from two candidate answers (line 30). The clues *big* and *small* are delivered
concurrently with gestural illustrations (IMGs # 5.9.1, 5.9.2) that are co-expressive with the content of her talk (cf. Lazaraton, 2004; McNeill, 2005). One student, Doyun, provides the expected answer small (line 31), but it is not ratified by ET. Rather, there is a 0.6-second pause (line 32) which is followed by ET placing a cupping gesture near her right ear and verbally stating that she is unable to hear the students (lines 33, 35). ET’s problematization of the other students’ silence manifests that she expects a collective response which involves the majority of the students.

While ET awaits a chorally-produced response, KT enters the interaction with an embodiment. After the 0.6-second pause, KT silently launches a gesture that replicates the manual depiction of small that ET had produced earlier in the interaction (line 34, IMG #5.9.3). Two observations are relevant in the analysis of this gesture. First, the gesture is post-positioned to Doyun’s single response. Whereas ET had originally embedded two types of gestures in her initiation turn, that KT selectively reproduces only the small hand gesture in this sequential position transpires as a third turn confirmation, an embodied positive assessment towards Doyun’s answer. Second, the gesture occurs at the timing when ET marks the onset of her cupping gesture, and it is sustained until the students provide a collective answer in line. As this gesture is continuously kept in the background while the students are expected to produce a choral response, it also acts as a nonvocal clue that encourages the other students to repeat after the visually corroborated answer. The amplified volume and exclamatory tone of Doyun’s second response (line 36) are possible indicators of having oriented to KT’s cue and thus resulting in an increased epistemic stance. It also within this context that a collective answer from the students is finally produced (line 37), and the timely withdrawal of KT’s gesture marks that its instructional purpose has been accomplished.
In both extracts, nonvocal conduct emerges as an essential practice in the introduction of new vocabulary, and the teacher does not accompany the lexical term with any verbal explanations. As ET takes the gestural lead, it provides a public structure for KT and the students to “co-operatively” act upon (C. Goodwin, 2013). The first excerpt was a case where KT immediately aligned with the gesture, and by delivering it with an enhanced presentation, she managed to assist KT’s instruction and collaboratively provide contextual clues that succeeded in eliciting an appropriate student response. In the second extract, KT recycled the first position gesture in a third turn position slot, which again served as a strong visual cue that guided the students to the correct understanding of the target word.

While the gestural alignment in the two extracts involved an exact duplication of the leading teacher’s nonvocal behaviors, the third example is different in that each teacher contributes to the interaction with an independent gesture. The data fragment in Excerpt 5.3 and shows the ensuing interaction that extends across four excerpts. The interaction demonstrates how the teachers and the students embody word meaning through their own verbal and gestural displays, and how the compilation of those resources lead to a collective understanding of the target vocabulary. To re-state the context here, KT is explaining the meaning of the lyrics *drive the doubt of dark away*, and in what follows, the word *away* becomes the specific focus of explanation.

Excerpt 5.10 [KDS-13119-3-side 07:16] *byebye*

01 KT₄: ++{(ET looks and points laser at screen)}
+(RF points at screen)--->
+kunTEY, +++drive-nun ceki Dar:κ iss-canha::
+ví-TP there be-COMM
dark of the=
“but drive, there’s dark over there”

02 ET₅: =dark
After pointing out the target phrase on the screen, KT moves on to explain the lyrics (lines 4-5). Whereas KT provides a direct translation of the phrase *doubt of dark*, the word *away* is kept in its English form. Instead, it is said with a sweep (IMG #5.10.1), a depictive gesture that captures the semantic content of the word. It is at this point that ET jumps in. She discontinues her previous activity of laser pointing, turns to face the students, and in a latched turn, says *byebye* (line 6) while waving her hand (IMG #5.10.2).

Two observations can be made about ET’s turn. First, the provision of *byebye* and its corresponding gesture reflect ET’s sensitivity towards KT’s previous actions. ET displays her
understanding that students need to guess the meaning of the word, and with that as a shared objective, she is able to join the instruction at an appropriate moment and with complementary action. Second, ET’s turn does not consist of talk alone but it contains an independent gesture that embodies a different contextual use of *away*. Compared to KT’s sweeping motion, ET’s gesture is more iconic and thus embodies a hint that is less ambiguous for the students. The familiarity of the expression may have also enabled the students to readily produce a verbal repetition of the *byebye* in the next turn (line 7).

Meanwhile, KT visibly registers ET’s *byebye* motion through a gaze shift, and she continues on with her turn to explain the meaning of *drive away*. 

Excerpt 5.11 [KDS-13119-3-side 07:27]

08 KT₄: [daːrk] [-han-key? -ATTR-thing
+((shakes fists up and down))

09 Jun: [tulaipu] [+naka-nun-ke drive go out-ATTR-thing “going out for a drive”

10 KT₄: +driv::e? (0.4) [+aːway::

11 ET₅: [awaːy.

12 (0.5)
After KT re-states the focal phrase of the lyrics (line 8, 10), she attaches the words *drive* and *away* with gestural illustrations. What is particularly interesting is that while KT previously depicted the meaning of *away* with a sweep and ET did so with a hand wave, we see KT adding another gesture – kicking (IMG #5.11.1). Each movement is imbued with verb-like attributes, but it schematizes the meaning of *away* within a different range of visual categories. For instance, while the sweeping hand represents *away* as an individual’s activity of brushing something aside, ET’s hand wave portrays it as a social activity that involves saying salutations to another person. The stances that the gestures carry also lie in contrast with one another. Compared to the sweep and the hand wave, to kick something away involves a relatively aggravated stance. That it is delivered with movements of the lower body, not just the hand, also enacts a slightly exaggerated visual representation of the word. Although the gestures share a common core of lexical reference, each of them are created separately by different speakers and with their own manual symbols. Through these embodied imageries, we are given access to various schematic versions of the referent, the teachers’ respective “imaginations” of the lexical meaning of *away* (Streeck, 2009b).

Then, how these different gesture forms are incorporated into the ensuing interaction remains as an interest of this extract. After the two teachers contribute in series their various depictions of the target vocabulary, KT appropriates ET’s hand wave both through verbal and
gestural means (line 13, IMG #5.11.2). The recycling of the hand wave reflects the fact that KT has been monitoring ET’s behaviors, and it ratifies ET’s gesture as an appropriate contribution to the sequence, making transparent KT’s alignment to the relevance of the *byebye* frame. This shows that once produced, the form of a speaker’s gesture, along with its symbolized meaning, becomes a shared resource among the participants (C. Goodwin, 2000; Kimbara, 2006). By making a return to a previously enacted gesture form by the other teacher, KT reinforces the indexical ties between the different gestures and the meaning of *away* and by extension, constitutes the entire package as embodied knowledge that is made available to the students.

In the next excerpt, we finally see what consequences this gestural package has on the students. Here, the students are invited to contribute with their understandings as KT seeks to summarize the translated meaning of the lyrics.

Excerpt 5.12 [KDS-13119-3-side 07:36] *bye bye sin*

19  KT₄:  kulem ettehkey [toy-n-ke-lkka
then how become-ATTR-thing-INTERRU
“then how does this all come together”

20  Juri:  [+phek!
pow

21  KT₄:  coi-lang: (.) sulpum-i ta::? (0.6
sin-and sadness-NOM all
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Following a transition-implicative *kelum* (“then”), the launching of *ettehkey toy-n-ke-likka* (“what does this come down to”) serves as a preface to KT’s upcoming summary and as it is formulated in an interrogative format (line 19), it also invites the students to enter the response turn with their own contributions. In fact, as KT continues on to translate the first part of the focal lyrics in
Korean (line 21-22), Juri and Jun come in overlapping turns. Juri does a gestural replication of KT’s former kick (IMG #5.12.1) and she couples it with a sound effect *phek* ("pow" line 20). Jun, on the other hand, recycles the hand wave theme (IMG #5.12.2) while simultaneously saying *coi-ya anyoung* (“byebye sin” lines 22-24). The phenomenon that we see here is the students selectively reproducing different gestures that were provided by the teachers. With the students re-using the teachers’ gestures, each movement is constituted as a communal sign of *away*, in which a shared bit of knowledge about the word meaning is embodied.

Also worthy of attention is Juri’s addition of a sound effect *phek* (“pow”) as well as Jun’s transformation of the gesture’s vocal counterpart. Whereas ET and KT repeatedly associated the hand wave with the lyrics of *drive the doubt of dark away*, Jun takes the footing in Korean and invokes the salutation frame to act out an imaginary scenario of sending *sin* away. Sin actually comes from the lyrics *melt the clouds of sin and sadness* that was discussed by the teachers immediately prior to this extract. That Jun is able to transform the target of the salutation from *darkness* to *coi* (“sin”) demonstrates his understanding of the contextual use of *away* as well as his orientation to extending the frame to other situations. Similarly, Juri’s sound effect *phek* (“pow”) recognizes the schematic action of the kick, and thus elaborates upon the gestural sign with her understanding of what it represents. Here, we find that the embodied enactment allows the students to not only construe vocabulary meaning in a specific way but also to reproduce it in a manner that is attached with their own interpretative stances and imaginative scenarios.

KT moves on to translate the rest of the lyrics, and in doing so, she makes use of a “designedly incomplete utterance” (Koshik, 2002). By leaving the next slot open after *kelayse etwuwum-i?* (“so to darkness?”) and marking its incompleteness with a rising intonation (line 25), KT invites the students to contribute to producing the rest of the sentence. As a result, we see
that KT, ET, and the majority of the students simultaneously co-complete the sentence with a verbal and gestural *byebye* (line 26) while Minwoo aligns with a kicking motion and sound effect (line 28, IMG #5.12.3).

Up to this point, we have observed the process through the two teachers evoked different representational gestures regarding a single vocabulary, and how the students collaboratively participate in meaning-making within this situated history of symbolic actions. This interaction shows that the various gestures provide publicly shared and interactive resources for multiple parties to accomplish joint word-meaning mapping, and thus enables the students to display their understanding of the lyrics in a coordinated and embodied fashion. By observing the contiguity of the teachers’ and students’ gestures, it enables us to examine the practices through which the bodily actions are made meaningful and gradually become communal symbols that index a shared type of embodied knowledge about a new vocabulary item (Hayashi, 2003; Lebaron & Streeck, 2000). As streams of talk and gestures are produced in series by separate actors, the participants reflexively attend to each other’s signs as resources for constructing a collective set of vocabulary definition as well as authoring their individual interpretations of the enacted gestural frames.

This particular sequence comes to an end as KT terminates it with a *final ly:* (line 29). The gestural theme, however, is re-invoked as the teachers move to explain the next line of the lyrics: *giver of immortal gladness.* The interaction below occurs forty lines after Excerpt 5.12, and it is when ET makes a return to the lyrics that were previously discussed.

Excerpt 5.13 [KDS-13119-3-side 08:24] *glad*

69 ET<sub>6</sub>: so *after, (.) after, (.)*
By means of prefacing her turn with a connective *so*, ET makes a discursive link between the current focus and the lyrics that was discussed prior to this context (line 69). Notice, however, that when ET states the lyrics, she does not cite verbatim from the original phrase, but she recycles the simplified version *say byebye to sin* (line 70). Also noteworthy is her concurrent deployment of bodily conduct. While she verbalizes the phrase, she first accompanies it with a hand wave, and then follows it with a kick (IMG #5.13.1). A kick is normatively an irrelevant and rather inappropriate gesture to the activity of saying bye, but what ET is enacting here is an embodied formulation that summarizes the gist of prior interaction and advances a specific understanding that was previously shared within the group.

That ET’s gesture involves a composite of two unrelated actions demonstrates that this gestural package is a mutual knowledge base shared by the participants and one that is constructed as a local understanding specific to this context. Like verbal talk, bodily conduct is also contingent upon the embodiment previously enacted by other participants and are consecutively linked as long as it bears relevance to the activity in progress. In this sense, we see that nonvocal resources are ingredients used by teachers in L2 instruction interaction as they not
only contribute meaning to the common ground, but also becomes a shared and jointly used symbolic resource for sustaining collective vocabulary understanding.

The last set of data fragments, Excerpts 5.14 and 5.15, come from a second grade science class on living and nonliving things, and the focal interaction is different from the other extracts in that the design of the activity requires a great deal of embodied action from one of the teachers. Below, the students have just finished learning a list of expressions (see Figure 5.1) that are used to describe living and nonliving things.

![Figure 5.1. List of target expressions on Powerpoint slide](image)

As a way of reviewing these target phrases, the following activity takes on a charade-like character where KT acts out one of the expressions, ET shouts out a “guess,” and the students indicate with an embodied “O” or “X” whether ET’s conjecture is correct or not. Excerpt 5.14 shows a sample interaction of this game:

Excerpt 5.14 [2C-120612-57:35] breathe
The extract exemplifies that the charade activity has a sequential pattern of three turns. The first position turn is nonvocal in that it starts with KT initiating a gestural reference to one of the expressions that the students learned. While KT sustains his performance in the background, ET produces different descriptions of the portrayed activity (IMG #5.14.1). Lastly, the students show their judgment on the appropriacy of KT’s description by putting up an “O” or “X” sign on top of their heads. The sequence comes to an end when ET offers the correct expression for KT’s embodied display and the students align with it with an “O” sign. We see here that the activity is predominantly reliant upon the participants’ interpreting each other’s nonvocal actions. KT’s gestural illustration operates as a public and commonly visible backdrop, upon which ET and the students organize their guessing activities.

This activity continues on in the next excerpt. As KT attempts to initiate a performance of a new item, however, he indicates trouble in recalling the target expressions and resorts to ET for assistance. Of interest in this interaction is the different gestures enacted by ET and KT, and how the serial enactment of gestures leads ET to contribute an item kick that was originally not included in the list of target expressions.
Excerpt 5.15 [2C-120612-57:51] move

913 KT₁: um: +(0.6) um uh:
914 ET₁: ((flaps both arms))

915 *((dances)) {((walks backwards, doing moon walk))}

916 KT₁: *yeah [+okay::
917 ET₁: uh:: babies?
918 Ss: no::

919 ET₁: breathe? hmha:: [hmha
920 KT₁: [+(does a taekwondo kick)]
921 Ss: ((laughing))
KT’s trouble of proceeding with the next item is indicated in the use of delay markers *um* and the occurrence of a mid-term pause (line 913). As KT directs his gaze to ET (IMG #5.15.1), he solicits ET’s assistance to provide him with the next item. In response, ET produces a gestural cue where she is flapping her arms by her side (line 914, IMG #5.15.1). This gesture is ambiguous unless one considers the list of target expressions to understand that KT is making a gestural reference to the verb *move*. That KT registers this information with an affirmation *yeah* and the *okay* orients to this shared understanding, and he directly moves on to stage an embodied performance of the verb.
In what follows, KT does not replicate the action provided by ET, but depicts the target word in a fashion that invokes various types of visual scenarios: dancing (IMG #5.15.2), moon-walking (IMG #5.15.3), and doing a taekwondo kick (IMG #5.15.4). It is through these embodied choices that KT reveals his own imageries of the concept move, or in the words of Streeck (2009a), “give[s] kinesthetic form to the imagistic representations of word meanings” (p. 154). The performances are also recipient-designed in that they take exaggerated, comical formats of inducing humor from the students. The most escalated form takes place when KT does a taekwondo kick, and its humorous effect is observable in the joint laughter occurring among the students and ET’s talk (lines 925, 926, 929).

Although a dance, a walk, and a kick can be considered as separate, unrelated actions, they are categorized as belonging under the same collection of “movement.” With these locally-embodied illustrations serving as the background, ET enacts different interpretations of the actions such as babies (line 917) and breathe (lines 919, 922), which furnishes the students with opportunities to demonstrate their recognition of the indexed target expression. When ET proffers the correct version of the gesture move (line 926), however, we see that it fails to meet with a student response. Instead, ET’s turn is overlapped with one of the students asking KT about his capabilities of kicking high (line 927), and KT orients to this question by following with another kick. The humorous impact of KT’s motion results in shifting the students’ focus away from ET’s question to the literal nature of KT’s kick.

One observation here is that ET, instead of pursuing a response to move, revises her question in a way that corresponds with the iconic content of KT’s gesture. Kick is not an expression that was taught during the lesson, but we see that ET not only introduces an item that is irrelevant to the curricular focus, but she also delivers it with a matching gesture (IMG
Such efforts exhibit her orientation to the transition in activity frame where she is now faced with the task of addressing the dominating import of KT’s kick and the students’ interest at the moment while also maintaining her role of initiating questions. By producing a turn that registers the kick both verbally and gesturally, ET re-organizes her semantic interpretation of KT’s gesture. Whereas the original purpose of her turn was targeted at reviewing the lexical term *move*, ET recognizes and aligns with the current theme, and consequently, revises her question in a manner that instantiates a literal interpretation of the kicking motion.

Gestures, due to its inherent ambiguity, are susceptible to different understandings as well as different interactional functions (Lebaron & Streeck, 2000; McNeill, 2005; Schegloff, 1984). In this extract, KT’s gestures supply various clues that embody the meaning of *move*, and the appropriate interpretations of them rely on a shared understanding that traces back to the target expressions as a shared reference point. As the kick takes on an exaggerated and humorous stance, however, we see the students attending to the visible features of the kick rather than its implied connection with the lesson objectives. This digression could potentially entail a teacher’s reproach, but ET establishes local cohesion within the sequence by revising her interpretation of the embodied action in a contingent fashion, and thus jointly engages within the humorous frame that is established by the kick. The jocular stance of KT’s kick is thus oriented to as the mutual focus of attention, a stance that momentarily supersedes the representational meaning of the gesture and allows leeway for a temporary “time out” from the official instructional business. Furthermore, as ET produces her kick with the verbalization of its vocal counterpart, the linguistic aspect of the gesture is added to the sequence as well. Here, we see that gestures are not only deployed as instructional tools for vocabulary description, but that its original purpose can also be transformed into another shared reality wherein the participants co-celebrate a joking
event, while incidentally creating opportunities to evoke a L2 lexical item outside the focus of the planned lesson.

**Interim summary**

The data in this section showed that teachers use body parts as tools, aiming for a local representation of meaning that is adequate to the description of a L2 vocabulary item. In all of the extracts, we observed that through gestural replication, appropriation, and alignment, the teachers’ embodied actions were mutually monitored and tightly linked with one another. Such gestural alignments were enacted as instructional tools alongside an interactional trajectory of eliciting student responses, establishing shared vocabulary meaning, and sustaining humor among the group. We found, through the students’ aligning answers and mimicking gestures how the teachers’ embodied actions became socially shared semiotic resources for jointly constructing vocabulary knowledge, and how the gestural frames were even transformed by the students to display their own interpretations of the embodied meaning of the target word. Altogether, the unfolding course of the participants’ embodiment in vocabulary activities provides a fuller picture of the process of negotiating L2 vocabulary knowledge in real-time classroom interaction, and it demonstrates how vocabulary understanding is constructed as a collective embodied achievement that is “publicly displayed and interactively oriented to within the production and the monitoring of each other’s actions” (Mondada, 2011, p. 550)

**5.5 Summary**

Gestures are a rich interactional and expressive resource available to participants who deploy them in coordinated, sensitive, and non-trivial ways (Gullberg, 2010; Heath & Luff, 2012; McNeill, 2005; Mondada, 2007b; Streeck et al., 2011). In this chapter, we begin to reveal in
more detail the nature of collaborative teaching and the embodied resources that the teachers employ to organize their participatory roles. The non-leading teachers’ gestural replications, premonitory actions, and depictive embodiments orient to the shared instructional objectives between the teachers, and by extension, capture aspects of their collaborative competence. Such findings contribute to the current multimodal CA research on institutional cooperative work (Heath et al., 1995, 2002; Hindmarsh & Pilnick, 2002; Svensson et al., 2009), and more importantly, the analysis also locates the precise moments in interaction – rather than pure reliance on extra-interactional measures such as planning time – through which one may gain insights about the collaboration occurring between a teacher pair.

Also evident is that gestures are used as an important part of the teachers’ pedagogic repertoire to encourage incidental L2 vocabulary learning. In the context of co-teaching, the gestures coming from each teacher supply different clues for the students to infer vocabulary meaning, and as the different parts are recycled, appropriated, and aligned with one another, the students are presented with embodied representations that at the end, assist them to address the teacher’s question and participate in the unfolding course of the vocabulary-focused activity. In this regard, gestures are an integral part of the teachers’ collaborative instructional efforts which not only promote inter-teacher coordination, but also create through the cooperative building of the gestures’ structural, semiotic and functional properties local mechanisms a particular understanding of L2 vocabulary. Whereas multimodal CA studies on L2 classroom interaction have focused on the participants use of nonvocal conduct to organize participation in the classroom, these findings highlight its interactional yet semantically expressive use as a pedagogical strategy within “an ecology of sign systems” (C. Goodwin, 2003; Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000; Streeck, 2013) in L2 vocabulary activities.
CHAPTER 6
INTERACTIONAL (A)SYMMETRIES AND TEACHER ROLES

6.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzes how co-teacher roles are conversationally assembled in and throughout classroom interaction by focusing on the participants’ construction of interactional (a)symmetries. The analysis locates three types of interactional (a)symmetries that arise in the unfolding course of co-taught lessons: (a) access to language, (b) entitlement to remedying instruction, and (c) authority to student discipline and classroom management. The co-teachers’ practices of orienting to differential access, entitlement, and authority demonstrate how the teachers are positioned asymmetrically vis-à-vis one another. This asymmetry captures the interactional occasioning of the teachers’ respective expertise, as well as their relationships that involves the dominance of one teacher over another.

6.2 Co-teacher Roles

One important rationale for co-teaching is the potential for complementary partnership between the two teachers. It is assumed that when two teachers work together, their different attributes and skills will complement each other, and this synergy can consequently promote not only student learning opportunities but also teachers’ professional development as well (Carless & Walker, 2006; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). In the Korean context, native English-speaking teachers⁹ (NEST) are readily associated with promoting students’ communicative competence, providing cultural information, and increasing student motivation in learning English.

---

⁹ As previously discussed in Chapter 2 and 3, this is an emic term used in the EPIK program as well as in local schools to refer to the Americans that are teaching English.
Meanwhile, the strengths of the Korean English teachers (KET) reside in their familiarity with
the students’ characteristics and needs as well as their knowledge about the local educational

Tajino and Tajino (2000) argue that teaching partners should have distinctive roles in the
classroom while maintaining an open mind in learning from each other. Although this logic
sounds intuitively appealing, studies have reported that this is rarely the case. Much of the co-
teaching literature reveals that the individual roles of the teachers are often left undefined,
leaving the teachers confused about what they are expected to do and how much they should
collaborate (Carless, 2006; Davison, 2006). For example, Hang and Rabren (2009) found that the
majority of the teacher pairs viewed themselves as being more responsible for managing student
behavior than the other teacher, which suggests that disagreements about teacher roles and
responsibilities exist. Studies on the context of Korea also show gaps in the teachers’ perception
of co-teacher roles (Jeon, 2010; M. Kim, 2010b; N. Kim, 2012). KETs commonly perceived co-
teaching as a practice where NEST takes the leading role while KET simply monitors the lesson
or provides incidental grammar or vocabulary instruction. In contrast, NESTs preferred the equal
division of roles and desired for KET to become more active in the collaborative planning and
actual implementation of the lessons.

To maximize the potential of both teachers, it has been suggested that a clear set of roles
and expectations need to be provided to both NESTs and KETs (Carless, 2006; Chung, Min, &
Park, 1999; J.-O. Kim & Im, 2008), but such improvements require governmental and
institutional support which has been slow to be realized in the local context (M. Kim, 2010a).
Co-teachers then, without much guidance, are continuously faced with the reality of discovering,
coordinating, and adjusting their roles as they move on with the local contingencies of their
lesson. Whereas the studies described in this section have explored this topic via surveys and interview data focusing on what the teachers perceive or report as being their desirable responsibilities, this chapter approaches the current reality of teacher roles by viewing it as an interactional phenomenon—a participant concern that is made relevant as the teachers proceed through an unfolding course of instructional actions (Y. Park, 2014). In doing so, I will particularly locate those moments when interactional asymmetries are made relevant in the ongoing classroom talk. The data indicates that these moments involve the teachers exhibiting different levels of access to the Korean and English as well as claims of entitlement and authority regarding the management of the lesson and student behavior. Focusing on these interactions, I will demonstrate how the participants orient to differential teachers roles during the lessons, and consequently what those moments reveal about the interactionally occasioned co-teacher rights, responsibilities, and expectations that as claimed in co-teaching literature, are expected to exist in a “complementary” relationship (Medgyes, 1992).

6.3 Power in Co-teacher Relationships

Regarding teacher roles and partnership, one strand of co-teaching research has predominantly focused on issues of power and status in teacher collaboration. Most of this literature has focused on ESL contexts to disclose the unequal treatment of ESL teachers in co-teacher relationships. In DelliCarpini’s (2009) interview study, for instance, ESL teachers report feeling marginalized and powerless in their co-teaching assignments, saying they were treated like aides than with equal teacher status. Other studies that explored teacher talk in classrooms and planning conversations have found that the ESL teachers’ knowledge and skills were positioned as a peripheral matter than the general education teachers’ expertise (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; Martin, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Creese, 2006). The institutional and
societal discourses surrounding ESL associates the subject with the “category of deficit” (Creese, 2010; Greg McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Talmy, 2008) which results in not only the ESL teacher having a lower status in the co-teaching partnership but also in the classroom as well. Despite joint presence and equally divided responsibilities and lesson time, students view the subject teacher as the “proper teacher” and ESL teachers are only there to help.

The context in Korea is different from ESL in that English education is not viewed under a label of deficit, and it is rather a subject that is attributed with a prestige status. The hierarchical relations of power and status in co-teaching partners have thus been less investigated, but a few studies suggest that the Korean context has its own issues. In Choi's (2009) survey study, the NESTs reported that co-teaching seems like a “power game” of who is going to get the dominance of the lesson. They also indicated that they do not feel like an independent teacher whose teaching styles and philosophies are respected, and that when it comes to class management, students are often confused with who to turn to and who to listen to. KESTs, on the other hand, unanimously voiced their concerns that NESTs are mostly unqualified or inexperienced teachers that fall short in their understanding of student needs and the local culture (Jeon, 2010). These reports suggest that teacher partnerships in the Korean context may also involve an unequal distribution of teacher status, roles, and rights, but not much understanding has been reached beyond what has been collected through survey and interview data. Before any assertions of dominance and asymmetry can be made, this chapter analyzes how the teachers may or may not invoke such issues in their unfolding course of classroom interaction.

6.4 Asymmetry in Interaction

To investigate how different teacher roles and possible issues of dominance are engendered and negotiated in each teacher pair, I focus on what CA studies have conceptualized
as *interactional asymmetries*, a temporally unfolding process through which participants are positioned and portrayed in relation to each other. This helps us consider the differential roles of the teachers as a momentary, social phenomenon rather than taking them for granted as a predefined set of identities that exist a priori to the interaction (J.-E. Park, 2007; Robinson, 2001).

One site where interactional asymmetry is occasioned is in the participants’ *access* to knowledge or “epistemic domains” (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Epistemic asymmetries were first discussed by Labov and Fanshel (1977) in their distinction between “A-events” (known to A, but not to B) and “B-events” (known to B, but not to A), which inspired recent CA studies to explore the practices for establishing another’s epistemic access as well as interactional resources used to manage the unequal distribution of knowledge (Stivers et al., 2011). As participants occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient that ranges from more knowledgeable [K+] to less knowledgeable [K-], they repeatedly work to display their relative epistemic access, solve any information imbalance, and establish intersubjectivity (Heritage & Raymond, 2012; Heritage, 2012a, 2012b). The ways that these knowledge asymmetries are enacted and resolved is discovered in the development of adjacency pairs and sequence organization. For instance, if a speaker positions herself in an unknowing [K-] position (e.g. asking a question), this invites elaboration from a more knowing [K+] participant and projects potential sequence expansion (Drew, 2012). In circumstances where a speaker claims to be in a knowledgeable [K+] position (e.g., making an assertion), s/he may simply be in a search for an affirmative response that shows support (Heritage, 2012a; Stivers & Rossano, 2010).

Apart from issues of managing access to knowledge, participants orient to another domain of interactional asymmetry, namely the right or capacity to carry out a certain action (Enfield, 2011). In CA, this right or capacity has been discussed under the label of *entitlement*,
which becomes relevant and particularly salient in settings that involve participants with
different roles and assigned tasks. Participants in interaction display and negotiate their
presumptions about the rights of one another through various linguistic means, and one feature
that has received attention is the different formats of requests. Curl and Drew (2008) argue that
the distinction in designing a request displays the participants’ different degrees of entitlement
and their understanding of the contingencies of their requests. For example, if one makes an out-
of-hours call to the doctor, the patient may mark his/her lack of medical expertise and the
likelihood that the request will cause the doctor inconvenience by using an “I wonder if...”
formulation. Such request formats show the speaker’s low entitlement in making the demand and
an awareness of the recipient’s contingencies in granting the request (Craven & Potter, 2010). As
opposed to requests, however, if the speaker uses an imperative format of a directive, it neglects
the question of contingencies and constrains the relevant recipient action to compliance instead
of acceptance (Antaki & Kent, 2012; Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011). Accordingly, the speaker’s
entitlement is enhanced by treating the recipients’ contingencies as a matter under his or her
control, which in institutional contexts, often points to the asymmetry of the participants’
institutional roles, rights, and expectations (Asmuß & Oshima, 2012; Asmuß & Svennevig, 2009;
Asmuß, 2007).

The last site of interactional asymmetry deals with authority. By examining the
participants’ actions in interaction, CA studies have been interested in the actual practices
through which authority is instantiated. Most research dealing with the performance of authority
has been conducted in institutional settings looking at medical discourse (Pilnick & Dingwall,
2011; Roberts, 2000; Robinson, 1998; ten Have, 1991), courtroom talk (Atkinson & Drew, 1979;
Drew, 1992), and classroom interaction (Macbeth, 2003; Mehan, 1979). Although varied in their
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scope of inquiry and research questions, the findings of these studies support the following two common points: (a) authority is displayed through talk-in-interaction and (b) authority can be legitimated by interaction participants invoking their roles. Especially in institutional talk, different authority can be enacted and legitimated by identities that lie external to the interaction. The roles of doctors and patients, for instance, are institutionally assigned prior to their encounters, which enables the authority of a doctor over a patient to be displayed through their talk (Robinson, 2001).

The three domains of interactional asymmetry – access, entitlement, and authority – are potential sites that showcase the locally-constructed teacher roles in co-teaching interaction. First, as teachers are positioned with greater epistemic access and relatively less access to linguistic issues arising in the lesson, this asymmetry instantiates the teacher roles that are mapped along their respective English and Korean expertise. Second, the teachers may also display different levels of entitlement when dealing with the contingencies that arise in the course of the lesson. Especially in situations where one teacher requests or proposes a revision of the current instruction, the linguistic format of the action displays the speaker’s commitment to the proposition as well as the appropriateness of its execution in a specific context that in effect, positions the other teacher in a relatively restricted role. Lastly, while the teachers may be institutionally granted with equal co-teacher status, I will examine teacher authority as an interactional achievement with interest on the teachers’ practices of legitimating their authority, and possibly asymmetrical authority, in the management and regulation of student behavior.

6.5 Analysis

The analysis is divided into three sections. First, I will analyze how the participants invoke the teachers’ differential language access to Korean and English, and how that imbalance
gets resolved or used throughout the interaction. The second section then focuses on the episodes wherein KT proposes a revision to ET’s instruction. The analysis shows that KT’s interventions involve a displays of high entitlement, while ET is conversely placed in a position of strongly expected compliance. Lastly, the third section presents cases where the asymmetrical distribution of teacher authority is made relevant in the management of student classroom behavior.

6.5.1 Access to Language

While teacher labels such as “native-speaking English teacher” and “Korean English teacher” take for granted the teachers’ differential language expertise, this section offers a detailed analysis of the social practices through which the participants construct their asymmetrical access to Korean and English.

Access to the Korean language

Most frequently, an asymmetry regarding access to the Korean language is occasioned between the co-teachers as students produce a response in Korean. Excerpt 6.1 is from a second grade lesson on fall fruits, and it is at the point when ET brings up the topic of green apples that a student produces a Korean word aoli (“green apples”).

6.1 [2H-131023-4-18:53] aoli

47 ET₁: what is this
48 Ss: apple
49 ET₁: apple let’s see:
50 ((different picture of apple appears on slide))
51 (.)
52 one more time
53 ((the word “apple” appears on slide))
54 apple:. (. ) what color are the apples.
55 Ss: red:
56 ET₁: have you ever seen green apples?
57 Yeop: yes=
58 Chan: yes
59 ?: [yes
60 ET₁: ah:: green apples:
61 Jin: I like
62 ET₁: you like green apples?
63 Kay: aoli!
As Jin announces her preference for green apples (line 61), ET acknowledges it with a modified repeat (Stivers, 2005). With green apples becoming the main theme, a non-selected speaker, Kay, enters in a latched turn and says aoli in an exclamatory tone (line 63). Green apples have a separate name in Korean, aoli, and by providing this response, Kay succeeds in aligning with the topic but in a manner that is inappropriate to the default language of the instructional sequence. This moment engenders an intersubjectivity problem. ET cannot recognize what is meant by aoli and displays her trouble by initiating an open-class repair (“hm?” line 64), a type of repair that implies her lack of understanding (Drew, 1997). Yet, Kay repeats the same word, treating it as if it simply were a hearing problem, which fails to resolve the understanding gap (line 65).

In contrast to ET who noticeably does not know the meaning of aoli, KT comes in and declares in an “A-event statement” (Labov & Fanshel, 1977) that aoli is a Korean term for green apples (line 66). With respect to epistemic access, at least two social norms are oriented to by KT: speakers should not inform recipients with information they already have access to (Sacks, 1992; Stivers et al., 2011), and relatedly, speakers should make assertions only when they have sufficient knowledge and rights to do so (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Then by proffering the word definition, KT treats ET as unknowing while conversely, KT is constructed as a participant with the rights and relevant language expertise that enables her to repair the situation. Her use of
the inclusive pronoun we also indexes KT’s membership as a legitimate Korean speaker, one that can assert with epistemic primacy to her lexical knowledge of the Korean language.

By means of invoking this asymmetry of Korean knowledge, KT’s intervention succeeds in moving the interaction forward. ET acknowledges the information with a news receipt oh and repeats aoli in a decelerated speed, with vowel elongation, and a pause that comes in between the syllables (line 67). The hesitance embedded in ET’s repetition reaffirms her unfamiliarity with saying the term but she manages to display that she has understood the word meaning through a “B-event” definition statement (“the green apple is aoli” line 69). KT confirms this definition and adds that aoli is a different kind of apple. After all, ET acknowledges the response (line 14) with a change of state oh-receipt that intimates an epistemic shift from her previous unknowing position (Heritage, 1984, 2012a).

Whereas Excerpt 6.1 involved a student response in Korean, the asymmetry in the next extract is triggered by the series of misaligning student responses. The sequence revolves around the different pronunciations of Genghis Khan in English and in Korean. The lesson is on the topic of countries in Asia, and ET has been introducing different facts about Mongolia.


428 ET₂:  (name of class)! let me ask you,(0.7)
429 do you know (.). very famous (0.5) sh:
430 very famous (.). person from Mogo:lia:. (0.3)
431 do you know?
432 Yoon:  =Jwumong 10?
433 (0.9)
434 ET₂:  Jwumong?=I don(h)t know(h)
435 do you know Genghis Khan?
436 Seojun:  ya Jwumong-[un
437 Joomin:  [ah! (.). (Japanese khan)!=
438 →KT₁:  =wuli mal-lo-nun cingkisukan 11
our language-in-TOP Genghis Khan
“in our language, it’s ‘Cingkisukan’
439 →ET₂:  cingkisukan=*

10 Jwumong was the first king and ancestor of Goguryeo, one of the ancient kingdoms of Korea (37 BC – 668 AD).
11 Using IPA, the Korean pronunciation for Genghis Khan is /jiŋgisukuʔan/. 
In relation to the topic of Mongolia, ET asks the students if they know Genghis Khan (line 435). Instead of providing a type-conforming and preferred answer yes, Seojun continues to talk about Jwumong, a historical figure of ancient Korea that was previously brought up by another student (line 432) while Joomin is reminded of a seemingly related yet incomprehensible cognate that appears to share the same word-final syllable (line 437). In both cases, the student responses fail to address the focus of ET’s question, consequently displaying their inability to identify who Genghis Khan is.

It is within this context that KT steps in with a commentary that supplies the Korean pronunciation for Genghis Khan. The topicalization marker -un highlights the contrast between the English and Korean pronunciation, and by stating this difference, KT displays his knowledge about the pronunciation of Genghis Khan in both languages. Furthermore, while ET may have treated the incorrect student responses as a result of insufficient historical knowledge, KT suggests that the students’ misrecognition may have been due to crosslinguistic differences of name pronunciation rather than their simple lack of historical knowledge. By contributing information unknown and unprovided by ET, KT invokes this asymmetry not only to provide a clarification but also to produce an account for the misalignment of student responses.

The following turns show ET admitting a “K- position” to this matter (Heritage, 2012b). First, ET takes receipt of the alternative pronunciation by addressing a confirmation request to
KT (lines 439-440). ET then follows up with a declarative that states her own knowledge about Genghis Khan and solicits confirmation through a tag question *right* to check whether KT is referring to the same person (line 441). Declarative questions as such address matters that are within the recipient’s epistemic domain (Heritage, 2013; Labov & Fanshel, 1977). ET thus appears to claim epistemic primacy regarding her knowledge of the Mongol emperor and by extension, demonstrates that her unknowing status is restricted only to the Korean pronunciation of the person’s title. In the aftermath of KT’s overlapping affirmation, ET registers the new information through a change-of-state token *uh* (Heritage, 1984) followed by a repetition of the Korean pronunciation of the name. Although it is unclear from the extract whether KT’s clarification actually helped the students to recognize the reference of Genghis Khan, we can see that the invoked asymmetry triggered the teachers to reach a similar level of understanding in that crosslinguistic differences of name pronunciations can be of potential difficulty for the students.

Other than in the context of misaligned student responses, an asymmetry in language access is also occasioned when there is an apparent misunderstanding among the participants. In this kindergarten class, students were asked to discuss in small groups using Korean to come up with one thing that they would like to ask for forgiveness. In the meantime, ET was in the front of the classroom while KT was closer to the students eavesdropping on the group discussion. Excerpt 6.3 starts as the students are asked to come together and share their discussion with the whole class.

6.3  [KSUN-121008] *please forgive*

58 ETₐ:  ↑oka::y (0.5) fo:rgiv:e (0.3)
59   >forgive< Chloe? (.) please this way pleas::e (.)
60   Junwoo
61   (1.2)
62 Junwoo:  baby?
Junwoo answers ET’s question in a way that is similar to “telegraphic speech” (R. Brown & Fraser, 1964). It only consists of the most important content words – baby, Junwoo, and hit (lines 62-64) – while all of the grammatical function words are omitted. After both teachers help Junwoo to substitute baby with a more accurate term younger brother (lines 66-69), ET initiates an “insert sequence” (Schegloff, 2007b) as a necessary step towards disambiguating Junwoo’s response. First, ET shows her understanding of Junwoo’s response by re-stating it in a more
grammatically complete sentence (“you were hitting your younger brother” line 73). Once Junwoo confirms ET’s understanding, ET takes a further step of attributing Junwoo’s hitting to the emotion of anger. ET’s speculation is confirmed by Junwoo once again, and ET acknowledges receipt of this news with an *ah*-token (line 77).

Normally, with ET having produced a third turn to Junwoo’s response, this could be a potential closing point for the current sequence. KT, however, launches a post-expansion to clarify that ET’s understanding is actually opposite to what Junwoo had said: it was Junwoo’s *younger brother*, not Junwoo, who did the hitting (line 78, 83). Different interpretations of Junwoo’s responses have arisen to the surface, thereby occasioning different entitlements that each teacher holds toward their propositions. According to Enfield (2011), if a speaker makes an unsolicited first turn assertion, not only does s/he display unmediated access to the referent, but also epistemic commitment to the “appropriateness and effectiveness of expressing this proposition as an utterance that contributes to this speech event here and now” (p. 308). In this extract, KT enters in a self-selected turn and issues a declarative that corrects ET’s interpretation. The high certainty of KT’s clarification claims maximal epistemic access regarding her understanding of Junwoo’s response, a proper result of having listened to and comprehended the peer group discussions that were in Korean. ET, without questioning or making any assessments of the truth value of KT’s alternative interpretation, directly accepts and incorporates the correction into her next turns (lines 84-88). By doing so, ET displays acquiescence to KT’s claims of having primary access to the source of information and citable reasons for being committed to its truth while also admitting her lack of epistemic rights to appropriately evaluate KT’s proposition.
As shown in the three extracts, asymmetrical claims of language access are occasioned in the course of the local contingencies of the lesson. We observed how KT voluntarily deployed claims of K+ epistemic status to solve an imbalance in intersubjectivity, clarify underlying reasons for incorrect student responses, and mediate a misunderstanding that occurred between ET and a student. In each sequence, the resulting asymmetry was subsequently accepted and aligned with by ET, and the sequence was terminated once ET demonstrated that an “epistemic equilibrium” was reached for the practical purpose of moving on with the lesson (Drew, 2012). In this sense, the asymmetry created in this section is not merely a “power” structure that places a constraint on the participants’ actions, but more so an interactional resource utilized by the teachers to achieve successful communication and to move the lesson ahead (J.-E. Park, 2007; Robinson, 2001; ten Have, 1991).

**Access to the English language**

The next extracts are instances where the teachers invoke asymmetrical roles regarding the English language. Unlike the previous section where KT’s Korean expertise was occasioned through his/her self-selected turns, the differential access to the English language is not directly asserted by ET, but made relevant through KT’s requests.

6.4  [2H-130912-3-00:52:34] cathedral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KT$_2$:</th>
<th>Ss:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>OKAY: let’s read together:: kay tee telephone company (.).</td>
<td>ready:, set: go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>kay tee telephone company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ku-taum (1.3) +yeki-ney:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>that-next here-IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ONE: two: three?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>+ONE: two: three?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>(xxx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*next is this*

+ (looks at ET, shakes head)
Notice that except for the first word `KT telephone company`, KT does not model the words for the students. Instead, KT moves through the different location terms and elicits the students’ independent readings only by means of pointing gestures, verbal deictics (“here” line 52), and preparatory counts (“one two three” lines 54, 56). The word `cathedral`, however, causes a problem for the students. The mumbling (line 57) and 0.4 second silence (line 58) indicate the students’ trouble in formulating their choral response.

This moment clearly poses the need for a teacher intervention, but it is not KT who has been taking the leading role that provides the solution. Instead, KT turns to ET, makes a claim about the students’ epistemic state. KT’s attribution of K- status to the students works as pre-request, in which the “can you” indexes KT’s high entitlement (line 59). KT’s gaze and her inviting hand gesture manifest that she is oriented to ET’s obligation to provide the linguistic resources of modeling the correct reading of the vocabulary. In response, ET aligns with the invoked role by immediately corresponding not only with a recitation of the word but also with a change in her spatial position in the classroom. The same pattern happens when KT points to the next word `national geography center`. As only one student is able to slowly read the word, KT disrupts the reading with consecutive `no’s` and reinstates the students’ insufficient knowledge.
This time, although there is no a verbal request, ET treats KT’s K- attribution as a moment for her to enter the next turn in response to. With this action, ET is seen as orienting to the immediately preceding sequence, making a locally efficient inference to the next action she is expected to do without an overt prompt.

In this extract, we see the asymmetrical teacher roles come in to play. KT’s request captures her deliberate withdrawal from reading the English vocabulary, while ET is obligated with the appropriate linguistic ability to remedy the sequence by modeling the target word. The differential distribution of language-related teacher roles is thus made relevant by the participants, and in the case of this extract, it works to publicly ratify ET’s institutional role of providing “authentic English input” to the students (M.-J. Lee & Seong, 2011; J. S. Park & Kim, 2000).

Another instance of invoking the asymmetrical teacher roles related to English is shown in the following excerpt. The aim of this second grade science lesson is to familiarize the students with vocabulary that describes the traits of living versus nonliving things. Prior to the extract, KT had been engaging the students in a charade-like activity in English. While KT acts out a motion, the students are expected to provide the appropriate vocabulary that describe the demonstrated action.

6.5 [2C-120613-56:49] native pronunciation

826 KT₁: and living things can? ((pants heavily 3 times))
827 caːn?
828 (0.8)
829 Ss: [breathe
830 Minwoo: [ungːka
((5 lines omitted, KT quiets down loud students))
836 KT₁: sensayngnim chalye-ya
teacher turn-IE
“it’s the teacher’s turn to talk”
In this extract, a transition occurs between the teachers. After KT ends the charade activity and settles down the disruptive students, he summons ET with an address term, gaze shift, and inviting gesture (line 837, IMG #6.5.1). Then, he declares his desire to listen to ET’s native pronunciation (line 838-839) and ET treats this as request for her to enter the teaching floor. She thus provides a nod followed by a verbal agreement token okay (line 840) and starts moving towards the center of the classroom (line 841).
Several observations can be made about KT’s turn. First, *native pronunciation* is a descriptive quality that is implicative of ET’s identity not only as an L1 speaker of English, but as such, a category bound predicate (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007a) that is linked to her institutional identity as a L1 English speaking teacher. Consequently, these category memberships entail her institutional and moral obligation to model English pronunciation. KT’s follow-up directions further characterizes ET’s pronunciation as one that the students need to *repeat after* (line 848), thus indexing the language ideology of privileging native speaker input as the highest standard of the target language (V. J. Cook, 1999; M. B. H. Rampton, 1990). ET, in the meantime, fully aligns with this turn as she accepts the terms underlying ET’s request and enters the main floor to exercise her expert status.

It should be noted that prior to this sequence, KT had also been using English throughout the entire charade activity. Then by making the native speaker category relevant in a request and in a transitioning moment of the sequence, a contrast is occasioned between what KT had been doing up to that point and what ET has been asked to do in the forthcoming interaction. The request, in other words, implies that native pronunciation is an added quality in ET’s talk and one that was possibly less realized in KT’s English instruction. Hence, the category ascription invites ET to compensate for the shortcoming in KT’s previous activity, which invokes an asymmetry between the “nativeness” of the teachers’ English instructions.

*Interim summary*

In this section, we saw that the teachers were repeatedly positioned alongside an asymmetry of language access. For KT’s, their voluntary interventions occasioned their Korean expertise with the purpose of promoting intersubjectivity between ET and the students, pointing to crosslinguistic issues, and resolving ET’s misinterpretation of a student’s response. As the
asymmetry in language access was actively oriented to and sustained by both participants, KT’s role as a facilitator, interpreter, and mediator was jointly produced by the teachers, with KT mostly taking the lead and ET acquiescing to the authority of the co-teacher.

The expertise of the ETs, on the other hand, was invoked by means of KT’s requests. Although KT’s in both classrooms delivered their instructions in English, the provision of “native input” was notably marked as belonging to ET’s territory, to which ETs aligned by means of immediately inserting their instructional turns. This analytical finding resonates and further confirms with interactional details previous interview studies that have reported on ETs often being placed into the role of a “human tape recorder” (Carless, 2006; M. Kim, 2010b) where the main expectation is associated with having students listen to and repeat after the ETs native pronunciation.

### 6.5.2 Entitlement to Remedying Instruction

Lessons do not always go the way they are planned, and teachers are expected to make improvised decisions as local contingencies arise. In the data, I identified 18 instances where the procedure of the lesson was revised by a non-leading teacher on the spot. One recurrent feature of these cases is that it only involved the second grade teacher pairs, and the remedial proposals were issued solely by KT when ET had done, or was doing, something that the KT considered as being problematic. It should also be noted that in these teacher pairs, KT’s had more than ten years of teaching experience at the institution while their ET partners were young, inexperienced teachers that were teaching for the first time that year.

In what follows, I will analyze how KT, through different request formats, underlines his/her entitlement to insert corrective comments in the process of ET’s lesson. The analysis shows that KT’s request ranges from declarative interrogatives, declarative proposals,
imperatives, and even complaints and bald disagreements. The various request forms illustrate the differential distribution of obligations that are involved in remedying instructions and by extension, the asymmetry of the co-teacher participant roles.

**Declarative interrogative**

The first extract is a second grade lesson on the topic of neighborhoods. The objective is to devise a map that illustrates the major landmarks of the students’ neighborhoods. As an assignment, the students were required to bring photos of different buildings in their neighborhood. In the following excerpt, ET is explaining that the students should glue those photos to a map and draw other things that they find in their neighborhood as well.

6.6 [2C-130914-3-07:39] who did not bring pictures

98 ET₂: I want you to draw something else.
99 (0.6)
100 Sup: [okay?
101 ET₂: because this is so easy
102 Miss Kobe: did this for you (0.3)
103 so you just go >ppwup ppwup ppwup ppwup< finished!
104 Yuri: yes!=
105 ET₂: (ET looks at KT)
106 →KT₁: excuse me! +(0.7) those who do not bring::
107 ET₂: pictures?=
108 →KT₁: pictures? they can draw (.) with their (..) hands?
109 ET₂: [ah:: ye]ah::
110 →KT₁: is it possible?=
111 ET₂: that sounds good:?
112 KT₁: yeah.
113 ET₂: so Sungmin Miyeon? (..) you draw.
114 +(points to 4 corners of the worksheet)
115 +(1.4) okay?
116 +(points to 4 corners of the worksheet)
117 +(1.8)
118 yes.
119 KT₁: anh kacye-on salam-tul-un not bring-come-ATTR person-PL-TP
120 tangyenhi ttokkathi kuli-l-swu-nun epskey-ss-ci of course same draw-ATTR-able to-TP not-
121 kunikka sangsang-hal swu iss-keyss-ci so imagine-do-able to
122 “the people that didn’t bring photos,
123 of course you won’t be able to draw exactly the same
124 so instead, you could imagine what it might look like”
In lines 106 and 108, KT addresses an issue that is relevant to the students who did not bring their pictures. He first designs the onset of his turn with an *excuse me* which not only solicits ET’s attention but also indicates that his ensuing utterance may involve a shift in the current activity. After securing mutual gaze, KT continues on with this turn to topicalize the category of students who are without photos (line 108) and offers a proposal that seeks for ET’s acceptance.

Here, we see the steps that KT takes to insert an issue that was unaddressed in ET’s instructions, and in doing so, KT’s actions are deployed in a fashion that resort to ET’s approval. Notice that KT also delays his direct intervention until ET issues his suggestion to the students. KT’s minimal response *yeah* (line 112) frees up the space for ET to directly assign the students with the drawing activity. It is only after ET signals the end of her directive sequence with a *yes* (line 116) that KT starts to elaborate the instruction in Korean (line 117). All in all, KT’s actions are carefully coordinated in a manner that orients to ET’s leading role in the lesson.

It should be noted, however, that this does not equal to KT taking a subordinate position. Although KT’s offers his proposal in a manner that leaves room for ET’s refusal, the grammatical format of KT’s suggestion is a declarative statement that ends with final rising intonation, and the way that it is produced is without any mitigations. That KT offers the suggestion as a declarative interrogative shows high epistemic strength and commitment to the content he is proposing (Heritage, 2013). KT’s follow up question *is it possible* (line 110) also adds evidence to this analysis. While KT makes ET’s acceptance or rejection of the proposal the next relevant action, the question strongly prefers a *yes* response, and a resulting affirmation would necessitate recipient action. ET, then by issuing an agreement, is faced with the expectation to reflect the suggestion in her subsequent actions. In this sense, the way KT’s
proposal is designed manages to show his entitlement to make adjustments to the lesson while still displaying his respect and sensitivity toward ET’s leading role.

Meanwhile, as KT seeks for ET’s confirmation, ET initially aligns with KT’s proposition with an enthusiastic affiliative response ↑ah:: ye↑ah::↓ (line 109) and in a later turn, ratifies it with a positive acknowledgement that sounds good:? (line 111). Note that it is also ET who marks the completion of the proposal sequence by immediately issuing the new instruction to the target students (lines 113-116). By granting KT’s proposal straightaway without any disagreements, ET shows alignment not only with what the proposal is about but also with the questions of entitlement regarding who issues the proposal and who grants it with complying action.

**Declarative Proposal**

In Excerpt 6.6, KT also makes a proposition that revises the course of ET’s instruction, but this time, the proposal is delivered with an escalated strength of entitlement. Here, in this second grade lesson of *sink or float*, ET has been explaining the procedure of the activity. KT, in the meantime, has been standing in the back of the classroom.

6.7 [2H-131023-3-15:26] *share their ideas*

26 ET₄: each table will get a +clay? (0.4)
27 and you need to tr:y so that it can +float.
28 →KT₂: but before they get,
29 and then th- they (. ) share (. )
30 their ideas "like brainstorm"
31 ET₄: uh-huh
32 KT₂: (xx)=
33 ET₄: =uh-huh=okay. I’:m gonna give you one minute to ta:lk
34 with your table ho::w >you can make this float<
35 sh:: ready? set, go
ET reaches towards the clay box, displaying that she is ready to distribute the clay to the students. While ET attempts to directly proceed to the implementation of the activity, however, KT comes in with an alternative proposition. In line 28, KT designs the onset of her turn with a disjunctive marker *but* and follows it with a statement that suggests a group brainstorming session to precede the main activity. The proposal in this extract differs from Excerpt 6.6 in that it is designed to project a disagreement to ET’s directions. KT’s inserted comment interrupts the progressivity of the sequence, and it requires that ET takes a step back in her instructional procedure. Moreover, the declarative syntax notably comes across “as a telling, rather than asking” (Craven & Potter, 2010, p. 423). The absence of interrogative tags or rising intonation treats the proposal as one that is unproblematic, and thus shows a clear orientation that KT sees himself as being entitled to alter the route of ET’s plan. In this way, the format of KT’s proposition strongly makes an acceptance of the proposal the next preferred action. ET shows immediate alignment by immediately granting KT’s proposal with an exclamatory token *aha* (lines 31, 33), issuing an *okay*, and directly changing the course of her plan to initiate the brainstorming activity (lines 33-35). Both teachers show no orientation to problematicity of the talk or to problems in regards to the asymmetric distribution of entitlement. While KT shows a clear orientation herself being entitled to offer a correction, ET aligns with this by complying with the requested action.

**Imperatives**

As KT claims high entitlement to his/her revisions, the two teachers are placed within an asymmetrical relation of participant roles. The next extract is an even clearer case as KT uses an imperative to insert a comment to ET’s ongoing instruction. In Excerpt 6.8, ET is leading a science lesson on living and nonliving things, and KT is standing in the back of the classroom.

6.8  [2C-120613-36:04] *please go faster*

01 ET: boys and girls these are all living things (0.4)
ET temporarily suspends the choral reading activity to reproach the inappropriate behavior of one student group. The reprimand is conducted over several turns. ET summons the student group (line 9), explicitly sanctions the untoward behavior (lines 10, 12), waits for students to comply with the directive (line 11), and produces a positive assessment to students that incorporated the correction (line 12). While ET directs her reproach to an individual student and waits for her compliance, however, KT comes in with a turn that embarks with an informing of the students’ demands: they want to move on with the lesson (lines 15-16). It is unclear whether KT’s claim is actually based on student reports or if it is an inference coming from KT’s part. In any case, it is KT who articulates the state of student affairs and uses that information as an entitlement to issue a directive in imperative format in the following turn (“please go faster” line 18).

Imperative forms of requests in English are fairly uncommon in most adult-adult conversations and even come across as an invasive or face-threatening action (Brown &
Levinson, 1987). For that reason, imperatives are often deferred by the speaker until less entitled types of request forms fail to elicit a conforming response (Curl & Drew, 2008). However, in this extract, KT displays his commitment to change course of ET’s instruction by pairing the imperative with a more urgent teacher obligation. The imperative formulation of KT’s request not only works to cancel ET’s disciplinary actions, but it is also a highly entitled move that strongly orients to ET’s compliance.

ET acquiesces to KT’s position with a latched o(h)kay: (line 19), and she responds with a complying action. The reproach is suspended and immediately, she makes a return to the lesson (line 21). It is worth noting, however, that ET’s o(h)kay: is embedded with a breath token. In other words, ET’s acceptance is produced as a preferred response and an aligning move to KT’s directive, but the breathiness projects a less affiliative stance than what a firm okay would have carried. This possibly orients to the forceful nature of KT’s imperative, but after all, due to ET’s compliance, the interaction results in the ratification of the asymmetrical participation roles.

The next extract is another example of KT using an imperative to issue a correction. This time, the directive requires ET to physically move across the classroom. As ET starts to distribute the class handouts, she calls on the student helpers to form a line in front of her. KT has been sitting towards the right side of the classroom, and this is when he notices that the students are standing in a tight space.

6.9 [2C-131205-FR-36:25] it’s too narrow

273 ET: +uh:: (6.9.1)
274 KT: >please wait in your seat<
275 ET₂: helpers come to me:?:
276 ((Ss run to ET))
277 → KT₁: >MISS KO (xx)< THAT PLACE IS TOO NARROW!: (. .)

#6.9.2

+((ET looks at KT))

278 → KT₁: Miss Ko TOO NARROW +between

#6.9.3

279 → KT₁: ((KT points to ET & and to the front of the classroom, repeats this two times))
+((KT withdraws gaze & sorts through stack of worksheets))
280 +(0.5)

#6.9.4

+((points to front of classroom))
++((ET moves to front of the classroom))

281 → KT₁: you need to +go ++(0.3) yes.
282 ET₂: ((looks at student reaching for handouts)) wait
283 → KT₁: too narrow

#6.9.5

284 ET₂: +Dongjun’s table:: (. .) >Dongjun’s table<
285 ((gives worksheet to Dongjun))
KT’s turn announces his “noticing” of a problem (Schegloff, 1988) regarding the narrow space where the students are trying to form a line. The accelerated speed, high volume, and accentuation of narrow mark the urgency of the situation (line 277), but the lack of ET’s recipient action causes KT to reinstate the problem in a subsequent turn (line 278). Finally, as ET exhibits her recipiency by establishing mutual gaze (IMG #6.9.2), KT issues an “embodied directive” (Cekaite, 2010; M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013) that requests ET to adjust her spatial position to the center of the classroom (IMG #6.9.3).

Although ET reaches for the handouts to carry them as she moves, the absence of immediate compliance calls for KT to re-issue his directive. Craven and Potter (2010) document that directives, when they fail to get a response, get progressively more demanding in a way that strongly presumes the recipient’s obedience. KT also follows a similar path as he upgrades the embodied directive into a verbal imperative. The verb need necessitates ET to move to the required space, which indicates KT’s commitment in defining ET’s optimal spatial position (line 281). Strongly entitled directives as such restrict the response options to compliance, constituting the requested action as the only acceptable behavior in that specific situation and thereby instigating an asymmetry between the participant roles (Antaki & Kent, 2012). ET orients to this expectation by forgoing the production of a verbal agreement but responding with a complying action. As soon as ET starts moving, KT shows receipt of the complying move with a yes (line 281, IMG #6.9.4) and ET, having arrived at the directed position, finally starts to distribute the handouts to the students (lines 284-285, IMG #6.9.5).

12 This comment, of course, does not preclude the possibility of rejection or resistance. In cases of such non-compliance, however, interactional complications may occur as in extensive accounts, repair sequences, and argumentative talk (see Craven & Potter, 2010)
What stands out from Excerpt 6.8 and Excerpt 6.9 is that while ET is leading the lesson, KT occupies a withdrawn position in the classroom that embodies his non-leading role in the lesson. Through the use of unmitigated imperatives, however, KT self-positions himself with a “spectator” role that is strongly entitled to cast a correction to ET’s instruction. This type of intervention is a threat to the leading teacher’s face, especially given that it not only disaligns with the current course of actions, but also characterizes ET’s instructional decisions as an insufficient or inappropriate one to that moment. Despite such risks, the instructional urgency of the situation overrules the contingencies of ET’s current business, and as KT’s directive is met with ET’s compliance, the superiority of KT’s entitlement is ratified as a result.

Request & Declarative Proposal with Disaffiliative Stance

The next two extracts are also cases of KT issuing a correction of ET’s instruction, but this time, the nature of the interaction is different in that it involves not only a disalignment but also a disaffiliative stance toward ET’s materials and instructions (Stivers, 2008). Excerpt 6.10 is a second grade lesson on countries in Asia. Using a PowerPoint presentation, ET introduced different Asian countries with information on their location, weather, food, and culture. ET then distributed a handout with a blank map that required the students to write down the name of each country next to its location. As both teachers walked around the classroom providing assistance to the students, KT discovers a stack of color-printed maps that were placed on a desk in front of the classroom. These maps clearly identify the locations of the countries, and virtually, they are the “answer sheets” to the current activity. The following extract is when KT picks up these maps and walks over to ET to suggest that they be used by the students to complete the assigned activity.

6.10 [2H-131120-4-41:11] it’s too hard for them

\[11\rightarrow KT]_{2}: +Miss Chu can you give them ++(0.6)
this paper
oh should we
yeah! cuz it’s too hard for them.
+((looks at handout))
+okay=

→ KT
2: =they +can’t do it ++mos-han-tako
cannot-do-
“they can’t do it”

(0.3)
+(takes the handout back from ET)
+ca:: yay-tul-a:: (0.3) yeki pw-a:
okay kid-PL-VOC here see-DC
“okay kids, look here”

eyes on the?

teacher will give you this paper?
and then you: (0.3) you look? (.)
this map and then you (0.3) write (0.6)
write the country (0.4)
can you do that?
yes
yeki ta iss-e >yay-tul-a<
look-and everything exist-DC kid-PL-VOC
“everything’s on the worksheet you guys you just have to look and write”

(0.6)
kak motwum-uy ppalkangi nao-seyo
each group- red color person come out-POL
“the red color helper in each group, please come out”
Having found a different set of maps, KT walks up to ET and asks her to distribute them to the students (lines 411-412). Here, KT initially makes a request using an interrogative form that starts with the modal verb *can*. Positive interrogatives as such make a yes-no acceptance consequential in the next turn and in effect, display the high entitlement of the speaker (Lindström, 2005). The format of KT’s request thus orients to ET’s role as the leading teacher to approve the proposition and subsequently, to announce and explain the introduction of another handout. ET acknowledges this request with a turn-initial *oh*, but instead of providing an acceptance or rejection, she reverses the recipiency of the question with *should we* (line 413). While KT had provided ET with the rights to judge the acceptability of her proposal, we see that ET does not align with that decision-making position. A noteworthy observation is that in contrast to the second person pronoun in KT’s request (“*can you*” line 411), ET’s interrogative involves an inclusive *we* (“*should we*” line 413). The different use of pronouns displays an incongruence in their discursive construction of teacher responsibilities. Contrary to KT who treats the delivery of instructions as being part of ET’s individual role, ET constitutes the remedying of the lesson as a joint responsibility that invites a possible exchange of opinions between the two teachers.

As the floor is returned to KT, she takes the chance to account for her sudden proposal, and in doing so, she challenges the appropriacy of ET’s handout in regards to the students’ intellectual level (line 414). Notice that KT’s account involves a declarative assessment that
demonstrates her strong entitlement in making judgments about the suitability of the handout. KT’s problem-account also transpires as a complaint (e.g., Selting, 2012; Waring, 2007) as noted in the exclamatory tone of yeah! and the accentuated ↑hard that project her disaffiliative stance towards the current handout. After ET receives the new handouts and offers an agreement token okay (line 415), KT re-asserts both in English and Korean that the level of the current handout is beyond the student abilities (line 416). Although challenging the co-teacher’s materials in the middle of the lesson is a face-threatening, disaffiliative move, KT’s account is without any mitigation or hedging that marks it as a dispreferred activity (Pomerantz, 1984). KT makes assessments of ET’s handouts with high certainty and directness, without necessarily providing further explanation why the handout might have been too difficult for the students. Furthermore, the Korean stance marker -tako, KT’s hand gesture, head shake, and stern facial expression add a disaffiliative force to the move and packaged together, they notably mark the turn as a complaint (IMG #6.10.1).

To this point, we see that ET’s should we (line 413) is met with KT’s unilateral display of problem-accounts and complaints. ET is not invited to voice her thoughts other than the minimal response okay that she provided in line 415. Shortly after receiving the handouts, ET starts to move toward the front of the classroom, possibly orienting to her role to issue the new instruction to the students (line 416). Before ET reaches the front of the class, however, KT takes them back, solicits the students (line 418-420), announces the new instruction (lines 421-428), and distributes the handouts herself (line 430-431). This move contradicts KT’s initial request that oriented to ET’s right to deliver the new set of handouts. Without asking for ET’s consent, KT appropriates the leading role of explaining the handouts during which ET stands in silence and with her gaze averting from KT and the students (IMG #6.10.2, #6.10.3).
The last extract is another example of co-teacher disaffiliation where ET’s instruction is met with KT’s objections. Here, the class involves “learning centers,” a once-a-week session where students move around different stations in the classroom (e.g., reading station, computer station, game station, etc.) to complete a wide range of activities. In Excerpt 6.11, two students, Jimin and Hyoyun, are ahead of the other students in that they already completed some of the activities during last week’s session. As a result, ET re-organizes the student groups as a way of preventing the two students from having to repeat the same activity again.

6.11 [2C-131026-BK-1-58:10] it doesn’t matter

52 ET₂: um, (0.5) lily and rose, (.)
53 ET₂: Jimin and Hyoyun you need to finish¿ (0.4)
54 ET₂: learning center with your group.
55 (0.8)
56 ET₂: okay? so (0.5) uh Jimin you will go with, (.)
57 Ro:se? and then Hyoyun >you will go with Lily<
58 ET₂: just for (.). today lesson (0.3) okay?
59 ET₂: [and then-]
60 →KT₁: [then Mi- Miss Ko?=impossible
61 (0.7)
62 ET₂: cuz they might have already done it.
63 (1.2)
64 →KT₁: it- it doesn’t matter=
65 ET₂: =it doesn’t matter?=
66 KT₁: =yes=
67 ET₂: =they’ll do it [again?
68 →KT₁: }>yes yes<

   +{(sorts through worksheets)}
69 +{3.2}
70 ET₂: daffodil::, (.), computer:
71 { (gives worksheets to daffodil group)}

Right after ET makes special arrangements for Jimin and Hyoyun, ET’s instruction is interrupted by KT’s overlapping turn (line 59). Prefacing the turn with an inference marker then, KT summons ET and puts forward an objection that characterizes ET’s previous instruction as impossible (line 60). This “extreme case formulation” (Derek Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986) displays KT’s critical stance toward the new arrangement, but its extremity and lack of reasoning also opens it up for contention.
In response, ET provides an account for revising the student groups, voicing her uncertainty of whether the students have done the activity before. For ET, having a student repeat a previously completed task is a situation that a teacher should avoid. So when KT says *it doesn’t matter* (line 64), treating the re-arrangement of student groups as if it was an unnecessary move, ET repeats it with rising intonation (line 65) which expects KT to explain the reasoning behind this claim. KT does not elaborate, however, and provides only a minimal response (line 66). ET challenges KT’s suggestion once again, by pointing out the problematic consequence of staying with the current groups (line 67), but even before she reaches her turn completion, KT overlaps it with consecutive *no’s* without giving any further account (line 68). Through the minimal use of affirmation tokens, KT refuses to defend his claim, and rather, he is placed in an advantageous sequential position that obstructs further expansion and curtails the sequence. To continue on with the argument, ET needs to take the floor in order to issue another challenging move. ET, however, abandons the sequence without providing a confirming response to KT’s turn, averts her gaze, and proceeds to distribute the worksheets to the student groups.

In this extract, ET orients to her rights and authority as a leading teacher by organizing the instruction and making appropriate adjustments to prevent students from repeating previous tasks. KT’s comment, however, not only subverts ET’s initial instructional plan, but it is also delivered in a way that portrays his unwillingness to participate with any substantive contributions.

**Interim Summary**

The data of this section showed that when the KTs proposed a change to ET’s plan or instructions, they issued directives in formats that assumed their complete entitlement to do so. These directives were often in unmitigated forms, imperatives, and even bald disagreements that
did not provide sufficient explanations of the reasons for their claimed entitlement. An asymmetry of participant roles was thus established as the ETs oriented to KT’s proposal as a change that needed to be accepted, rarely demonstrating their independent judgment regarding the suitability of the suggestion. In one case where ET contested agency over the terms of KT’s proposal, instead of displaying acceptance, the disagreement was not properly attended to by KT, which resulted in KT retaining control of the proposal.

6.5.3 Authority for Student Discipline & Classroom Management

This section explores the teachers’ practices of portraying authority in the classroom, especially in matters of conducting student discipline and behavior management. The data centers on three types of scenarios: (a) rewarding of students that show positive behavior, (b) co-teacher interventions to issue disciplinary comments, and (c) prohibitions of the other teacher’s disciplining actions. As in the previous section, these issues arose only from the second grade teacher pairs wherein the KTs were experienced senior teachers and the ETs were young, novice teachers in their first year. The analysis shows that the participants deploy their verbal, sequential, and nonvocal resources to orient to an asymmetrical distribution of teacher roles, their authority and rights to regulate student behavior at that particular instructional moment.

The first extract involves a second grade classroom where rewards are offered in the form of hearts when a student group completes the prescribed work and behaves well according to the teacher’s directions. The group with the most hearts at the end of the semester has been promised with a prize. Excerpt 6.12 starts with ET issuing a directive and an announcement that she will be distributing hearts to those student groups that exhibit the desired behavior. Here, ET performs the leading teacher role in the sense of independently regulating student activities (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001).
Excerpt 6.12 [2H-131023-4-54:51] I’m gonna give you a heart

While ET prepares to reward the student groups, we see that KT who was in the back moves toward the front of the classroom (line 283, IMG #6.12.2) and secures herself in a position
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nearby ET and the heart chart. Her vision is faced toward the students, and her arms are clasped behind her back (line 284, IMG #6.12.3). Through this spatial and postural shift, KT communicates her co-involvement in the heart-giving activity, embodying the authority of an overseer that is monitoring the students for commendable conduct. ET aligns with this frame as she also directs her gaze at the students and holds up a heart to signal the beginning of the reward sequence (IMG #).

Finally, as all of the students reach total silence and settle in their seats, KT announces the first group that showed the best behavior (line 285). Although ET was originally the teacher that launched the heart-giving sequence, we see that KT self-establishes her rights and authority to take lead in appointing the qualified groups and orients to it as a relevant action at this particular moment. ET, on the other hand, concedes to these demonstrated rights without challenging KT’s moves and aligns with KT’s announcement by placing hearts next to the name of the designated groups (line 286). This pattern continues throughout the sequence, engendering an asymmetrical division of teacher roles. KT portrays the authoritative figure of nominating the student recipients while ET hear those nominations as directives to distribute the hearts to the corresponding groups. ET does not add her own selection of student groups nor does KT ask for ET’s opinion on her choices. When ET does enter in a self-selected turn, it is to confirm the seating of one of the student groups which further confirms her acquiescence toward KT’s leading role and demonstrates her sensitivity to accurately reward those groups designated by KT (line 288). KT’s dominance of the activity is also evidenced by its closure. When KT leaves the floor and walks toward the left side of the classroom, ET does not extend the heart giving beyond that point. ET treats KT’s withdrawal as the end of the sequence and moves on to announce the next agenda of the lesson.
An even clearer example of the unequal teacher authority is shown in Excerpt 6.13. KT is the same teacher that was in Excerpt 6.12, but this time, she is working with a different ET. The focus of this second grade lesson is to teach the students how to count in tens. The students have been practicing the counting through a choral chant, and in this extract, ET announces that she will offer a heart for a student group that shows the best performance in saying the chant. KT is not captured in this camera angle, but she is standing on the right side of the heart chart.

Excerpt 6.13 [2H-120709-M062-56:38]

256    ET3:    I’ll give a heart (. ) to one group °that has best°
257    +((Ss sitting up straight))
258    +(3.3)
259    ten, (. ) twenty, (. ) thirty=forty=fifty!
260    ((points both index fingers to Ss))
261    Ss:    ten, (. ) twenty, (. ) thirty=forty=fifty!
262    Bin:  t te l i = t te l i = t te l i
263    +((ET maintains gaze at Ss))
264    → ET3:    okay:: +((moves toward chart))
265    → KT3:    one more. one more time=
266    →    I don’t think::, ++Joy group has a (. ) heart.
267    →    (0.5)
268    ET3:    =one more time? okay +(0.6)
269    Ss:    ten, (. ) twenty, (. ) thirty=forty=fifty!
270    ((points both index fingers to Ss))
271    +((moves toward center of classroom))
Up to line 264, ET portrays an independent teacher role of announcing the start of a reward sequence, eliciting student repetition, monitoring the students, and engaging in spatial movement that marks a shift to the heart-giving activity. ET, by means of her transition-implicative okay
and her embodied actions of walking toward the heart chart, displays that she is ready to move on and nominate the student recipients of the hearts (line 264, IMG #6.13.1). KT, however, puts a halt to this transition as she points to the Joy group, disqualifying them from receiving a heart (line 265, IMG #6.13.2), and issues a directive that demands ET to repeat the choral chant (line 267). KT’s intervention results in ET stopping midway in her movements, shifting her gaze to KT, and delaying her engagement with the hearts (line 265, IMG #6.13.2)

Whereas ET had initially constructed her primary rights to take lead of the heart-giving activity, KT’s entrance not only interferes with ET’s projected course of action, but also reverses the sequence to its starting point. That KT was able to notice a group of less participatory students mobilizes her co-teacher rights to perform control over the direction of the activity. ET, on the other hand, relinquishes her control by waiting in silence, verbally accepting the requested action, moving away from the heart chart, and re-initiating the choral repetition with the students. Here, the actions of both teachers configure KT as the one who dictates the progression of the heart-giving sequence from then on, which instantly instantiates a re-mapping of teacher roles and their portrayed authority.

The impact of KT’s intervention does not stop here but continues on in the ensuing interaction. ET repeats the choral chant with the students for the second time (lines 269-271), but unlike the first time when she immediately moved towards the chart upon its completion, we see that ET holds her position and fixates her gaze at KT (line 271). ET’s gaze shift is followed by a 0.6 second pause which evidences that ET “tacitly addresses” (Lerner, 1993; Stivers, 2010) and is waiting for KT to produce the next relevant action. The lack of follow up leads ET to slowly relocate herself toward the chart, possibly orienting to the pause as a silent approval to proceed with awarding the hearts (line 271, IMG #6.13.3). But even as she moves, ET’s gaze is
maintained at KT and that her arms are clasped behind her back embodies the withholding of unsolicited actions (line 272, IMG #6.13.4). It is this package of nonvocal conduct that not only projects but also licenses KT’s authority to steer the direction of the activity.

Counter to ET’s prediction, KT does not grant the commencement of the reward and engages in an extended disciplinary sequence of admonishing students that failed to participate in the chant (lines 273-282). This leads KT to issue another directive that necessitates ET to revisit the choral repetition for the third time (line 285). After ET completes the third round of repetition, KT disqualifies another student group (line 290) and makes the final announcement to those that are granted with her approval to receive the hearts (line 291). Similar to Excerpt 6.12, we see ET conceding to KT’s decisions, checking her understanding of the appointments through a clarification request (line 292), and ending the sequence upon KT’s withdrawal without adding any of her own student choices.

In both extracts, we see KT exercising her control not only on the nomination of heart recipients but also over ET’s instructional role in the sequence. ET, who initially demonstrated “ownership” over the chant and heart giving system, is relegated to a position that is reliant upon KT’s cues. KT’s intervention leads to a reconfiguration of teacher authority, and especially to an asymmetrical one where the two teachers occupy different participation roles. The role of one teacher conveys higher entitlement and authority as she offers propositions that asks for the compliance of the co-teacher and the students. Conversely, the other teacher is restricted to a less active role of simply accepting the co-teacher’s student nominations and placing the hearts on the chart accordingly.

The next extracts show a different type of teacher asymmetry in conducting classroom management, focusing on cases where KT enters in an incursive turn to insert a disciplinary
sequence. Excerpt 6.14 occurs after all of the student groups finished presenting their class cheers that they created in preparation of sports day. Both teachers are in the front of the classroom, and ET is holding a set of handouts that she intends to introduce as being the next activity in line.


| 06 | KT₁: | cal-hay-ss-e.  
well-do-PST-IE  
“good job” |
| 07 |  | (0.8) |
| 08 | ET₂: | good jo::b. (.) |
| 09 |  | <you guys are aweso:::me.> |
| 10 |  | (0.5) |
| 11 |  | +((looks down at handouts))  
+okay,=  
+(looks at ET)) |
| 12 | KT₁: | +=please.  
(1.0) |
| 13 |  | “they cannot (xx)” |
| 14 | ET₂: | (clears throat)  
+(ET & KT maintain gaze at Ss))  
+((Ss gradually come to absolute silence)) |
| 15 |  | (17.0) |
| 16 | KT₁: | talu-n ke ha-lke manha-yo  
different-ATTR thing do-PROS a lot-POL  
“there’s a lot we have to do”  
ca palo  
“okay sit straight” |
| 17 |  | ((6 lines omitted)) |
| 25 | KT₁: | al-keyss-eyo¡ (0.4) ney  
known-DCT:RE-POL yes  
“do you understand, yes” |
| 26 |  | (looks at ET)) |
| 27 | ET₂: | okay this is the last thing we will need |

The extract starts with both teachers providing positive assessments toward the student presentations (lines 6, 8-9). Having jointly released their third turn assessments, ET treats this as a moment to terminate the presentation sequence. As indicated in her shift-implicative okay, the continuing intonation, as well as the gaze shift to the handouts (line 11), ET marks a transition in activities and communicates that a new course of instruction is underway. KT, however, takes
the floor in a latched turn and produces a firm please (line 12) that demands ET to temporarily suspend her current business.

Not letting the other participant finish is by its nature interruptive, a violation of conversational rules both in institutional contexts and mundane conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). In this extract, KT interrupts ET from embarking on a new activity to pursue what he displays as being a more imminent business than moving on with the lesson – quieting down disruptive students. What appears to be a reasoning for the interruption (“they cannot” line 14) orients to the potentially invasive nature of KT’s turn. Not all states of overlap challenge the speaker’s completion of his/her turn, but in this case, we see KT gaining immediate control of the interaction while ET is expected to temporarily abort her speakership rights. The interruption is motivated by the urgency for student discipline which invokes a set of institutional rights and obligations that grant KT with the authority to insert a disciplinary act in the expense of suspending ET’s agenda (cf. Goldberg, 1990). With KT pursuing this goal, a momentary asymmetry is created between the two teachers. KT’s interruption constrains the direction of the sequence, and this control is ratified as ET relinquishes her speakership until the floor is returned to her with KT’s gaze (line 26).

Excerpt 6.15 shows a different teacher pair, and ET is interrupted by KT in a similar manner. ET is leading a second grade math lesson that focuses on the expressions of greater than and less than, but KT notices that several students are not participating in the choral practice of the target phrases.


68 ET3: okay follow me twenty is,
69 Ss: twenty is,
In line 68, ET initiates an IRF that elicits choral repetition from the students. The continuing intonation of the first phrase *twenty is* projects that there is more to come. KT, however, enters before ET recites the remaining component of the target sentence. The consecutive *no*-tokens suggest a prospective disalignment, and the gaze direction and pointing gestures convey a problem that requires ET’s attention (line 70, IMG #6.15.1). Here, KT’s intervention is not only interruptive in that it emerges in the midst of the course of action that ET was engaged in, but it also places a halt to the progressivity of ET’s instructional activity.

Although ET had recognizably self-selected herself as the speaker of the next relevant turn (line 71), she immediately aborts completing her sentence in overlap with KT. Notice that as KT takes an extended turn to admonish the non-participating students, ET does not insert her contributions to the disciplining sequence despite the 1.2-second pause that occurred at one of the transition relevance places. ET remains in a standby position until KT signals the end of the sequence with a gaze shift and nod, which displays and legitimizes the asymmetrical control that KT occupies in issuing the student reprimand.
In both Excerpt 6.14 and Excerpt 6.15, KT’s intervention results in revealing the diverging interactional goals of the two teachers. While ET is occupied with her instruction, KT constitutes the relevance of conducting disciplinary business as one that is of greater priority than ET’s projected course of action, presenting her own judgment of the situation irrespective of its placement in ET’s turn or its effect upon the speaker’s face (Goldberg, 1990; O’Reilly, 2008). That KT’s incursive turns are rarely challenged nor followed by ET’s co-participation licenses KT with the sole authority to take lead of the sequence, until the point that KT withdraws from that position by signaling the closure of her activity.

Whereas in the previous extracts, the asymmetrical participant roles of the teachers are construed by their actions and interactional positions, the last extract shows a case where KT explicitly verbalizes his superior rights for disciplining the students. Another difference in Excerpt 6.16 is that KT’s asserted position is not complied with, but met with ET’s resistance. Here, it is a second grade class where ET is in the front of the classroom, leading a game of bingo. She is about to call out the first item, but stops because the students are overly noisy and inattentive.

6.16 [2C-131026-30:42] *that is my role*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ET₂:</td>
<td>okay number one::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>((kids still talking))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>I will wait until you’re quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>((goes up to a student and taps his head with a folder))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>sh::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>→KT₁:</td>
<td>Miss Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ET₂:</td>
<td>[okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>→KT₁:</td>
<td>[Miss Ko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As ET fails in her first attempt to quiet down all of the students, she walks up to one of the talking boys and taps him on the head with a file folder (line 42). KT, who had been standing near one of the teacher’s desks, summons ET (line 45, 48), and after establishing mutual gaze (#6.16.1), characterizes her disciplinary action as one that trespasses the boundaries of KT’s role (line 50). The accentuated my: carries an evaluative import of categorizing ET’s action as a wrong-doing, and the falling intonation indexes a disaffiliative stance which in combination, makes KT’s turn hearable as a reprimand. Reprimanding a co-teacher for her conduct in public is a challenging action. ET thus orientsthe face-threatening nature of KT’s turn with a dispreferred, breathy okay, and rejects the content of the reprimand saying that she is also
entitled to discipline the students. ET’s facial expression also consists of a slanted half grin which comes off as a display of mitigated irritation (#6.16.2).

The disaffiliation between the two teachers escalates as KT’s uptake takes the form of an explicit negation. KT’s no simply cancels out ET’s attempts of defending her rights to conduct student discipline, which by nature is a strongly argumentative move (Hutchby, 1996). ET does not orient to this turn, but instead resumes her previous activity of class management by starting with a shush and follows it with a summons of the entire class. However, as ET tries to count back from five to give the students time to calm down, KT intervenes and takes over the floor to engage the students in joint activity that forces them to abandon their illicit behavior.

The co-teacher interaction in this extract is different in that the ET’s disciplinary actions are explicitly sanctioned by KT. KT’s assertion for unilateral control, ET’s resistance, and KT’s intervention for student discipline point to tensions regarding the division of disciplinary roles in the classroom. In this extract, it is KT that eventually retains control, and ET’s role in managing the class is marginalized as a result.

6.6 Summary

This chapter examined the teacher roles as they are occasioned in the unfolding interaction of co-taught lessons. The main interest centered on investigating the interactional asymmetries that involved the participants’ display of language access, entitlement to remedying instructions, and teacher authority in disciplining students. In the first section of the analysis, we found that the teachers were positioned with asymmetrical language access as each of them shifted from being an expert and relatively less of an expert in addressing language-related issues in the lesson. The findings confirm that similar to previous studies, KT exercises his/her role as the Korean expert by providing translations, bridging crosslinguistic differences, and mediating
between ET and the students when misunderstandings occur. ET, on the other hand, is oriented to by KT as the English expert, especially in terms of verbally modeling the standard reading and pronunciation of the target language. This asymmetry shows how teachers co-construct each other as complementary language resources, which capitalizes their respective expertise in achieving intersubjectivity and benefiting the students with native language input (Liu, 2008; Medgyes, 1992; J.-E. Park, 2014).

The second section focused on the particular incidents KT voluntarily issued a proposal or correction that targeted ET’s instruction. In analyzing the various formats used to initiate the intervention, the absence of interrogative requests marked a deviation from institutional and conversational interactions found among adults (cf. Craven & Potter, 2010; Curl & Drew, 2008). KT’s frequent use of declarative proposals, unmitigated imperatives, and bald disagreements was indicative of an asymmetry in entitlements and participants roles. The impromptu instructional revisions were mainly based on KT’s perspective, and ET conversely was restricted to a position of compliance.

The last section zoomed in on the teachers’ practices of managing student discipline. The data illustrated that the interactional style taken by KT consisted of monopolizing the student reward system of giving hearts, inserting disciplinary comments via interruptive turns, and explicitly sanctioning ET from engaging with student discipline. These actions are not only invasive and face-threatening to the leading role that ET occupies in the lesson, but they also mobilize issues concerning asymmetry and authority in managing the students’ behavioral conduct.

It should be noted that while KT’s interventions portrayed control and dominance over ET’s projected course of actions, it may have also been the urgency of the situation that afforded
KT with more leeway to claim greater entitlement and show less awareness of ET’s contingencies. It was not the case in this chapter that the tone of the co-teacher interactions was overly oppressive or unfriendly, and despite some tensions, ET conceded to the invoked asymmetries most of the time. Nevertheless, the nature of KT’s interventions lies in contrast with the teacher pair in Y. Park's (2014) study where the non-leading teachers’ disciplinary actions were configured in a way that minimized interference with the leading teacher’s talk. Such sensitivities point to the participants’ orientations to balance between the tasks of solving instructional urgency and treating the other teacher as an adult colleague of equal status. This implies that the dynamics shown in this chapter is not a normative asymmetry involved in all co-teaching interaction. The unequal participant roles and authority requires further investigation, as it is, after all, an exhibit of the teachers’ institutional identities that the students are exposed to in the classroom.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to investigate the interactional organization of bilingual co-teaching in South Korea. Throughout the previous chapters, I have explored the participation structure of IRF sequences in co-taught lessons, the multimodal nature of collaborative teacher activities, and interactional asymmetries that arise between co-teachers during classroom interaction. In this final chapter, I will briefly summarize the analytical findings of Chapters 4, 5, and 6. I will then address some of the main implications of the findings for research on collaborative teaching, L2 classroom interaction, and multimodality. Finally, I will suggest possible areas for this research to be further developed within applied linguistics and L2 co-teaching research.

7.2 Summary of Analytical Findings

Chapter 4 focused on IRF sequences to reveal the interactional particularities that oriented to the presence of two teachers in the classroom. The findings demonstrated that through the teachers’ jointly initiated initiations and their entries into the student response and third position turns, co-taught lessons exhibit a distinctive structure that sets them apart from one-teacher classrooms. Furthermore, while the delicately-timed coordination of the co-teachers’ turns displayed the teachers’ orientation to a mutually-shared curricular objective, certain actions also acted as a pivot for the co-teacher to launch a turn that disaligned with the other teacher’s focus. This analysis not only produced an empirical account of the indigenous practices of co-teaching interaction, but it also shed light on what collaborative instruction does for the
accomplishment of lesson progressivity, management of unforeseen classroom exigencies, as well as the organization of student participation.

Chapter 5 showed that the participants’ nonvocal conduct is a significant interactional resource not only in coordinating co-teacher alignment but also in and across the course of incidental L2 vocabulary learning. In the first part of the analysis, I examined cases in which the non-leading teacher’s embodied conduct constructed frameworks of co-participation, making visible precisely-timed actions that are in alignment with and premonitory to the current project of the leading teacher. The second section centered on episodes of L2 vocabulary instruction. I described how the participants construct L2 vocabulary knowledge through such cooperative nonvocal conduct as gestural replication, appropriation, and alignment. As the teachers supplied different but closely linked embodied representations of the target word, the students were furnished with shared gestural frames to infer and display their own interpretations of the vocabulary meaning.

Chapter 6 examined how interactional asymmetries were constructed in the co-taught lessons. Whereas previous research on collaborative teaching has reported on co-teachers’ perceptions of differentially distributed teacher identities, status, and power in teacher partnerships, this chapter demonstrated how such unequal relationships were made relevant through the participants’ own orientations in the classroom interaction. First, by analyzing the language expert statuses occasioned by participants through epistemic displays, I described how the partnered teachers co-constructed asymmetry regarding their respective access to Korean and English. I also observed cases wherein KT proposed a revision to ET’s ongoing instructions. The analysis highlighted that KT’s intervention involved displays of high entitlement, while ET was repeatedly placed in a position of strongly expected compliance. Lastly, I examined the teachers’
interactional practices of legitimating their authority, the findings of which revealed that KT frequently assumed the role of the dominant figure in dealing with student discipline and classroom management.

7.3 Contributions

In Chapter 2, I argued that teacher collaboration, and especially co-teaching in ESL/EFL contexts, is a relatively undertheorized topic that calls for further research and conceptualization. While previous studies primarily focused on stages of co-planning and used surveys and interviews to investigate those processes, the present study aimed at examining the interactional details of collaborative instruction as occurring in situ in the classroom. By taking a CA approach, the resulting analysis revealed the participation structure of three-party classroom interaction through which each of the co-teachers interacted with the students and with one another. Teacher collaboration, in this sense, is not just limited to “plan[ning] together a curriculum and teaching strategies which will take into account the learning needs of all pupils” (Bourne, 1997, p. 83), but it is also an observable social activity that teachers and students accomplish throughout the temporally unfolding course of a lesson (Aline & Hosoda, 2006; J.-E. Park, 2014).

Building upon the current literature on classroom discourse, this study illuminates how collaborative teaching departs from the interactional organization of single-teacher classroom formations. Whereas CA researchers have been increasingly interested in departures from the normative patterns of classroom talk (Garton, 2012; Hellermann, 2005b; Waring, 2009, 2011), this study also expands upon the current research on IRF by examining instructional sequences in which co-teachers share IRF positions while working around the constraints of the basic
sequence. Chapter 4, for instance, showed that a non-leading teacher can enter in the middle of the leading teacher’s ongoing IRF sequence to promote the progressivity of the lesson and remedy unforeseen exigencies. As the initiation, response, and feedback turn positions become shared properties between the co-teachers, interventions as such reveal the teachers’ orientation to lesson objectives, to each other’s activities, and ultimately to their collaborative effort of managing instructional contingencies.

Another central finding of this study is the embodied nature of teacher collaboration. Whereas previous research on co-teaching has given no/only cursory attention to the role of embodied action, Chapter 5 demonstrated that both vocal and visual conduct are resources made publicly available for the participants to observe and act upon. In particular, the participants’ nonvocal behavior needed to be taken into account in order to gain access to the silent yet active participation of the non-leading teacher. By analyzing how the co-teachers used embodiment to display their alignment to the instructional task and to jointly accomplish L2 vocabulary explanation, I have illustrated that teacher collaboration is essentially a collective multimodal achievement. These analytical findings not only contribute to the multimodal CA research on cooperative work in organizational settings, (C. Goodwin, 2013; Luff, Patel, Kuzuoka, & Heath, 2014; Svensson et al., 2009; Tutt & Hindmarsh, 2011) but they also reaffirm the call for research in applied linguistics to investigate the role of gestures and other nonvocal behaviors in L2 classroom interaction (Gullberg, 2010; Mortensen, 2009; Seo, 2011; Sert & Walsh, 2012).

Furthermore, this multimodal analytic focus also advances the methodological endeavor of examining how simultaneity in the participants’ nonvocal behaviors is oriented to and made consequential in an unfolding course of interaction. What may have seemed like the actions of a single teacher when only the talk was considered often proved to be layered with nonvocal
contributions by the non-leading teacher in a concurrent time frame. The simultaneity involved in collaborative activities thereby necessitates a model of participation that attends to not just the sequential organization of the talk, but also the concomitant multimodal activities of all participants to an interactional event (C. Goodwin, 1981; Heath & Luff, 2012; Mondada, 2012). In the case of examining co-teaching, it is through this integrated outlook on the multimodal and sequential details of action that the sensitively coordinated nature of teacher collaboration can be thoroughly revealed. Such an approach challenges viewing nonvocal conduct only as a secondary activity to consecutive verbal actions (Deppermann, 2013), and by extension, highlights the potentially relevant properties of simultaneous multimodal activities in the production of interactional organization.

Other than the sequential and multimodal organization of collaborative instruction, examining the interactional organization of co-taught lessons has also shed light on the imbalances involved in teacher partnerships. Optimal forms of co-teacher relationships have been discussed in terms of “communities of professional equals committed to continuous improvement” (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 204), but Chapter 6 showed that the KTs’ use of declarative proposals, unmitigated imperatives, bald disagreements, and interruptive turns frequently relegated the ETs to an asymmetrical position of compliance. While educational and institutional policies on teacher collaboration often assume that the professional relationship between co-teachers is unproblematic and uncomplicated (Arkoudis, 2006), this study shows that imbalances in teacher partnership exist as a locally observable phenomenon. Teachers construct asymmetric relationships between them through their interactional practices as they orient to differences in their positions in the institutional hierarchy of the school. Unlike the widespread assumption that teachers do not need guidance in developing collaborative relations, this finding implies that
teacher partnership requires sensitive considerations of interactional practices that unfairly place one teacher into a subordinate position.

Finally, by treating teacher collaboration as an observable, interactionally accomplished, and multimodal phenomenon, a crucial contribution of this study resides in its practical implications, particularly in regards to assessing the effectiveness of teacher partnerships. In recent co-teaching literature, evaluation schemes for teacher collaboration have mostly centered on devising assessment frameworks that are external to the in-class delivery of co-taught lessons, such as attitudinal factors that occur across the teachers’ planning stages (Beninghof, 2012; Edge, 1995; Nunan, 1992). For instance, the most widely cited study, Davison (2006) proposed four indicators for categorizing different levels of teacher collaboration: attitude, effort, achievement, and expectations of support.

In contrast, the present study contends that micro-analyses of the sequential development of collaborative action, coupled with the simultaneous, nonvocal details in participants’ conduct, can supply the evaluation criteria of teacher collaboration with a rigorous observational dimension. Based on the findings of this study, Table 7.1 presents a framework that can be used to systematically observe, describe, and evaluate collaborative instruction as well as interactional displays of co-teacher relationships. Each criterion corresponds to the analysis chapters of this dissertation – IRF sequence, embodiment, and interactional asymmetry – while the guiding questions map out participant actions that produce insights to the co-teachers’ collaboration.
Table 7.1 Criteria for evaluating teacher collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequence</strong></td>
<td>• Co-initiation in adjacent, overlapping, interruptive turns</td>
<td>Do the teachers’ co-initiation, second turn, and third turn position actions…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Second turn to Y/N or WH-Questions</td>
<td>✓ reveal shared orientation to the instructional task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Third turn assessments, follow-up questions</td>
<td>✓ demonstrate shared understanding of each other’s turns and students’ contributions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ achieve progressivity of the lesson and curricular objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ display conflicting agendas, teaching philosophies, or cultural assumptions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embodiment</strong></td>
<td>• Repeated gestures</td>
<td>Do the teachers’ verbal and nonvocal conduct…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gestural alignment</td>
<td>✓ occur in a sensitively timed and coordinated manner to each other’s activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forward-gesturing</td>
<td>✓ display their orientation to a shared instructional objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ replicate and/or transform the semiotic structure provided by the other teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ provide various but interconnected embodied meanings of the instructional target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional (A)symmetry</strong></td>
<td>• Co-teacher interventions</td>
<td>Do the teachers’ interventions, disagreements, and disaffiliative actions…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disagreement</td>
<td>✓ comprise mitigated forms of directives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disaffiliation</td>
<td>✓ take dispreferred shapes of turn design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ orient to differential epistemic stances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ imply unequal claims of institutional status, entitlement and/or authority?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interactional dynamics described in Table 7.1 uncover the co-teachers’ collaborative competences as they are made public and socially available to both the participants and to the analyst. By means of conducting a microanalysis of the instructional sequence, embodiment, and sites of interactional asymmetry in co-teaching practices, we are able to locate precise moments where optimal teacher collaboration occurs or fails to take place. By adopting such a framework, not only can assessments of teacher partnership and collaborative instruction be grounded in empirical, rigorous descriptions of behavioral evidence, but the findings can also be utilized to
instigate dialogues between teacher pairs and in teacher training sessions. The capacity of CA for institutional interventions has been well documented in recent publications on applied conversation analysis (e.g., Antaki, 2011; Heritage & Robinson, 2011; Stokoe, 2014). In this sense, the findings and the suggested criteria for evaluating teacher collaboration also carry the potential of generating reflective practices among teachers in order to promote an enhanced understanding that bridges their differences in teaching philosophies, instructional styles, and cultural backgrounds, and that ultimately, guide them in their accomplishment of effective co-teaching practices.

7.4 Directions for Further Research

In order to extend CA’s engagement with examining instructional activities and collaborative organizational work, and to promote the analytic use of videorecorded observational data for co-teaching research, I will discuss several areas that deserve more exploration.

First, the data in this study examined different partnerships of co-teachers as well as their distinct interactional practices in delivering a collaborative lesson. Such mechanisms often promoted the smooth progression of the lesson, but the key question still remains whether they afford students with opportunities to produce meaningful and extended utterances for language learning (Hall, 1998; Nassaji & Wells, 2000). We witnessed cases as Excerpt 5.11 where the co-teacher entered the second turn position to contribute her own ideas to “what can we make with wheat.” Meanwhile, the students’ responses remained unattended until the teacher-teacher brainstorming exchange reached an end. While IRF has been notoriously associated with the pedagogy of transmission and providing few occasions for negotiating meaning (van Lier, 1996), CA research on IRF has examined the complexities at each turn position, revealing local
transformations that defy reductionist generalizations about IRF as a monolithic form of instructional organization (Koole, 2012b; Margutti & Drew, 2014; Waring, 2012a, 2012c; Zemel & Koschmann, 2011). IRF in co-teaching similarly requires an awareness of the specific and complex interactional practices that organize student participation, and in exchange, necessitates the teachers to contemplate ways that maximize the students’ level of engagement in pedagogic activities. An important focus for future research, therefore, is to the heterogeneity of co-teaching practices and effective interactional practices that result in extended opportunities for students to use the target language.

More detailed examinations of collaborative instruction can also shed light on the socialization processes that occur across and between co-teachers. As illustrated in Excerpt 4.15, instances where KT’s intervention prompted ET to revise her instruction display that certain interactional practices can facilitate the socialization of inexperienced teachers. Earlier studies have explored how novice teachers adopt the practices of more experienced teachers and gradually become competent members of the school community, but such research has primarily relied on data collected through interviews and questionnaires – the teachers’ reports of perceived factors and experiences that influence teacher socialization (e.g., Caires, Almeida, & Vieira, 2012; Shin, 2012; Zeichner & Gore, 1989). Detailed analyses of classroom interaction are needed to supplement those findings by discovering how in and through collaborative instruction, teachers accommodate and transform socializing resources that they make available for each other.

Another topic for further inquiry is the extent to which classroom contexts of co-teaching are indexical of larger discussions, debates, and discourses on the English education policy of South Korea. The findings of this study demonstrated that through specific interactional practices,
ETs were positioned into a relegated teacher status by KTts. How that difference is constructed in relation to discourses at the institutional and societal level, and how such unequal treatments reproduce existing linguistic, social, and educational ideologies in Korea need deeper and more thorough investigation. Increased awareness of the links between classroom practices and societal level discourses can be an important step towards debunking any marginalization involved in current conceptualizations of teacher collegiality and by extension, promote policy and institutional support that establish and sustain equality in collaborative teaching partnerships.

The current study presented an example of how co-teaching is organized in EFL classrooms, and it is centered on a single school setting. Although different teacher pairs have been examined, research of other collaboration formats will contribute to a deeper understanding of co-teaching in Korea, and ultimately furnish a more generalizable and comprehensive assessment criteria that can be used for teacher training purposes. Another important topic is the potentially heterogeneous interactional practices among students of different age groups and language proficiencies. The students in this study were young, beginner-level learners of English, which may have contributed to the strict and controlled nature of the classroom interaction. Whether such restrictions are more relaxed in classes of older age groups is an empirical question for future exploration.

Lastly, a further site for extending co-teaching research is the interactions occurring outside of instructional talk. For example, how each of the teachers interact with the students during recess, lunch time, and other casual activities could reveal different action formats, participation styles, and interactional structure that diverge from those during an ongoing lesson. In contrast to instructional talk, where teachers exercise privileged rights to keep the class under control, the unequal turn exchange system is less likely to govern off-class interactions. How the
students orient to each of the teachers outside of the lesson could further reveal issues relevant to
the differential roles, status, and authority that the teachers have in the institution.
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Elementary bilingual education in Korea: Investigation of a partial Korean/English immersion program

I am Josephine Lee, a researcher and intern at your child’s school, Central Christian Academy.

I am also a Ph.D. student at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, in the Department of Second Language Studies.

The purpose of my research project is to investigate bilingual classroom interaction among teachers and young learners of English. I am asking your permission for your child to participate in this project. I also will ask your child if s/he agrees to participate in this project.

Project Description:

If your child participates in this project, here is what I will do:

1. I will observe and video-tape your child’s classroom interactions 2-3 class periods per week. Your child will not be asked to do anything, but to participate in the classroom activities as usual.
2. With your permission, I will study your child’s writings or tasks that were completed in class.

Your Rights:

Confidentiality:

- The recorded classroom interactions and your child’s class work will remain totally confidential so that your child cannot be identified. This means that his/her name will not be mentioned in the research paper, publications, or presentations. Your child’s name will appear in pseudonyms.
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- You may ask questions about this research at any time. Please contact me at 010-2665-4565,
or email me at jlee2@hawaii.edu whenever you have questions or concerns.

To Withdraw at Any Time:

- Your child’s participation in this project is voluntary, and so is your decision about permitting or not permitting (him or her) to participate. Moreover, at any time, your child can stop participating in this project and you can withdraw your consent without any loss of benefits or rights. I want to assure you that the choice to participate or not participate in this project will have no impact on your child’s report card or on his/her relationship with the teacher.

Benefits and Possible Risks

There are no direct benefits to your child for participating in my research project. However, the study will help me, other teachers, administrators, and researchers to better understand how effective English teaching is conducted through bilingual classroom interaction.

To the researcher’s knowledge, there is no potential risk involved in the study.

Your consent to the release of video recordings

I would like you to indicate below what uses of these recordings you are willing to consent to. This is completely up to you. I will only use the recordings in ways that you agree to. In any case of these recordings, your child’s name will not be identified. If you decide not to give consent to your child being videotaped, the camera will be placed at an angle that will not capture your child.

Only initial the uses that you agree to.

1. The video-recordings of my child can be studied by the investigator for use in the research project.

   _____ [Please use initials to indicate your consent]

2. The video-recordings of my child can be used for scientific publications.

   _____* [Please use initials to indicate your consent]
3. The video-recordings of my child can be shown in public presentations.

________* [Please use initials to indicate your consent]

*If you agree to have your recordings shown in public, you have the option of having your child’s face blurred.

________ Yes, please blur my child’s face.

________ No, I don’t need my child’s face blurred.

Signature

I certify that I read and understand the above, that I have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice or loss of benefits or compensation. I agree to be a part of this study with the understanding that such permission does not take away my rights, nor does it release the investigator or the institution from liability for negligence. If I cannot obtain satisfactory answers to my questions, or have comments or complaints about my participation in this study, I may contact: Committee on Human Studies (CHS), University of Hawaii, 1960 East-West Road Biomedical Building, Room B-104, Honolulu, HI 96822

Phone: (808) 956-5007. Email: uhirb@hawaii.edu

Name of Child (Print): ___________________________________________________

Name of Parent/Guardian (Print): _________________________________________

Parent/Guardian's Signature: _____________________________________________

Date: ____________________________
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Elementary bilingual education in Korea: Investigation of a partial Korean/English immersion program

Purpose of this research

The purpose of the study is to investigate bilingual classroom interaction among teachers and young learners of English. The interview is to learn more about your background, teaching philosophy, lesson preparation work, and challenges that you have experienced from being a teacher in a Korean-English bilingual classroom. This information will help the school continue to improve their bilingual program.

Project Description:

If you decide to participate in this project, here is what I will do:

1. I will video record the usual lessons in your bilingual class for 2-3 sessions a week.
2. With your permission, I will study your students’ writings or tasks that were completed in class.
3. I will conduct an interview will focus on your experiences and perceptions about the bilingual program. No personal identifying information will be included with the research results. Approximately 4-8 people will participate in the study. Interviews will be audio-recorded for the purpose of transcription and is predicted to last about 30-45 minutes.

Your Rights:

Confidentiality:

- Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Every data to be obtained will be treated with absolute confidentiality. All personal names, if presented in the data, will be assigned codes or pseudonyms and no personal information will be revealed at any cost. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the Primary Investigator's office for the duration of the research project. All research records will be destroyed upon completion of the project.
- The video recordings will not be used in any public forum unless I get specific permission from you.

To Ask Questions at Any Time:

- You may ask questions about this research at any time. Please contact me at 010-2665-4565, or email me at jlee2@hawaii.edu whenever you have questions or concerns.
To withdraw any time

- Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of the project with no penalty, or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled. You may also request the data be destroyed without any consequences.

Benefits and possible risks

- Participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. However, you may request to be informed of the results and to read this study. The study will help me, other teachers, administrators, and researchers to better understand how effective English teaching is conducted through bilingual classroom interaction.
- To the researcher’s knowledge, there are no potential risks.

Your consent to the release of video recordings

I would like you to indicate below what uses of these recordings you are willing to consent to. This is completely up to you. I will only use the recordings in ways that you agree to. In any case of these recordings, your name will not be identified.

Only initial the uses that you agree to.

4. The video-recordings can be studied by the investigator for use in the research project.

   _____ [Please use initials to indicate your consent]

5. The video-recordings can be used for scientific publications.

   _____ * [Please use initials to indicate your consent]

6. The video-recordings can be shown in public presentations.

   _____ * [Please use initials to indicate your consent]
*If you agree to have your recordings shown in public, you have the option of having your face blurred.

________ Yes, please blur my face.
________ No, I don’t need my face blurred.

I certify that I have read and understand the above, that I have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice or loss of benefits. I agree to be part of this study with the understanding that such permission does not take away any of my rights, nor does it release the investigators or the institution from liability for negligence. If I cannot obtain satisfactory answers to my questions, or have comments or complaints about my participation in this study I may contact: UH Committee on Human Studies (CHS) at uhirb@hawaii.edu or (808) 956-5007.

(Print your name)       (Date)

_________________________________    ____________________________
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