Chapter 5  Silence: An Empirical View - Case Study 1

5.1 Overview of Chapters 5, 6 and 7

In the preceding chapter, the silence of Japanese students in university classrooms as perceived by both Japanese students themselves and by lecturers was discussed. In chapters 5, 6 and 7, the 'perceived' silence of Japanese students will be investigated further by examining the behaviour of participants in naturally-occurring classroom situations. The issues of main concern here are: 1) whether the 'perceived' silence mentioned by Japanese students and lecturers can be found in actual classroom situations; 2) how silence of Japanese students is constructed in actual classroom communicative processes; 3) how perceptions and performance interact to create certain meanings and functions of silence in classroom communication.

For a close examination of participants' behaviour and perceptions, case studies of three Japanese students were designed. Classes which these students attended were observed as well as video-recorded, and follow-up interviews were organised with the Japanese participants, the lecturers in charge and some of the Australian peer students (for details of methodology including details of participants and observed classes, see 3.2.1.6, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.1.8 and 3.2.1.9.). It should be noted here that not all the talk transcribed and shown in excerpts in chapters 5, 6 and 7 was shown to the participants in stimulated interviews, since allowing time for detailed transcription and close analysis of transcribed data between observation (and video recording) and the interview was expected to lower the quality of the participants’ reflections on what had happened in the classroom (cf. Gass & Mackey 2000). Descriptions of the three case study participants, already presented in Chapter 3, are provided again below (Table 5.1). The participants' names are pseudonyms and the names of the units of study have been modified for reasons of confidentiality. Interview comments from the Japanese students are translated from Japanese by the author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of residency in Australia</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Subject names of the classes observed and recorded</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BED LOTE (Languages other than English)</td>
<td>Teaching as a Profession</td>
<td>3 hrs 20mns [3hrs 20mns]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Examinations</td>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>5 hrs [5 hrs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA Japanese Studies</td>
<td>History of Secondary Education</td>
<td>20 hrs [8 hrs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA Japanese &amp; Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 hrs 40mns [4 hrs]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Japanese participants in classroom case studies
Although the three students had achieved an IELTS overall band score of at least 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band or a TOEFL score of 575 with TWE 4.5 in order to be accepted to the University of Sydney, a re-evaluation of their speaking proficiency was considered to be important for looking at their interaction in Australian classrooms. As Liu (2002) reports, even at a postgraduate level, lack of competence in speaking and listening to English can play a major role in overseas students’ silence. At the same time, a possible underestimation by students of their own language skills should be taken into account. Consequently, two raters, a qualified former English teacher who is a native speaker of English and had had experience of rating second language speakers' English proficiency, and the researcher, also a qualified English teacher with a TESOL certificate and registration as a language proficiency examiner in Japan, rated the proficiency of the three students. The native speaker rater was shown three sections of interaction in which the students participated, and evaluated their proficiency using ISLPR (International Second Language Proficiency Ratings: see Appendix 5 for details) rating system. Short descriptions of each Japanese student’s competence in English were then made.

In each of Chapters 5, 6 and 7, the three case studies are presented. The results are integrated in the concluding chapter, Chapter 8. In this chapter, the results and discussion of Case study 1 with key participant Tadashi will be presented.

5.2 Background to Case Study 1: Tadashi

Tadashi, the only male student in the case studies, is a 27 year-old fourth year undergraduate student majoring in Bachelor of Education in LOTE (Languages Other Than English). He has been residing and studying in Australia for 8 years, in which time he studied in a Bible School for three years and in a university TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) program for two years before he started the Bachelor of Education program at the University of Sydney. While he was in the TESOL program, he was asked to teach Japanese, and this experience led him to join the LOTE program.

When the observation for this case study started, he had just finished his teaching practicum at a private girls' school in Sydney and he was hoping to find a teaching position at a secondary school in Sydney. He is married to a Korean wife, and a few weeks into the observation, his second child was born. He uses Korean or Japanese at home, as his wife speaks Japanese as fluently as he does Korean. His spoken English language proficiency was rated 4 (ISLPR) by both raters.
The classes observed for the case study were from two subjects offered by the Faculty of Education and will be referred to as 'Teaching as a Profession' and 'Curriculum and Examinations'. Both classes were observed for one two hour session each week, the former for two weeks and the latter for four weeks. The former was a large tutorial with 22 students who are mostly Australian educated and spoke English as a first language. The group had a large proportion of female students (18), and the rest of the class consisted of two Australian males, one American male, one Italian male, one Korean male and Tadashi, the only Japanese. The tutor was a middle-aged female Australian (Ms. Hardy).

The group from Curriculum and Examinations was smaller, with only five students. There was one Australian female and three Greek-Australian female students as well as Tadashi. However, the number of the students in each session ranged from two to five with a couple of students attending only half of the total of six sessions. Tadashi, however, attended five out of six sessions. The recording and observation of the class took place four times, of which Tadashi missed one session. The lecturer was a middle-aged male Australian (Mr. Fuller) who had been involved in language teaching policy in secondary school education and had recently been appointed to a lecturer's position at the university.

5.3 Quantity of participation

From the interviews with students (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.1), lack of participation was found to be one of the major problems for Japanese students in their learning experiences at Australian universities. A question which arises is how realistic students self-perceptions are. To approach this question, the quantity of participation was measured by counting the number of turns and measuring the length of turns produced by the students in the observed classes.

When we look at Tadashi’s participation, he had significantly fewer turns than his local Australian peers. First of all, let us look at his participation in the Teaching as a Profession class. In the total of the two two-hour tutorials of Teaching as a Profession, he spoke only twice, on both occasions after being selected by the teacher. The average length of his turns was 1.5 seconds. Although the class, with 22 students, was large, the students were encouraged to share their ideas and experiences, and their extremely active involvement was observed throughout each of the two sessions. Overlapping, interruption and competition for the floor were frequently observed, and humour and jokes from the students were common. Tadashi, however, was rather an observer and did not attempt to jump into the class discussion at all, which is also reflected in his interview comments such
as 'I normally just listen, thinking, "Right, right"' or 'Generally I am on the side of listening, sometimes feeling amused, "Hah hah, that's funny"'. In both of the two observed sessions, the students worked in pairs to discuss how they would cope with hypothetical problematic situations in the profession of teaching. The students were given about ten to fifteen minutes to discuss the situations in pairs, and the teacher asked each pair to report their solution to the class. The class was then invited to comment on the solutions. In the first session observed, it was Tadashi's partner in the pair work who told the class what they had discussed, and Tadashi did not speak during the class at all.

In the second session of Teaching as a Profession, it was again Tadashi's partner who commented. This time, however, Tadashi added a short comment immediately after the completion of his partner's turn. Following this, the teacher's request for him to repeat what he had said elicited his second turn. Thus, in this session, although Tadashi spoke, his contribution was significantly smaller than most other students overall.

To give a more general overview of what happened in these two sessions in terms of quantity of talk, Table 5.2 below shows the distribution of talk along with the average number of turns and average turn length of the sample population in this class. Although the student number was 22 in this class, due to the constraints on identifying participants in the video recorded data, the contributions of nine students in the group were included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Number and length of turns in Teaching as a Profession (Total)

It is quite noticeable that Tadashi did not participate as much as other students, except for Susie who spoke only once for four seconds. The results also suggest that there are a number of active students who tend to dominate classroom discussion, which was also confirmed in the classroom observation. However, it was also observed that there were few students who were as silent as Tadashi in this group. Since the group had completed their teaching practicum and intended to start their teaching career in the near future, they were
generally keen to share the experiences in their practicum and to benefit as much as possible from these sessions to prepare themselves for their future career. In a recall interview, the lecturer, Ms. Hardy mentioned:

[Interview excerpt 1: Ms. Hardy 101]

[...] there were so many people trying to say things. That is the problem with that course just when they're all talking about their experiences in prac because it's so vivid, it's so real.

On the other hand, Tadashi never shared his teaching experiences, and both Ms. Hardy and an interviewed peer student indicated that he was quiet in class. Ms. Hardy, who had Tadashi in her class for two semesters, gave her impression of him:

[Interview excerpt 2: Ms. Hardy 71]

I remembered vividly micro teaching two years ago, umm it was Tadashi and (        ) in the same group - where they wouldn't talk out. They're sort of shy. That's how I feel it is. When he's on one on one, Tadashi - he's very confident, expresses what he wants and will tell you. ... But in class, he doesn't speak and he doesn't participate, and I feel that as a tutor now being exposed slightly, because I didn't make him speak.

She often mentioned Tadashi in association with Wong Young, a Korean student who was sitting next to Tadashi in the second session observed. She found them 'similar' in that they were generally quiet, except for a memory of 'Wong Young answering something detailed but not Tadashi'. A peer student also described Tadashi below:

[Interview excerpt 3: Kylie 95]

I find that he probably doesn't communicate as much as some of the other students. I think he prefers just to listen and take notes, but when it's his turn to provide - sort of or participate, he always says valuable stuff to say and he's usually pretty knowledgeable on what we're doing.

Tadashi was also observed in four lectures for another education subject called Curriculum and Examinations. Although the sessions observed were supposed to be lectures, they were more like tutorials since only five students were enrolled in this subject. This allowed a relaxed and intimate atmosphere in the class, though the sessions had comparatively more teacher-talk compared with the tutorials for Teaching as a Profession. The teacher-centredness of this class was noted by Tadashi, Mr. Fuller himself and a peer student, who expressed the following:

[Interview excerpt 4: Kylie 49]

He's got a lot of knowledge and I think he finds it hard to condense it into something so small - he just ends up talking most of the time. But it's good. I mean I don't mind. And usually he lets us talk if we have anything to say or questions to ask.

Both an interviewed peer student and Mr. Fuller pointed out that the nature of the subject required input of practical information from the lecturer who had the expertise and
insider knowledge of issues around Higher School Certificate exams (examinations for graduating Year Twelve students in Australia). Nevertheless, there was a considerable amount of discussion and talk in this class, as described in the comment above.

When the students' participation in this Curriculum and Examinations class is examined by the number of turns, it is again evident that Tadashi is one of the two students with the lowest participation rates, as can be seen in Table 5.3 below. For this class, contribution from all the students was included as the speech of all participants was captured clearly by the video recording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Number and length of turns in Curriculum and Examinations (Total)

It should be noted that in the cases of other students with low participation rates, Christine attended only 40% of the video-recorded class time and Linda attended only 50% of the video recorded class time. On top of this, only Tadashi and Kylie attended the last session, in which Tadashi took 11 turns. This means that his average of 13.7 turns per class is higher than his actual average number of turns when everyone attended the class.

Looking at the length of turns, although students generally produced short turns with the average of 3.3 seconds, when students' longest turns are examined individually, Tadashi's longest turn was 6 seconds while Kylie's was 33, Tamara's 39, Linda's 12 and Christine's 18.

In the follow-up interview for this class, Mr. Fuller never mentioned Tadashi's silence but instead gave generally positive comments about him:

[Interview excerpt 5: Mr. Fuller 73]
I personally - I warm to him as a personality. He's a positive person. He approaches his tasks and learning with some enthusiasm. He seems to be unafraid to ask questions when necessary.
(long pause) I think he should make a success of his career as a positive personality.

Throughout the interview, however, it was implied in Mr. Fuller's comments that negative comments should be avoided. Defensive strategies such as providing a long explanation of what he knew as an educator and an account of the emergency nature of the observed session (it was in fact out of an emergency that the subject was set up, and he had to teach
this course on a voluntary basis) were given during the interview. Unlike Ms. Hardy, Mr. Fuller was careful in deciding what to say, talking slowly with occasional long pauses, avoiding any judgemental or impressionistic comments or comments expressing stereotypical images of classroom practices or certain cultural groups.

It is possible that he tried to protect himself as a lecturer from any negative evaluation, since not only was it his first year at university but also he may not have been well prepared for the subject. A peer student actually mentioned in her interview that the course 'was not structured', even though she found that there was valuable information in the course. Thus, it is possible that Mr. Fuller also avoided negative comments about Tadashi or other students in the group as a defence against any negative evaluation. The only comment concerning Tadashi’s participation in the class, 'He seems to be unafraid to ask questions when necessary', also seems to indicate that Mr. Fuller is being careful in his wording. This evaluation does not tell us how frequently Tadashi participated, which depended on the type of situation in which Tadashi found it 'necessary' to ask questions, a key issue in quality of participation to be discussed later. Tadashi's own reflection of his participation in this class was almost the same as in the other class, namely of 'listening almost all the time'. The comparison of the students' longest turn lengths also indicates that it is not only the frequency of turns but also the length of turns in which Tadashi's participation is limited.

In sum, Tadashi appears to reflect the image of the silent Japanese student represented in the Japanese students' accounts in the interviews (see Chapter 4). Although the three participants in the follow-up interviews all indicated that Tadashi was a conscientious, punctual student with a good attendance rate, he was a passive and silent student in the classroom as far as quantity of his participation was concerned.

5.4 Quality of participation (1) Turn-taking and sequence organisation

Another issue of concern in Japanese students' classroom performance is the quality of participation and how it affects perceptions of silence. Three aspects of participation were found relevant for an analysis of the quality of participation in the case studies: patterns of turn-taking, formality of language use and topical preference. These partially overlap with the concept of register, whose basic components are mode, tenor and field (Halliday 1978, 1985). Drawing on Halliday (e.g. 1978, 1985), Eggins (1994) explains that mode, tenor and field are three aspects of context which 'make a difference to how we use language' (Eggins 1994: 52). In the present research, it is not only the amount of talk or silence that
is of concern but also the relationship between participants' language use and their perceptions about silence. Therefore, it is worth exploring the quality of participation in these aspects of classroom interaction.

5.4.1 Overall patterns of turn-taking and sequence organisation

First, let us examine turn-taking among the participants in relation to its influence on silence. Turn-taking in classroom communication is closely related to participant structures, which are 'ways of allocating student involvement' (Philips 1983: 79). In this regard, the two classes in which Tadashi was observed were structured in slightly different ways. In the tutorials of Teaching as a Profession, the role of the teacher was a 'tutorial leader' who led classroom discussion so that students could achieve a better understanding of the subject content as well as develop their problem-solving skills for the real world of teaching. On the other hand, in the more teacher-centred Curriculum and Examinations class, there was greater space for teacher-talk, although the students did ask questions of one another and comment on their peers' ideas and thoughts (cf. peer student's description in interview excerpt 4). However, due to the small class size, interaction among the students was often similar to ordinary conversation and sometimes the distinction between public and private interaction was not clear.

First of all, to obtain general characteristics of the participants' turn-taking behaviour, as already detailed in Chapter 3, students' turns were coded using categories of situations in which turn-taking took place: 1) bidding for the floor; 2) open floor and 3) individually offered floor. As far as the first and second categories are concerned, in both classes, there was a general tendency for more turns to be taken through 'bidding' rather than in an 'open floor', and generally fewer turns taken through individual selection by others than through all other methods. Considering these findings in addition to the shared property of turns self-selected through 'bidding' or in an 'open floor', it seems worth examining the distribution of self-selected and other-selected turns. Thus, figures obtained for the first and the second categories were combined for analysis as a category of self-selected turns, although they were also examined separately. The category of 'individually offered floor' in contrast with that of self-selected turns is accordingly called other-selected turns, since turns are selected by others when the floor was offered to a specific individual. The terms self-selection and other-selection are derived from the notion of self-selecting and other-selecting in turn-taking rules which is central to conversation analysis as proposed by Sacks et al (1974).
Comparing self-selected turns (Table 5.4) with other-selected turns (Table 5.5) in Teaching as a Profession, we can see that there are clearly more self-selected than other-selected turns as a tendency of the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Number and length of self-selected turns in Teaching as a Profession

Since there was relatively stiff competition for the floor, students had to 'jump into' the discussion if they wanted to say something, rather than waiting for the chance to speak to be offered by the teacher. In this class, Tadashi did not self-select at all. One of the two turns coded for ‘individually offered turns’ could be regarded as self-selected, as he added a short comment to what his partner had said when the pair was nominated. However, this short turn was classified in the category of other-selected turns, as the teacher nominated the pair saying 'Tadashi and Wong Young can you -'. Their response as a pair was not completed until Tadashi added a short comment to his partner's turn after a short pause and this partner immediately said 'yea:h' to give away the floor given to them as a pair. In either case, Tadashi did not self-select his turns when no exclusive attention was given to him as a potential speaker. He and Wong Young had the rights to the floor to themselves until other students started to respond to the same question through bidding.

Table 5.5 Number and length of other-selected turns in Teaching as a Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 Number and length of other-selected turns in Teaching as a Profession
Let us now turn to the Curriculum and Examinations class. Tadashi self-selected his turns 22 times, but not as often as the other students, as we can see in Table 5.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Number and length of self-selected turns in Curriculum and Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Number and length of turns through bidding in Curriculum and Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Number and length of turns in open floor situations in Curriculum and Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 Number and length of turns through individual nomination in Curriculum and Examinations

Although the total number of turns (cf. Table 5.3 in section 5.3) shows that Christine took fewer turns than Tadashi, it should be noted that she attended only 40% of the recorded sessions in which Tadashi was present. Moreover, three turns out of twelve in the bidding category for Tadashi (Table 5.7 above) were taken during a one-on-one session with Mr. Fuller before other students joined the class, and four turns out of twelve in the same bidding category were taken in the session in which only Tadashi and Kylie attended.
This leaves five turns taken by Tadashi during the sessions in which more than three students attended. In any case, the average number of turns taken by Tadashi in the bidding-for-floor situation is the lowest in the class. In the ‘open floor’ category (Table 5.8 above), four out of ten turns were taken during the session in which only Tadashi and Kylie attended.

Regarding participation through individual nomination (Table 5.9 above), Tadashi had the highest number of turns, although on average Tamara showed the highest number turns per class. It should be noted, however, that nine of Tadashi’s turns in this category were yes-no responses, as were seven of Tamara's. This suggests that other-selected turns were not common in this class. Thus, as in the larger Teaching as a Profession class, the students in Curriculum and Examinations also had to self-select to participate to an average degree despite the small class size. It is possible that this turn-taking system in classroom interaction which required frequent self-selection made it difficult for Tadashi to participate to an average degree, since he had a tendency to participate more by other-selection. This is also suggested by the teacher in the Teaching as a Profession class:

[Interview excerpt 6 Ms. Hardy 76]
[...] he would never volunteer and there's so many kids in that group that do volunteer that unless you do, you don't have a chance.

From the coding results it can also be inferred that due to this preference for self-selection in classroom participation, there seem to be a number of students who tend to dominate interaction. Kylie, for example, was the only student except for Tadashi who was in both of the two classes followed in this case study, and it is clearly shown in the results that she is the most active student in both classes (Table 5.2 and Table 5.3 above). More importantly, comparison of Table 5.4 and 5.5, and Table 5.6 and 5.9 above shows that although Kylie's average number of other-selected turns is not significantly higher than others, her self-selected turns are overwhelmingly higher than her classmates. Kylie was observed to be a motivated, enthusiastic and active student. This type of attitude was positively evaluated by Ms. Hardy. She noted in her recall interview how impressed she was by Kylie's performance saying, 'That Kylie girl sounds pretty good, too. I thought she was going to be wonderful.' Gary, a mature student from the US who was also articulate, voluble and enthusiastic (cf. Table 5.2) was described by Ms. Hardy as 'really committed'. It is also the case that he self-selects his turns frequently while the frequency of other-selected turns is moderate. The cases of Kylie and Gary are the reverse of Tadashi’s whose classroom performance was negatively evaluated by Ms. Hardy:
Earlier Ms. Hardy commented that Tadashi and Wong Young only spoke when they were asked direct questions (‘direct’ meaning straightforward factual memory checking questions), which she found unsatisfactory. Moreover, the negative evaluation expressed in interview excerpt 7 above was not exactly an evaluation of classroom performance but actually an evaluation of overall academic performance. This comment seems to strongly encode the considerable weight of classroom participation on perception of academic competence, at least from Ms. Hardy’s point of view.

On the other hand, Mr. Fuller noted that Tadashi approached ‘his tasks and learning with some enthusiasm’. This stands in contrast with Ms. Hardy’s negative evaluation. Moreover, Mr. Fuller mentions directly after the above comment, 'He seems to be unafraid to ask questions when necessary'. However, among Tadashi’s total 22 turns through self-selection in this class, he asked three questions out of which two were asked during the one-on-one period in a class concerning access to publicly distributed documents about the HSC examinations. In addition, since Mr. Fuller describes ’a good class' as:

[Interview excerpt 8: Mr. Fuller 26]

[...] a good class is where the students are interested in asking questions, are interested in - or understand however much one knows, there is always more to know - are prepared to examine the relationships between the content of the course that is being delivered and for student teachers, the practical application of that content for themselves and their future careers.

it is possible that Tadashi's questioning in the classroom is not really up to the expectations Mr. Fuller has of students. However, the gap in Mr. Fuller’s comments and Tadashi's performance maybe due, as mentioned earlier, to the fact that Mr. Fuller is overly careful about giving any judgemental or negative comments.

So far, patterns of turn-taking in terms of self-selection and other-selection of turns have been presented. These patterns can affect not only perceptions of silence but also may affect the ways teaching staff perceive students' academic competence. The question which arises following these findings is how this difference in turn-taking patterns is created at the local level of talk-in-interaction. In other words, it is essential to address the issues of who selects who, who the talk is directed to and how exactly the turns are selected, as well as what interactional roles the participants take in classroom interaction. The following sub-sections will explore the local level of talk-in-interaction.
5.4.2 Interactional roles of students and teacher

Looking more closely at Tadashi's tendency to participate through other-selected turns, it is possible to see some patterns in interactional roles in the classroom.

Classroom interaction is often characterised by a type of sequence in which the teacher asks a question and the student responds to it, followed by the teacher's evaluation (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). This characterisation has been linked to the 'traditional' teacher-centred classroom (Drew & Heritage 1994). However, as English for Academic Purposes courses or learning centres at universities normally provide opportunities for students to acquire skills for tutorial discussion and participation, university classroom discourse can include more diverse structures of interaction. Nevertheless, the 'traditional' form of classroom discourse can still be found extensively, naturally as the teachers still hold the ultimate control of their classes. The following interaction excerpt from the Curriculum and Examinations class can be identified as a typical teacher-student interaction. Here, Mr. Fuller (referred to as Lect in the transcription) asks his first question to Tadashi in line 1 and 2, to which Tadashi responds in line 4, and then Mr. Fuller acknowledges it in line 5. Thus, the first two turns form a question-answer adjacency pair with an expansion in the third turn. In Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) terms, these three turns form an I-R-F (initiation-response-feedback) sequence (ibid.). Then, in line 9, 10 and 11 Mr. Fuller asks another question, to which Tadashi responds in line 16 and 17 (although the beginning of Tadashi's turn is overlapped by Mr. Fuller expanding on his question), and then Mr. Fuller again provides feedback as an expansion of the sequence. In fact, this is indeed the typical form of participation by Tadashi. His turns are typically second pair parts of question-answer adjacency pairs.

[Interaction excerpt 1: T5 16]

1  Lect:  or: (0.4) the day: which day is it when: uh
2  um parents give the children bit of money?
3  (0.5)
4  Tadashi: Uh: uh first of January?=(0.5)
5  Lect: =First first of January. okay. (0.8) so: that
6  interests kids (. ) You know the idea that
7  parents give them a lo(h)t of mone(h)y eh
8  heh heh you know that’s something that would
9  huh (. ) that we bring in, (0.2) Are there any
10  other special days: between: January and
11  June? (0.5) in Japan?
12  (0.2)
13  Tadashi: u[ h ::]
14  Lect: [At al]1?
15  (0.4)
Examiner the directionality of Tadashi’s turns in this way reveals that his participation mostly occurs after explicit nomination by Mr. Fuller. Below is another example:

[Interaction excerpt 2: T3 3]

Lect: Now why is this more important in the language than any other subject. well we looked at, (0.4) one of the things we looked at, (0.2) er: the nature of the HSC, because it cross-references also at the School Certificate. (1.5) and we looked briefly last week (1.2) um at the School Certificate. ± perhaps you (.). you might remember what are some of the: what- what- what some of the: (.) key things from the School Certificate (0.3) because you see (.). this whole new (0.5) examination regime, (0.3)is gonna have some flowback (.). though (0.7) some affect on numbers. You- you remember: what I was saying about the School Certificate? = There were some=
→17 Tadashi: =Um ° [ ]°
18 Lect: °[there there was] some key subjects.=
19 Tadashi: =Yea, (0.8) yes. um:
20 Tadashi: [ English and ][ma:ths,]=
21 Kylie: ="(English maths) °] [science]=
22 Tadashi: =Science? yeah°.
23 (0.3)
24 Lect: =Right. (0.3) English, (1.4) Ma:ths,(0.8) science? = and there’s a new one.
25 Tadashi: New one is uh: uh geography? (0.2) and history? °( °)°?= 28 Kylie: ="(Well/Why didn't you say) ° [ so ].
29 Lect: [Yeah].

This excerpt also shows a pattern of classroom interaction similar to the Initiation-Response-Feedback model, with Mr. Fuller nominating Tadashi in line 8 through to 11, then 14 through to 15. Tadashi received nominations directed exclusively to him such as this, as he was the only student who had attended the previous session. Thus the ‘you’ in line 14 above refers to Tadashi. Although he does not respond to the invitation to contribute in line 8 through to 11, with the nomination by ‘you’ in line 14 in a form of questioning, he responds in line 17, interrupting Mr. Fuller. It is possible that the first cue in line 8 to 11 was either not direct enough for Tadashi to feel obliged to respond or he was not sure what the point of the question was (as evidenced in his hesitation in line 17). In fact, Mr. Fuller’s question at the first nomination was vague, as the words ‘key things’ instead of ‘key subjects’ suggest. After Mr. Fuller’s repair to clarify his question, Tadashi
responds instantly, latching onto Mr. Fuller's turn and providing his answers in line 20, although this response was completely overlapped by Kylie's answer to the question (detailed analysis of timing in turn-taking in this excerpt will be provided later in section 5.4.4). Tadashi recognises the difference in the two simultaneous answers and repeats the missing part in his answer in line 22. Mr. Fuller accepts the answer and then moves on to the next elicitation move ('and there's a new one' in line 25). To this, Tadashi responds again without a pause. Tadashi’s smooth turn transition with no pause or with latching in line 26 could be considered as an indicator of his strong sense of commitment to interaction initiated by Mr. Fuller. From another perspective, it is also possible that Tadashi required and waited for another explicit cue from Mr. Fuller. Other instances of Tadashi’s participation indicate that his turns are almost exclusively derived as a consequence of Mr. Fuller's elicitation moves.

Tadashi’s peers, however, were found not only to respond to Mr. Fuller's elicitation but also to talk across the class with other students, to initiate adjacency pairs or to expand on second pair parts produced by other students. In the interaction excerpt 3 below, reacting to Mr. Fuller's question (line 5 to 9), Tamara checks her response with one of the peer students sitting next to her in a low voice (line 11). Kylie takes this up and elaborates (line 12 to 14, and then 16) on Tamara's half-public response.

[Interaction excerpt 3: T3 5]

1 Lect: But that may be (even) newspaper (.) can
2 incorporate cultural, (0.5) and did I
3 mention (.) do what- did I look la:st week
4 at intercultural: (0.3) approaches we
5 (can use) ( ) , (.) in- in the
6 work you've done the last few years
7 with (Jane), (0.2) did she um touch
8 on intercultural approaches or the
9 intercultural learning?
10 (1.0)

->11 Tamara: (She did didn't [she])
12 Kylie: [Ye ]ah probably meaning
13 like- (.) um using the other cultures
14 to ( ) or ( ) to-
15 Lect: yeah.=
16 Kylie: = [to ] promote it.
17 Lect: [To ]
18 Lect: To create a focus and (. ) increase
19 contrast in sort of (langua[ges]).
20 Tamara: [Ye ]ah.

->21 Tamara: (We've) liked [it.]
22 Lect: [and] that [sort] of things,
23 Kylie: [yep.]
24 (0.3)
25 Lect: which can also be u:sed, (0.5) in a school
26 mag or newspaper. I then also: (. ) look at
27 (0.2) u:m (0.3) what I might call: (0.2) uh
28 you know, (0.2) th- the general type of the
role plays, (0.5) u:m (. ) or a ( (cough))
film project.

In this way, with this class, unlike in a larger class such as Teaching as a Profession, how 'public' a certain stretch of talk is is difficult to decide, as 'chatty' talk among students is more likely to be heard and taken as a public comment. It also seems that the small size of the class made classroom interaction more intimate and casual than in larger classes.

There are other instances in which student talk is directed to other students and not to the teacher. In interaction excerpt 4 below, Tamara asks a question in line 54 which refers to Tadashi's immediately preceding turn. Again, this is a kind of expansion to a base adjacency pair (line 40 FPP and line 42 to 44 SPP). Interestingly, it is Tadashi who mentioned 'French community' and thus had the first rights to the floor after Tamara's question, but it is Kylie who responds to Tamara's question (line 55). Tadashi is rarely actively involved in student-student communication which responds to or expands on his peers' turns. When he participates in interaction among the students, his turns are mostly second pair parts which provide acceptance or acknowledgment of others' turns, as seen in lines 45 and 47.

[Interaction excerpt 4: T3 10]
Another instance of a diversion from the typical I-R-F classroom interaction sequence can be found below. In the following excerpt, Mr. Fuller asks a question of the whole group (line 7), to which Linda, Kylie and Tamara respond. Line 8, 9 and 10 are all second pair parts to Mr. Fuller's question in line 7. Tamara then starts to provide a detailed account of her experience in line 11, which makes up an expansion to the earlier mentioned base adjacency pair (line 7 and 8, 9, 10). When Tamara's account is completed in line 15, which was acknowledged by Mr. Fuller in line 16, Kylie starts to speak about her own experience in line 17. Kylie continues her turn in line 19, but she is overlapped by Tamara who manages to hold the floor to give her story supported by listener continuers from Mr. Fuller.

[Interaction excerpt 5: T3 8]

1 Lect: You sometimes have a beginner's group, (see it), (0.8) and the two unit into the same class.=
2 Kylie: =Um, = (0.4)
3 Lect: And the issue's about how to manage that.= 'ave you ever experienced that,=
4 Linda: =No [ u- ]
5 Kylie: [Yep.]
6 Tamara: Yeah.
7->11 Tamara: My history teacher:, (0.5) had a: (0.4) I remember we used to do two units three unit at the ( time,=
8 Lect: =That's right.=
9 Tamara: =All in the (one class)?:
10 Lect: [Yeah.]
11->17 Kylie: We [ did ] two ( ) two general
12 Lect: [Yeah.]
13 Kylie: to: [( )]
14->20 Tamara: [And others] in both class ( . ) both in two unit and three unit and so ( . )
15 we're sort of lost, (0.3) for a while,
16 thinking, (0.4) what are we doing
17 are we doing three unit or two unit,
18 or: what's happening,
19 (0.3)
20 Lect: So: you had to (. ) become a little bit of
21 a magician.[Yeah].
22 Tamara: [Yeah] (hh) huh.

What this stretch of interaction seems to show is that turns taken by Tadashi's Australian peers are not limited to responses to Mr. Fuller's elicitations but can be expansions of earlier sequences. Moreover, their turns could make up recounts elaborated over a number of multi-unit turns, as we can see in Tamara's talk through lines 11 to 26 in the above excerpt. If Kylie's turns in line 17 and 19 are taken out of consideration (as she failed to secure the floor), what is left are Tamara's multi-TCU turns with Mr. Fuller's continuers, 'Yeah'.
At this point, the issue of elaboration and underelaboration comes to attention. Tadashi never produced multi-unit turns and provided substantial accounts of ideas or experiences, while his peers did. It is possible that a gap in shared background in that he was the only one who did not go to school in Australia may have affected Tadashi’s underelaboration in this class. (This issue of shared background will be discussed later in section 5.6.) However, Tadashi had had his teaching practicum in Australia, and Mr. Fuller also drew on his knowledge about the Japanese education system and culture during the class more than once. Tadashi did not expand on these opportunities as his Australian peers did.

Tadashi’s underelaboration was actually pointed out by Ms. Hardy in the Teaching as a Profession class. It appears that Tadashi remained silent in the multi-directional mode of classroom interaction not only in Teaching as a Profession with 22 students but also in another smaller class with Ms. Hardy:

[Interview excerpt 9: Ms. Hardy 107]
Ms. Hardy: [...] at the beginning of the year - the first 12 weeks - there were only 15 in the group and if you have a few away, there would be sort of 12 which is very small. ...but when we had about 12 to 15, it worked fantastically. They all knew each other and they all talked across, although then again, Tadashi and Wan San sat with just with all of us and Zolta I think it was Zolta and Zolta did all the talking, occasionally Peter put in something and Wong Young and Tadashi didn’t. Or very rarely - I would say one or two - but nothing.

I: Even in a group of twelve?
Ms. Hardy: Yes. I mean they'd answer direct questions but they wouldn't - In fact, I remember Wong Young off answering something quite detailed but not Tadashi. I don't think I've ever had Tadashi (            ).

Why, then, does Tadashi not self-select his turns in classroom discussion or expand on other participants’ comments? The following sections will discuss this issue.

5.4.3 Shifts in organisation of classroom interaction

In this sub-section, analyses of two transcripts from a section of the Teaching as a Profession class are presented to address why Tadashi does not or cannot self-select. This particular section shows shifts in patterns of classroom interaction, by which Tadashi’s participation seems to be affected. The following stretches of classroom interaction show that once a shift takes place in the turn-taking patterns of classroom interaction, Tadashi disappears from the interaction in spite of opportunities to participate.

Interaction excerpt 6 illustrates a shift from teacher-nomination of individual student to a more dynamic mode of communication. This shift was commonly observed in the two case study classes. In the excerpt, Lect is Ms. Hardy, WY is Wong Young, a Korean student who was Tadashi's partner for the pair work, and FS1 is a female student whose
face was not caught in the video but who was one of the key participants in this particular stretch of talk. Wong Young was not included in the process of quantification of talk, but it is worth noting the similarity between Tadashi and Wong Young in that both Wong Young and Tadashi came from East Asian backgrounds and the contributions on this occasion were the only ones from these students during the observation.

[Interaction excerpt 6: T2 1]

1 Lect:  Great.
2 ((Students laugh))
3 Lect:  Okay, let’s move on, =Tadashi: and (.) Wong
4 Young can you,
5 (1.0)
6 Lect:  The last, (. ) Eleven,
7 (0.6)
8 WY:  What is a profession. (0.3) What
distinguishes profession from trade, (0.2)
9 What does it mean to be a professional?
10 (0.4) Does being a pro- professional affect
11 the way you dress (0.2) speak behave
towards others at work?
12 (0.7)
13 WY:  Uh: °[(so:)]°
14 Lect:  [Comments?]
15 WY:  U:m (0.5) my definition of a profession is:
16 u:m (0.4) actually (0.2) ei occupation,
17 (0.2)
18 Lect:  Mn hm?
19 WY:  Uh: but um (0.4) who got thi: (0.5) um e-
20 expert on (a special) field?
21 Lect:  Mn: hm?=  
22 WY:  =Yeah.
23 (0.4)
24 WY:  =Yeah.
25 (0.4)
->26 Tadashi: An- to be paid for (too).=
27 WY:  =Yeah.h.
28 Lect:  And what? Sorry?
29 Tadashi: Um to be paid for?
30 (0.3)
31 Lect:  Paid for? So what to do with
32 (discriminating) a profession and a trade.
->33 (1.5)
34 Kylie:  [You have to study to]
35 Gary:  [You have to (0.2) ni]fty ja:rgon (.) if
36 you are a professional (0.2)
37 ((Class laugh))
38 Gary:  So that n]o =
39 Dave:  [Profe-]
40 Gary:  =one e[lse ( ) gonna say to them?]
41 Dave:  [profession (it offers you money)]
42 (0.2)
43 but I think it’s mo:re specialised
44 (0.2)
45 Gary:  Yeah.=
46 Dave:  =knowledge
47 ?:  Mn:=  
48 ?:  [=knowledge based] knowledge based
49 ?:  [=Knowledge based] knowledge based
50 Dave:  ( ) whereas trade’s more
51 (0.4)
52 ?:  Uh:=
53 (0.5)
54 ?:  Yeah, trade’s obscure. [Yeah].
55 Dave:  [(But s]ti[ll )]
don't (actively)=
=No actually my dad's just (0.4) he's a
tradesman, (0.4) he's a plumber but- (0.4)
he's had to do courses (0.4) all the time=
=cause he's the head of (0.3) his department
(at the) hospital. (0.5) And he just did one
the other week about (.) destroying um crazy
(.) materials and (0.4) the effects like
(0.3) ( ) and they're saying (0.6)
( ) and something and=
=Yeа:h.
All these chemicals he had to learn
about that, (.) high safety, u:m drierlls,
and (0.5) you know so it's:=
=Well sure, and that's
[( ) you know in in any occupa]tion
[So he's in a different ro:le there].
[that] that][ the bases ] the
[He’s]
[Yeah I know]
[BA[SES of ]].
[But it’s changing.
Yeah. =
=It's not (.) just (0.3) you go out and
you're a plumber and that's [IT.]
[Yea]h.
There’s a lot beyond we have ( )
in the eyes.

In this part of the discussion, Ms. Hardy asks Wong Young and Tadashi for comments, to which Wong Young responds first. Tadashi participates by adding his view to his partner’s. Then, Ms. Hardy asks a question of Tadashi (line 31, 32) regarding his comment on the definition of profession (line 26, 29). He remains silent, looking at the task sheet with one of his hands on his chin (line 33). It is possible that in line 27 he was interrupted by Wong Young, which could have shortened his response and made Ms. Hardy ask for clarification, but Tadashi’s paraphrasing in line 29 with a rising intonation suggests that this may not be the case. In either case, the silence in line 33 is accompanied by a gesture which suggests that he is either thinking or he is not sure what to answer. The ‘discrimination between a profession and a trade’ was a part of the task, and thus he and Wong Young were expected to discuss it. However, Tadashi noted in his recall interview that he and his partner only discussed the first part of the task and then talked about job hunting. Thus, it is likely that his non-verbal communication suggested that he did not know the answer. Two of his peers volunteered to answer the question in line 34 and 35 (although at least one response was deliberately humorous) which suggests that these students judged Tadashi’s silence as a sign of an inability to answer. Hence, from there on, it appears that the floor was open to the whole class. The mode of communication was no longer one-on-one (or in this case, one-on-two), and students started to self-select. The free-competition for the floor can be found in lines 34 and 35 between Kylie and Gary, from lines 38 through to 41 between
Gary and Dave, and from line 71 to 81 among three speakers overlapping on and off. It is worth noting that in line 73 and 75 the teacher also overlaps Dave's talk, ignoring his comments but supporting FS1 to round up her claims in line 78, 80 to 81 and through to 85. Only after this female student completes her argument does the teacher come back to produce a rather long turn to summarise the point being discussed. This stretch of talk from line 34 to 84 seems to take a more ‘conversational’ form of exchange unlike the so-called I-R-F exchange typical of 'traditional' classroom interaction (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). On the other hand, the earlier exchange from line 16 to 32 seems to be more 'institutional', and resembles the I-R-F model of classroom exchange, with the teacher eliciting responses from the students. This observation suggests that there appears to be a shift from a formal or traditional structure of classroom interaction to a more informal and dynamic one which resembles 'free-flowing conversational interaction' (Drew & Heritage 1992: 14). What seems significant here is that the Japanese student, Tadashi, did not participate in the interaction after this ‘shift’ took place in line 34 when students started to self-select their turns, although he and his partner were still responsible for the particular task as a pair. Thus the question emerges as to why this silence occurs after the shift in interactional structures.

Coming back to the point where the teacher summarised the discussion after line 83 in the above stretch of talk, the teacher's talk is attended to by everyone for a while, which brings the mode of communication back to teacher lecturing students. However, shortly afterwards the free-competition takes place again, this time with some students talking privately in low voices while public talk goes on. Then, because of the time constraints and redundancy in the discussion, the teacher makes an attempt to bring the focus back to the questions on the task sheet. The excerpt below shows the talk which occurred shortly after line 84 above:

[Interaction excerpt 7: T2 1]

->99 Lect: That’s- that’s true. Can- (..) just come back,
->99a Lect: ((opens hand and point to Tadashi and WY))
100 (0.4)
101 Gary: [and] there is a secret (=).
102 Lect: [um ]
103 Lect: =there’s other parts.= [That’s right.]
->103a Tadashi: ((leans forward to look at the task))
104 Class: [huh huh huh] huh
105 ((class laugh and talk 1.3))
106 Lect: *[that I want you to bear with, (.)
->107 Quickly I know you- I feel sa:me here
108 just for a few more minutes. (0.2)
109 hhhhh
In this excerpt, the teacher attempts to bring in the routine procedure of going through the task sheet in line 99 by saying 'just come back,' and she again reminds students that 'there's other parts' (line 103) to discuss the task Tadashi and Wong Young were assigned, although Gary continues to speak in line 101. The teacher in fact opens her hand to point to Tadashi and Wong Young in line 99 as she says 'that's true' to Gary, and this is before the explicit reminder 'just come back.' In line 103, when the teacher says 'there's other parts,' Tadashi leans forward and looks at the task sheet, reacting to the reminder by the teacher.

Between line 103 and 107, however, the class is noisy and the lecturer does not receive much attention. However, in line 107 after 'Quickly I know you- I feel' the class becomes silent and attends to the teacher. A short silence follows, and a humorous exchange takes place between the teacher and some of the students in the next six lines. In line 117, the teacher says 'Quickly' for the second time, this time with her finger pointing at Tadashi and Wong Young, but Tadashi is looking down. The teacher's 'quickly' is followed by a one second silence (although students are joking off the main floor during this period – i.e. in the background) and the teacher's two 'u:m's. At the pause in line 121, Tadashi looks up and sits straight, but after the teacher's second 'u:m,' he looks down again. When the teacher mentions the issue of dressing, in line 123, Tadashi looks up at the teacher at 'all right?' but she has shifted her gaze towards the whole group, and in line 126 she explicitly addresses the whole class with 'all of you?' It is possible that the teacher judged that there was no signal from Tadashi or Wong Yong to indicate they wished to speak. Interestingly,
one of the students, Kylie, starts her response with a short overlap in line 125, before the
teacher's explicit address to the whole class. Overlapping rather too early, she restarts her
turn in line 127 and this time successfully completes her turn, which recognised by the
teacher in line 129 with 'That's right'.

Looking at this stretch of interaction in this way, there seem to be five opportunities for
Tadashi and Wong Young to speak. First in line 99, then in line 103, then in lines 106 and
107, then in line 117, and then in lines 122 and 123. None of these opportunities are
created by explicit verbal selections by name, but by rather indirect stimuli, including the
non-verbal expressions. Tadashi and Wong Young do not seem to pick up these indirectly
created opportunities for participation.

This particular section is interesting in that while the teacher seems to be making an
attempt to cause a shift from the turn-taking system of the 'formal' teacher-student model
by using indirect stimuli, the students seem to be ignoring these stimuli to resist the
teacher's attempt to open the floor to the whole class and have the 'free conversation' style

of interaction. In this situation, Tadashi seems to be in the middle of the tension created by
the teacher and the other students in the class, as he is expected to take up the opportunities
which the teacher tries to create for the shift.

Hence, there seem to be three possible ways to interpret Tadashi's silence in terms of
patterns of turn-taking in classroom interaction. One is that he does not recognise or
interpret the stimuli from the teacher as expected. Another is that he cannot pick up the
opportunities for participation with an expected timing when the opportunities are not
given explicitly and verbally. The third could be that he resists participation by avoiding
taking up the opportunities even though he recognises them. Avoidance can be detected in
some cases where Tadashi avoids eye-contact with the teacher around the indirect stimuli
by looking down. The inability to recognise the opportunities for participation could
actually be caused by the direction of his eye-gaze which may be an intentional behaviour
to avoid 'being picked on'.

Tadashi's comments in his recall interviews seem to support all these possibilities. He
repeatedly indicates that he has things to say but he cannot find the right timing to speak in
class. One of his comments on this issue is given below:
As I said before, when we have discussion, uh, even if I have things I want to say, I don't know when I should say - you know, the timing - yet.

Thus, it is possible that Tadashi may not be able to recognise opportunities for participation or have difficulties in responding with the appropriate timing or with effective strategies even if he recognises the opportunities. In the case of avoidance, first, it is possible that Tadashi is not committed to gaining knowledge generated from interaction among students but would prefer to gain it from the teacher. For example, he did not discuss all the questions in the task with his partner in the Teaching as a Profession class but talked about jobs. On the other hand, Tadashi was observed to be more active in one-on-one situations with Mr. Fuller. Moreover, when another student joined in, Tadashi stated that it was ‘good’ to have the lecturer to himself.

Tadashi’s preference to speak in less public situations as above can give us another possible explanation for his avoidance of speech in the dynamic multi-party mode of classroom interaction. That is, he may have wanted to avoid loss of face by remaining silent instead of publicly saying something irrelevant or wrong, as other Japanese students’ comments showed in interviews (see Chapter 4). He explained his silence in the discussion in excerpt 6 and 7, above, in his interview:

My opinion, you know it wasn't really - I did not have confidence whether it was right, I was not sure, so in the end I did not say anything. (pause) Yeah I couldn't say anything in this situation.

It is also likely that he experienced a loss of face by being counter-questioned by Ms. Hardy and not being able to answer the teacher's question earlier in the above stretch of talk. This may have lead to inhibition regarding any further participation.

In the case of experiencing difficulties in management of turn-taking, it is possible that Tadashi is not familiar with the dynamics of turn-taking in tutorials as he was never socialised into it in Japan (cf. Marriott 2000).

It seems that a combination of these factors may be reasons for Tadashi’s silence in multi-party discussions, and the factors interrelate to cause a silencing effect. An important point here is that management of participation through nomination affected participation in the succeeding discussion. Other instances of this were found in this case study and in others.
Factors such as a heavy reliance on the knowledge 'transmitted' by the teacher and inhibition from the fear of loss of face will be discussed further in the sections on formality (5.5) and topical preference (5.6). The next section will examine how management of turn-taking can affect silence.

5.4.4 Management of timing and pause

In relation to the 'inability' to participate in discussions with the same orientation to timing in turn-taking as native speaker students, it has already been mentioned that Tadashi could have missed or have been unable to pick up opportunities for participation. A lack of familiarity with the norms of timing in turn-taking in the Australia classroom may cause difficulties in securing participation. In Japanese schools, students rarely speak unless they are explicitly nominated by the teacher (see Chapter 4, section 4.3). Thus, there is less (or almost no) competition for the classroom floor, which in turn means that students in Japan may not be equipped with strategies and appropriate recognition systems of handling turn-taking in competitive participatory situations. In addition, because it is assumed that the students respond only when the teacher nominates them, less pressure may be felt by Japanese students to self-select. However, the initiative to speak even without being nominated is assumed in Australian classrooms, because of which Australian students may be better equipped with competitive classroom participation strategies and therefore respond to indirect stimuli for participation quickly.

This section will discuss how classroom participants’ handling of timing in turn-taking may lead to silencing of Tadashi, along with other possible interpretations of silence. In the following interaction excerpt, the class is talking about the number of language courses in the Higher School Certificate (for students graduating at the end of Year Twelve). As Tadashi was the only one who was present the week before, he was nominated through Mr. Fuller's reference to what had been spoken about the week before:

[Interaction excerpt 8: T3 7]

1 Lect:  u:m (0.4) now (1.0) you’ve got (0.3) u:m (0.3)
->2 I don’t know if you remember (0.5) the figure
3 I gave you and ( ) in the old HSC
4 now how many: uh: languages courses.
->5 (0.4)
6 Lect: There are hundred and forty nine HSC
7 courses, how many languages
8 cour[ses].
9 Kylie: [thir]ty ei[ght]?
->10 Tadashi: [uh:]
11 Kylie: [thir]ty ei[ght]
12 Tadashi: [ uh:]
no there are thirty eight languages, but each language is more than one course.

Mr. Fuller nominates Tadashi in line 2 to 4 with a question accompanied by his hand movements towards him, which is followed by 0.3 seconds of silence in line 5. He also refers to Tadashi since he is the only student who attended the class the week before.

Thus, even though Tadashi was nominated to give an answer to the question, another student filled this answer second part. The 'uh:'s in lines 10, 12, 20 and 24 indicate feedback. It turns out that Tadashi's response was wrong, and Mr. Fuller clarifies lines 4 to 7.

Tadashi then responds to the question as Kyle re-takes holding his floor because of overlap with Mr. Fuller's question. Mr. Fuller waits for Tadashi to respond again. Hence, the silence of 0.3 seconds in line 13. We see that Tadashi does not remember the figure in line 13 but to wait for Mr. Fuller to provide an answer different from line 26. Tadashi then responds to the question at Mr. Fuller's third attempt in line 26 saying 'I don't remember.'
that he is aware of the pressure of being nominated for response. However, Kylie's quick response suggests that she judged that she was entitled to speak at this stage, although it is also possible that she was trying to save Tadashi’s face, or to maintain the quality of interaction by lessening the wait-time for an answer. In any case, as a result, Tadashi's response to Mr. Fuller's initial question was delayed. If this is the case, although it is much shorter than the standard 1.0 seconds' length of significant silent pause (Jefferson 1989), the 0.4 seconds of silence in line 5 could be playing an important role in decisions about whether the right to speak is restricted to one particular student or is open to the whole class. The peer student's judgement of her entitlement to answer the question seems to cause the loss of opportunity for Tadashi to respond to Mr. Fuller's question, but Mr. Fuller's explicit nomination towards the end brings back the opportunity. In the case of the stretches of talk presented in interaction excerpts 6 and 7, no explicit nomination occurred or not enough space was given to Tadashi after peer students took over the discussion, and he never came back to the discussion.

However, the question is whether Tadashi lost his opportunity to respond because of Kylie in excerpt 8 above. It is possible that Tadashi's silence was intended to communicate the idea that he did not remember the figure. In other words, his silence may be intended to mean 'I don't remember'. If this is the case, the silent is a performance with a propositional meaning, used as a face-saving 'off-record' strategy (Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997; Jaworski & Stephens 1998). In this case, Mr. Fuller's question in line 25 may indicate that he did not read Tadashi's silent message and that he required a verbal response to his question. Tadashi's giggles imply that he was rather embarrassed to lose face in having to admit that he did not remember after all. This type of silence was in fact observed in the other Japanese students in the case studies (see Chapters 6 and 7). The same type of silence was also observed and mentioned by teachers in Japanese high schools during my school visits in Japan, which suggests a possible transfer of the silent politeness strategy into the Australian classroom. Therefore, there seem to be elements of both 'silencing' and 'performed silence' in the cases discussed above.

Let us look at another example of a possible 'delay' and a mishap caused by it from the Curriculum and Examinations classes. In excerpt 2, Tadashi seems to have at least two opportunities to respond to Mr. Fuller's question directed to him (line 11 around a short pause, line 14 around 'numbers') but does not take them. At the end of ‘Certificate’ in line 16 is a possible turn completion point, but Mr. Fuller’s latching talk makes it difficult for Tadashi to come in. This explains the overlap in line 17 and 18. After Mr. Fuller’s
modification of the question ('there was some key subjects' in line 18), Tadashi provides his answer in line 20. However, this is overlapped with Kylie's answer as she self-selects her turn. Although Tadashi indicates that he remembered what Mr. Fuller talked about the week before by saying ‘Yeah’ in line 19, he also has a silent intra-turn pause and a hesitation marker of ‘um’ following the ‘Yeah’. This delay in giving the answer seems to have led Kylie to move, although the move appears to be interruption, as line 19 seems to function as a pre-sequence to the answer itself. However, Tadashi seems to be aware of his role as the respondent in the interaction as he repeats Kylie’s 'science' which he has not mentioned. After 0.3 second's silence, these responses by Tadashi and Kylie are acknowledged by Mr. Fuller ('Right.' in line 24), but then Mr. Fuller requests 'the new one' to be named, which Tadashi picks up immediately and answers in line 26 and 27. Regarding this response by Tadashi, it is worth noting Kylie's low-voiced turn in line 28. If it is 'why didn't you say so', it is possible that her turn is directed to Tadashi to accuse him for his silence about the 'new one' at the first opportunity between line 20 and 23.

What the analysis of interaction in excerpt 2 seems to show is that there appears to be a gap in expected rapidity in taking a turn between Tadashi and Kylie, which is likely to result in silencing.

The next excerpt shows an example of Tadashi’s orientation to timing in turn-taking which seems to support the observation stated above. In interaction excerpt 9 below, Tadashi's turns again directly follow Mr. Fuller's elicitation moves. In this excerpt, we can find inter-turn silences between the elicitations and responses. It should be noted that these inter-turn pauses take place before Tadashi speaks even when there is no competition for the floor, unlike the earlier examples. The first one is one second (line 14), and the second one 0.5 second (line 27). Although they may not appear too long, they can be significant in terms of fine-tuning of turn-taking. Moreover, as we can find frequent overlapping talk and latching around transition relevance places (TRPs) in interaction excerpts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, it seems essential to predict the TRPs and pick up opportunities for participation as early as possible and react quickly in order to secure a turn in Australian classroom interaction. Hence, it is possible that a gap in speed of reaction affects the control of interaction and silences Japanese students such as Tadashi.

[Interaction excerpt 9: T3 6]

1   Lect: but kids were saying languages are
2            marked down on the eich es cee.
3   (1.0)
4   Kylie: ‘Scale (problem)’, =

194
Similar 'delays' can also be observed in interaction excerpt 1, where Mr. Fuller finishes his question initially with 'are there any other special days, between: January and June?' (line 10 and 11). A pause of 0.5 seconds follows this, and Mr. Fuller adds 'in Japan?' (line 11). Yet another pause follows this, to which Tadashi responds with 'uh::', the lengthening indicating that he is thinking. Overlapping with this, Mr. Fuller elaborates further with 'at all?' Yet another pause of 0.4 seconds follows and finally the response comes from Tadashi, which immediately receives acknowledgment from Mr. Fuller.

All of these short periods of silences appear to have triggered elaboration or further explicit nomination by the lecturer and possibly also caused peer students to self-select before Tadashi did. As mentioned earlier, Tadashi refers repeatedly in his interview to this 'problem' of 'not knowing the right timing to participate'. In fact, in one subject he made an arrangement with the lecturer to be nominated to give an answer which he had prepared before the class. This arrangement, according to Tadashi, worked well for him. If this is the case, Mr. Fuller's elaboration and explicit nomination can be considered positively in that they support Tadashi's participation since they send signals to all the participants that it is Tadashi's turn to speak. It should also then be remembered that Ms. Hardy did not provide
these signals to support Tadashi in securing his turns to the same degree. She had difficulties in including Tadashi and Wong Young in discussion due to the large size of the class where most other students were keen to share their ideas and opinions through self-selection. She evaluated Tadashi’s performance negatively and indicated that she never found him 'in control'. Not being in control in classroom discussion, however, seems to be one of the consequences of a complex negotiation of turn-taking among classroom participants, particularly of timing.

A note should be made in relation to the role of language proficiency in participation. Tadashi was evaluated to be fluent with a good command of technical and academic language by the raters. When he produces a long turn, his language is accurate and the speech flows well. However, as we can see above, his sociolinguistic competence in terms of his capacity to handle turn-taking in Australian classroom discussion may be one of the major reasons for his silence.

What also needs to be noted here is that it is often a small number of students who are enthusiastic and willing to contribute, and these students tend to dominate classroom discussion and silence other students, albeit unconsciously. Therefore, statements about the degree to which culture and language proficiency explain silence should be regarded carefully. In fact, there were cases of Australian students complaining about their peers who tend to 'dominate' discussions on a web discussion page set up for a course at the University of Sydney.

5.5 Quality of participation (2) Formality of language

The second aspect of quality of participation is to do with formality of communication. Formality of language is a consequence of choice in tenor, which can be defined as 'the social role relationships played by interactants' (Eggins 1994: 55), and can be considered in terms of power, affective involvement and contact. In other words, the three aspects of tenor are the power relationships in the roles which interactants take, how often the interactants have contact and what degree of affective involvement exists among them. Eggins (1994:67) provides characteristics of formal and informal language as shown below:
5.5.1 Lexis and overlaps

Tadashi showed a tendency to use neutral and formal lexis, and his turn-taking behaviour was careful in that he rarely overlapped or interrupted except for giving backchannels. On the other hand, his Australian peers used more colloquial lexis, humour and grammatically incomplete sentences. Moreover, as already shown above, overlaps and interruption were frequent. These overlaps and interruptions were generally caused by competition for the floor when students tried to self-select their turns, unlike Tadashi’s overlapping talk which was mostly supportive and non-intrusive backchanneling. In interaction excerpt 9 in the above section, Mr. Fuller asks Tadashi if he can explain the differences between the new and old reference systems for the HSC exams (line 10 to 13). He responds after a 1.0 second-pause. His speech shows technical and neutral lexis such as 'norm reference', 'certain percentage' and 'bell curve', and in addition, 'yes' is used twice instead of 'yeah' which is more colloquial and more frequently used by his Australian peers. Tadashi then waits for Mr. Fuller to acknowledge his response before he starts to explain the other type of referencing (line 28 to 32). Again 'yes' is used, as well as technical and neutral lexis such as 'standard or critical referencing’. Abbreviated forms and colloquial lexis are rarely found in his speech. He uses 'yeah', but it is more frequently used when agreeing with peers. In contrast, 'yes' was rarely used by the Australian peers (notice Kylie's 'yep' in line 39.)

The following excerpt shows frequent overlaps and colloquial language use in interaction among Mr. Fuller and three of Tadashi's Australian peers:

[Interaction excerpt 10: T3 9]
Tadashi's Australian peer students tend to use 'you know' (for example, line 133 and 139 above) and 'yeah' frequently (line 128), irrespective of who they are directing their speech to. These expressions can be found abundantly in the data. Although it does not appear in the two excerpts above, repetition of 'like-' as hesitation or gap-filling can also be seen frequently in Australian students' speech. Another colloquial expression 'gotta' can also be found in the excerpt above in line 143 in Linda's talk. When overlapping talk is examined, there are non-intrusive and transitional overlaps near TRPs (line 136 and 137, 139 and 140), but also interruptions (line 139 and 141, 143 and 144), backchanneling (line 128) and cooperative co-completion (line 145 and 146, although it is also possible that Tamara in line 146 may be interrupting rather than cooperating). These features found in Australian students' language use are of an informal nature, while the features of Tadashi's language use tend to be of a formal nature.

As to the lecturer's language use, it appears to have a tendency towards the informal end of the continuum, although at times it shifts towards the formal. In excerpt 9 above, Mr. Fuller uses the word 'kids' (line 1) to refer to students in secondary school, which he uses interchangeably with 'students' in all the classes observed. In the same excerpt, informal expressions such as 'gonna' (line 34) and 'yeah' (line 57), and, in excerpt 10, 'you know' (line 127) and 'gotta' (line 152) indicate informal language used by Mr. Fuller.
With Ms. Hardy, the use of 'yeah' (interaction excerpt 6, line 67, 79 and 82), and overlapping talk including interruption (interaction excerpt 6, line 73 and 75) and backchanneling near TRPs (interaction excerpt 6, line 82) can be found. In fact, for Ms. Hardy, it was often necessary to interrupt or overlap to regulate and lead the discussion in class, as there was a large number of students. In this class students overlapped frequently competing for the floor, as evident in interaction excerpts 6 and 7.

The above analysis of lexis and overlapping talk appears to show that Tadashi's lexis and turn-taking tend towards formal language use, while a more informal orientation is observed among the lecturers and Australian students. This suggests that Tadashi may assume a more formal environment in the classroom than his Australian peers and the teachers. In the next section, this aspect will be discussed from the perspective of politeness theory.

5.5.2 Orientation to politeness in classroom communication

Eggins (1994) explains that differences in power, contact frequency and affective involvement are important factors determining formality of language use. This claim seems to overlap with that of researchers who work on politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987). However, in Eggins' description of formal and informal language use, 'politeness phenomena' is included in the properties of formal language while in politeness theory, politeness is not only to do with formal language use but also to do with informal language use. When people attend to others' 'positive face', they emphasise similarities and assume solidarity with others, and mutual informal language use is likely to be observed as an orientation to positive politeness.

According to Brown & Levinson (1987), politeness strategies can be ranked in order of degree of threat to one's face. When the threat to face is minimum, one acts 'bald on record', while with maximum face threat, one takes no action. Positive and negative politeness strategies come in the middle where one performs 'redressed' acts. When negative politeness strategy is not enough, a face-threatening act (FTA) can be done 'off record'. These politeness strategies are summarised in the chart by Brown & Levinson (1987: 69), which was given in Chapter 2, section 2.2.2 (figure 2.1).

Between the lecturers and Australian students in the case study, orientation to positive politeness was observed in general. What appears to be the most salient case is found in interaction excerpt 7, in which Ms. Hardy almost 'begs' students to 'bear with' her (line 111). Her tone of voice goes up around line 108, and in line 111 she sounds almost as if
she is imitating a child begging its mother, which makes students as well as herself laugh. Moreover, in line 113 and 116, some of the students respond to these 'purr words' (Eggins 1994: 67) from Ms. Hardy with a similar comical tone but reject her plea with 'snarl words' as a joke. Joking can be a strategy to create rapport and solidarity in communicative encounters, and Paltridge (2000), elaborating on Brown & Levinson (1987), includes 'joke about things' as one of the positive politeness strategies. In this regard, Eggins' (1994) point that 'politeness phenomena' are indications of formal language use needs to be clarified in that informal language use often entails 'positive politeness' strategies while formal language use tends to require 'negative politeness' strategies (Brown & Levinson 1987). Examining another part of interaction excerpt 7 just before the joking, we find that Ms. Hardy shows sympathy towards students saying 'I know you- I feel same here' (line 107). This is another type of positive politeness strategy which is to show sympathy or the same point of view (Paltridge 2000, Scollon & Scollon 1995, Brown & Levinson 1987).

As shown above, it is possible to see examples in the data of positive politeness strategies used by the lecturers and the students despite a distance in power due to the institutional roles given to them. Not only in the Teaching as a Profession class but also in the Curriculum and Examinations class, jokes and teasing were found. The following excerpt in which the class is talking about a language proficiency test is an example:

[Interaction excerpt 11: T3 9]

93 Lect: [Uh I ] thought you were saving level three
94 was [( ) low].
->95 Kylie: [No level ] three was the top one.
96 Lect: Level three was the top.
97 Kylie: Mm:.  
98 Lect: Okay well so what I am saying depending
99 on thi: on- on the kind of test is that
100 there's some tests where the danger
101 i[s , ]
->102 Kylie: [There]'s >only three levels.<
103 (0.3)
104 Lect: Oh [okay. = I did ]n't know.
105 Kylie: [uh(h): huh huh ]

In line 102, Kylie interrupts Mr. Fuller to tease him for his wrong interpretation of levels in the test. Mr. Fuller admits that he did not know and Kylie giggles. Not only does she tease Mr. Fuller but also she explicitly points out his misunderstanding in line 95, overlapping his speech. This action is highly face-threatening, as the student acted 'bald on record' without an attempt to redress the message 'No, you are wrong'.
When Tadashi’s performance is examined, these politeness strategies with an orientation to social relationship of solidarity are rarely found. There was an occasion in which Mr. Fuller’s joke in relation to Japanese culture could have been reciprocated by Tadashi but he smiled in slight embarrassment without a word. A similar reaction was observed when Mr. Fuller apologised for asking for information which he thought Tadashi had but did not.

Teasing was carried out and jokes were made by students when highly face-threatening acts such as disagreements and critical comments were performed in response to both peer and lecturer comments during the observations. Students used various strategies to perform these FTAs. In the above excerpt 11, Kylie performed a highly risky FTA in a rather 'cheeky' way which could be considered a positive politeness strategy. Below is an example of another student in the Curriculum and Examinations class critically commenting on Mr. Fuller’s point:

[Interaction excerpt 12: T3 2]

5 Lect: .... Language teachers haven’t
6 checked, (.) you know, Greek teacher
7 hasn’t checked with Italian teacher=Italian
8 teacher (.) ah hasn’t checked with the
9 Japanese teacher.
10 Tamara: [But-]
11 (0.2)
12 Lect: What’s happening in the different
13 languages that I can bring in,
14 (0.2)
15 Tamara: Mn[:]
16 Lect: to my subject for example film, (0.4)
17 bringing in the aspect of film, and
18 the text. (cough) um (1.2) one of the
19 successes with French and German, (0.2) and
20 then later Japanese, was (.) precisely
21 using film. (0.5) and it’s come late to some
22 other languages = you were gonna say
23 but (.) I’m sorry,=
24 Tamara: =Ahm yeah I- I understand like cause I’ve
25 been studying Greek for many many many
26 years since (.) you know kindergarten, and
27 uni,(0.7) but- um (0.4) uh I just don’t
28 know okay we have to implement new
29 strategies in order to get (0.2) you know,
30 candidates to continue the language, •huh
31 but I think it’s (0.4) it- it varies from
32 subject to subject< cause once you get to
33 year eleven and twelve for Greek< it’s more
34 content based. •huh I don’t know how >you
35 will be able to< introduce it.=
36 Lect: =(Right/But),
37 Tamara: and I don’t know how students would
38 react. (0.4) I don’t know if it’s such a
39 difference?...
In the excerpt above, Tamara says 'But' in line 10, overlapping rather too early for turn transition. Mr. Fuller does not stop and continues his talk (line 12 to 13, and then 16 to 23), but comes back to Tamara with an apology for ignoring her earlier attempt to make a comment (line 22 to 23). Tamara then comments on Mr. Fuller's point, first acknowledging it ("I understand...") but then questions the practical effect of his approach. In line 38 and 39, her questioning is slightly more critical. After this, she goes on to assert her claim by recounting what she heard from her own brother who has been studying Greek for the HSC. Mr. Fuller then accepts her point, but approaches the problem pointed out by Tamara from a different perspective to further emphasise his point. What is interesting here is that Tamara performs the FTA of making a critical comment in stages with redressing positive and negative politeness strategies such as showing approval (line 24, positive) and then indirectly showing her concern (line 27 to 30, negative), before gradually getting to her main point (line 31 to 39). This type of staged disagreement or critical comment was seen to be performed by other students in both the large class and the small class. Often when this type of action was performed, negotiation took place and the lecturer summed up the discussion, as in the case above.

As for Tadashi, he never made critical comments or disagreed with the teacher or his peer students. It is, however, important to recognise two possible ways to interpret this silence: 1) he did not find anything being talked about as debatable; 2) he disagreed or questioned what was being talked about but he did not express this. His comments in his interviews account for both of these possibilities. In the first case, he mentioned that he admires and accepts other students’ knowledge:

[Interview excerpt 12: Tadashi 3-46]
I think they are knowledgeable - they know a lot of things. As for me, I almost always listen by their side thinking, 'Oh that's what it is,' and I am always nodding my head.

In the second case, he recounted two incidents in the Curriculum and Examinations class in which he remained silent although he was not completely convinced by the lecturer's ideas. Both incidents occurred in the last class which only Tadashi and Kylie attended. In the first incident, Mr. Fuller had asked which topic on the list would be the most effective for a Year Eight language course. After a number of unsuccessful attempts by both Kylie and Tadashi (six by Kylie and three by Tadashi), Tadashi gives the 'right' answer. However, he was not convinced. Below is his comment on this incident:

[Interview excerpt 13: Tadashi 3 31-33]
T: In fact there were some things I did not quite agree with him. For example, uh he said for
teaching, Eating. Eat, Eating and Drinking is important [topic], but in my opinion, rather
than that, I suppose how to say 'what do you like,' you know, that would be a bit more
functional or practically applied.
I: At that time, did you think you would say that to him?
T: Say to him... well, yeah, I tend not say these things, yeah.

On the other hand, after her attempts with extensive explanation and justification, Kyli shows her irritation, as shown in the excerpt below:

[Interaction excerpt 13: T5 15]

90  Kylie:   Uh:[ :]
91 Lect:   [Wh]at else you have kids like. (1.2)
92           something which also gets you into the
93           culture.
94           (1.4)
95 Kylie:   '(... )' no. well ↑sort of, I suppose
96           if it's (0.5) there (. ) you can get in for
97           actually giving them like the: (0.6)
98           like games and like you know sort
99           of ( ) days and (0.4) all that?
100          (0.4)
101 Lect:   But kids have asked ( ) here.
102          (0.5) I'm a[sking you] to think
->103 Kylie:   [ ye:ah? ]
104          (0.3)
105 Lect:   Uh hang on hang on hang on a minute. (0.4)
106          (0.3) of basic needs and basic drives.
107          (2.0)
108 Lect:   Thirteen year olds.

Kylie's 'ye:ah?' in line 103 overlaps with Mr. Fuller's speech in line 102 in an interrupting
manner far from a TRP. Moreover, the lengthening and strong rising intonation convey
irritation and annoyance, to which Mr. Fuller responds with 'hang on hang on hang on a
minute' (line 105). Tadashi on the other hand patiently attended to the clues Mr. Fuller
provided and made a few attempts without overlapping or showing irritation, although he
was not totally happy about the 'correct' answer.

The second incident where Tadashi did not voice his doubts was not actually to do with
the content but to do with the design of the assignment for the course. Mr. Fuller wrote up
his ideas for the assignment on the whiteboard, willing to negotiate its design. While
Tadashi focused on copying the details of the assignment on the board, Kylie negotiated
the content with Mr. Fuller, as we can see below:

[Interaction excerpt 14: T5 17]

1   Lect:   Is this: (0.6) being unreasonable? or can
2       you see uh:=
3   Kylie:   =No it=
4   Lect:   =practical purpose with this.
Kylie in fact mentioned in the follow-up interview that although the class gave her practical knowledge useful for her future career, it was not structured well, and added, 'We seem not to know what we're going to learn and what we were actually going to do until sort of five minutes before the end of the lesson'. As for Tadashi, he said in the recall interview that he thought the assignment was too long, but he did not say so. Later in the interview Tadashi explained what he was thinking in class:

[Interview excerpt 14: Tadashi 3-73/74]
I: What did you think of the content of assignment?
T: That was a bit, well, to be honest I thought it was, it might be a bit too much, but, then, the content of the assignment seemed very useful, so - then you know it's not just writing one essay and over with it but if you actually do this it looked like it was going to be useful later, so I decided not to say anything. 'I will do this if the teacher told us to do this,' I thought.

This silence of 'non-resistance' or 'non-negotiation' in fact could be considered as his politeness strategy of 'Don't do the FTA'. This strategy is one which can be taken when the face risk is the maximum. Sifianou (1997:70) claims that remaining silent to avoid 'expressions of disagreement, disapproval, contempt or any similar act' which 'threatens the addressee's positive face' is the strategy of 'Don't do the FTA' which has 'high politeness value'. In this case, it may be that Tadashi views the politeness system in the classroom as either a hierarchical or a deference system (Scollon & Scollon 1995), which makes the act of disagreement or critical comment highly risky. On the other hand, his Australian peers may see the same act not as risky if they assume a solidarity system (ibid.). In fact, Tadashi seems to regard a clash of different opinions and further negotiation as highly risky for the maintenance of good relationships with his peers. In two separate accounts regarding his communication with peers, Tadashi indicated that he did not want to let
differences in opinions affect his relationships with them, saying 'but I would like to stay in
good terms with him' or 'because he is my friend, so, if he says so, I leave his opinion as it
is.' On both occasions, he did not explore possible solutions through negotiation.

However, the FTA as causing threat to the speaker's own face (Sifianou 1997) should
also be addressed here. In other words, it may also be the case that Tadashi wants to
protect his own face from the possibility of being negatively perceived by the lecturer or
peer students. In the interview, he spoke about an incident in which he was criticised by a
peer student for 'being too idealistic as a teacher'. He actually gave this account to give an
example of the impression he occasionally had of other students that 'they sometimes
appear to have negative impression of me’. He also mentioned his accent as a possible
reason that his peers may have a negative perception of him. A similar use of silence to
avoid risking one’s own face as well as others’ is reported by Jaworski & Stephens (1998)
on the silence of hearing impaired people (see Chapter 2).

However, as Sifianou (1997) points out, silence can be used as other types of politeness
strategies such as negative politeness to show deference, positive politeness to represent
rappor and solidarity, and even off-record strategies to be indirect. Thus one has to be
careful not to assign any particular silence to the 'Don't do the FTA' strategy. In this respect,
Tadashi seems to use silence as other politeness strategies. As already discussed, in
interaction excerpt 8, his response to Mr. Fuller's question indicating that he does not
remember the figure was delayed, and it is possible that this was an 'off-record' politeness
strategy to communicate his not knowing the answer.

5.5.3 Summary: Silence and formality in language use

As we have seen, the different orientations to formality and politeness strategies in
classroom communication may be an obstacle for Tadashi in establishing a rapport with
not only his Australian peer students but also with lecturers if they expect more solidarity
oriented and less formal communication with their students. Ms. Hardy suggested that she
felt difficulties in establishing rapport with Tadashi, as seen in her comment below:

[Interview excerpt 15: Ms. Hardy 233]

[...] there must be a difference and in the behaviour that we'll tolerate that would cause actually
a difference between how I relate to Tadashi that I expect a bit more up front more um
engagement with me that probably- I find [it] difficult - that I don't get with him and that I must
admit I don't get with a lot of students that haven't got that an Australian background? [ …] So
in my dealing with him I wouldn't - I could - yes it's a hurdle I wouldn't - I would find difficult
because I'm so used to having kids who are um able to communicate in that way and because
he's not used to doing that, it makes it so much harder for me.
She also mentioned earlier that she 'did feel a barrier and - whether it was language or just the personality', although she believed that 'he can communicate perfectly well'. On the other hand, as seen in interview excerpt 5, Mr. Fuller said he could 'warm to him as a personality'. However, in a defensive manner, he also mentioned:

[Interview excerpt 16: Mr. Fuller 77]
I suppose if I had to characterise his communication, I would say it would be - he's a good communicator, very business-like. He's efficient in his communication. As I understand it as a reflection of his personality, he likes to get things done.

It can be inferred from 'very business-like' and 'he likes to get things done' that Mr. Fuller also did not find in Tadashi the type of attitudes described in interview excerpt 15 such as 'up front' or 'engagement'. And Kylie, the peer student, observes, 'I think his concentration is more on his uni work and getting it done and then go home.' Considering these comments from the lecturers and a peer, it appears that the formality of language and its underlying assumption about appropriate politeness strategies could make his silence conspicuous and inhibit the rapport between Tadashi and his lecturers and peers. Furthermore, Ms. Hardy’s comment ‘it makes it so much harder for me’ suggests that the incongruity in politeness orientations makes teaching harder for her and thus learning harder for the rest of the class.

5.6. Quality of participation (3) Topical preference

The third aspect of quality of participation is what participants talked about and did not talk about in the classroom. As Jaworski (1993) states, silence can be found where certain issues or subjects expected be brought up are not spoken about. In the following subsections, this type of silence found in Tadashi’s case will be discussed.

5.6.1 Recounting personal experiences

In the sessions observed, it appeared that students were allowed or encouraged to share their own experiences whether as a student or a trainee teacher, since they had already had their teaching practicum in that year and were about to enter the teaching profession. Therefore, comments such as 'I remember in my prac,...' or 'In my school, ...' were heard frequently. For example, in the following interaction excerpt, one of Tadashi's classmates provides her own experience related to the issue of 'rank order' in high school exams in the Curriculum and Examinations class.
This type of recounting of one's own experience was frequent among local students. In interaction excerpt 5, Tamara recounts her experience as a student of being in a class with students from a group at a different level (line 11 onwards, 'my history teacher, ... I remember we used to...'). In the same excerpt, Kylie also attempts to tell her own experience (line 17, 'we did two...'). Similarly, as mentioned earlier, the Teaching as a Profession class was full of stories from the students' experiences in their teaching practicum. Tadashi, however, did not make this type of contribution at all in either of the two classes.

5.6.2 Application of classroom subject matters to personal life

Australian students' comments were not limited to their own experiences, but often related to their own life and people around them outside university. For example, in interaction excerpt 6 from the Teaching as a Profession class, a student argues against another student regarding his comment that a profession is 'knowledge based' while a trade is 'obscure' (line 39 to 52) by referring to what her own father does as a tradesman (line 58 to 84). In the Curriculum and Examinations class, Tamara expressed her concerns about bringing culture and film into language teaching by referring to a discussion with her brother. In the case of Tadashi, these types of comments were not made, but rather his
contribution was dedicated to neutral, technical and impersonal matters. For example, when Tadashi and his peer partner Wong Young were asked to give comments in interaction excerpt 6, Tadashi gave a comment 'to be paid for' to explain the meaning of 'profession' (line 26 and 29). The question he was responding to was 'What is a profession?' which was followed by 'What distinguishes profession from trade?' and 'What does it mean to be a professional?' Ms. Hardy recalls that incident and commented on Tadashi's response:

[Interview excerpt 17 Ms. Hardy: 189]
[...] that was quite a detailed - I remember that question - there was a lot wanted from that question there. And to just make those sort of observations, they're very thin.

In the interaction, she further asks Tadashi the difference between a profession and a trade (interaction excerpt 6 line 31), which he had not yet explained but had been expected to, according to the task given to his pair. However, with Tadashi leaving a 1.5 second pause after this question, Dave answers the question (line 41, 42 and 47), with which one of the students disagrees by making her point with her father's case (as mentioned above, line 58 to 84). Although only the first two questions of the four included in the task for Tadashi and Wong Young were addressed up to this point, neither Tadashi nor Wong Young came back to make their contribution or to elaborate on their points further. Ms. Hardy also lets other students explore the issue. When she decides to address the final part of the task, her attention comes back to Tadashi and Wong Young by pointing to them non-verbally, (as explained in 5.4.3), but in the end she addresses the whole class saying 'all of you'. She describes this shift, reflecting on her own decision-making in the classroom:

[Interview excerpt 18 Ms. Hardy: 191]
[The responses from Tadashi and Wong Young are] bit shallow. (laugh) And - and yeah the fact is you see I let them go. That's - I do that all the time. I let - I let them go and defer to someone who has much more to - to hear.

In fact, Ms. Hardy had had Tadashi and Wong Young in her class in another subject the previous semester, and she describes what type of contribution was obtained from Tadashi and Wong Young in the recall interview as below:

[Interview excerpt 19: Ms. Hardy 111]
If I ask them a question, [they would respond] but it would be a total sort of a factual recall type question. It wouldn't be about - it wouldn't be a nuts and bolts type question - it wouldn't be about an issue that was an educational or something. I don't recall except Wong Young when I was talking about Korea - but I don't recall any Japanese schooling ever been mentioned.
In the Curriculum and Examinations class, where more participation by Tadashi was observed, his contribution was concentrated on responses to the teachers' questions to check the facts and figures which had been provided in earlier lectures. In other words, responses to 'total sort of factual recall type' questions. For example, in interaction excerpt 2 (section 5.4.2), he responds to Mr. Fuller's question of what the key subjects in the School Certificate were (line 20, 26 to 27) and in interaction excerpt 4 (section 5.4.2), he lists the main themes for school subjects. In interaction excerpt 9, as he was the only student who had attended the class the previous week, he explained the differences between two 'reference systems'. All of these contributions are to do with facts or labels for categories which require a search of one's memory or notes.

5.6.3 Emphasis on administrative matters

A couple of occasions on which Tadashi unusually self-selected to ask a question appear to reflect his orientation to participation focusing on administrative or practical issues. In the interaction excerpt below, he asks a question regarding the availability of the material which Mr. Fuller has introduced to him.

[Interaction excerpt 16: T4 11]
What also seems significant in the above excerpt is that there are frequent overlaps, response tokens and grammatically incomplete sentences by Tadashi. This suggests that Tadashi is capable of participating in 'free-flowing conversational interaction' (Drew & Heritage 1992: 14) in classroom talk at least in one-on-one situations with the lecturer, but if we take a closer look at some of the turn transitions (line 8-9, 15-16 and 18-19), there are pauses which suggest slight delays in Tadashi’s timing. This also supports the explanation that his silence in group discussions is due to difficulties in managing timing in turn-taking (cf. sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.4).

In interaction excerpt 17 below, Tadashi asks a question about the year of publication of the material Mr. Fuller is talking about, which is again a non-negotiable business affair. However, in line 20 and 21 he expresses his personal reaction to the introduction of some useful material, which was the only occasion that he expressed his own opinion during the case study. It should be noted that the 13.5 second silence (line 18-19) in a one-on-one situation may have pressured Tadashi to speak.

[Interaction excerpt 17: T4 12]

1 Lect: So: (0.9) you know you'll you'll see that
2 the they're given. it's from the board of
3 studies (1.3) a:nd (1.6)you you should make
4 a note of thi: um the contact number and the
5 fax number to (0.7) cGo:ntact because this is
6 very u:m (1.0) that's that's very useful.
7 Tadashi: Ye: s.
8 ((Lect brings out more materials 3.8))
-->9 Tadashi: If you (0.2) if I ring them up can I
10 get (0.2) u:m (0.2) eich es cee
11 report (0.4) from nineteen ninety
12 seven or nineteen ninety six?=
13 Lect: Yeah it's a question of uhm ringing the
14 client ringing (0.2) wha- what you do is you
15 you ring client services.(0.4) at this phone
16 number. (1.2) uh ask for client services.
17 Tadashi: Okay.
18 ((T take notes/Lect still bringing out
19 materials 13.5))
-->20 Tadashi: I thought it's very helpful to look at past
21 examinations, (. ) to prepare for (0.3)
22 examinations. (0.2) it's good.

In 5.5.3, Mr. Fuller in the above excerpt described Tadashi as ‘business-like.’ Tadashi himself reveals that the type of questions he asks would be more to do with administrative matters than actual content of subjects:

[Interview excerpt 20: Tadashi 3-39]

I: What kind of occasions do you tend to ask questions?
T: Mmmm. I don't really ask questions much, but well if I do, what can I say, rather than the content, I ask about uh when the due date for assignment is (laugh) or I ask the teacher to
explain the assignment a bit or something like that. Other than that, about content of the class, unless there is something I really need to ask about, I'd ask my friends.

Below is a comment by Ms. Hardy:

[Interview excerpt 21: Ms. Hardy 18]

[…] the other students were quite personal, quite personal comments about their life and about what they'd done and how they feel, but he certainly didn't do that.

Thus, there seems to be a gap in relevant and preferred topics between Tadashi and Ms. Hardy, while his Australian peers’ preference appears to match the expectations of Ms. Hardy. Furthermore, Ms. Hardy also thought that Tadashi and Wong Young did not need the course any more because she had the impression that they were 'sorted out' and 'had their jobs lined up'. Tadashi had not found his job yet at that stage, but Ms. Hardy’s impression was correct insofar as they did not seem to feel the necessity of committing themselves to discussions or the tasks. As mentioned earlier, Tadashi and Wong Young did not discuss all of the four questions in their task but talked about job hunting during the time allocated for pair discussion. It can be inferred from this that Tadashi may not see discussion among peers as an important aspect of learning, something which was perceived negatively by Ms. Hardy.

5.6.4 Summary: Topical preference and silence

When topical preference in classroom interaction is examined as above, the question of inability or resistance arises again. In other words, it is possible that Tadashi is not able to contribute by associating the content of learning with his personal experiences as his Australian peers often do, but it is also possible that despite his ability, he is not comfortable with it or he does not feel it is necessary for his own learning.

A close examination of his non-verbal behaviour suggests that Tadashi is more committed to responding to knowledge-testing questions than to reaching a better understanding of issues through interaction. This suggests resistance to participation. When fact-checking questions were asked, Tadashi often diligently examined his notes to find the answers. He also made more attempts to self-select when questions requiring him to go back to his memory were asked. For example, in interaction excerpt 4 (section 5.4.2), Tadashi seems to be competing for responses with Kylie. He gives the 'right' answer (line 42) slightly earlier than Kylie, who overlaps Tadashi (line 43), but Tadashi repeats his answer in the clear space (line 42). The competition continues for the next six turns. Tadashi’s perseverance in the sequence is unusual but can be clearly seen in this excerpt in
which memory-checking was the main task. It should also be mentioned that talking about personal life may be face-threatening if Tadashi considers classroom discussion to be a formal situation where negative-politeness orientation is expected (cf. section 5.5 above).

In relation to inability, it is possible that Tadashi's topical preference is not completely different from his Australian students, but his interactional competence prevents him from participating. For example, in the Teaching as a Profession class, the drinking of alcohol by teachers in relation to the legal implications for the profession was discussed at one stage. Tadashi did not publicly speak about his own experience of seeing the teachers drinking after school in the teachers' room, but he shared this experience privately with his classmate Peter during a heated discussion in the classroom. This was captured in the video-recording and confirmed in a recall interview. He indicated that he thought about sharing his story to the class but he didn't, because it was difficult for him to find the right timing to speak.

At this point, another factor should be considered carefully in relation to inability to speak on certain topics. While all the students in the Teaching as a Profession class including Tadashi had experienced a teaching practicum in secondary schools, in the Curriculum and Examinations class, Tadashi was the only student who did not go to an Australian secondary school. The Curriculum and Examinations class focused exclusively on issues involved in the planning, teaching and administration of the HSC exams for secondary school students in New South Wales. Thus, having graduated from secondary school in Japan, it may have been particularly difficult for Tadashi to bring his own experiences to the Curriculum and Examinations class where he had a 'topical disadvantage' in participation. This type of disadvantage inherently faced by overseas students due to lack of local knowledge can be regarded as one of the factors which negatively influence their capacity to participate.

5.7 Summary of the chapter

In this case study, the Japanese student Tadashi was one of the most silent students in terms of quantity of participation in both of the two groups observed. Further examination of participation patterns revealed that Tadashi's participation occurred mostly through nomination by the teacher. This tendency was found to be in contrast with the general tendency of Australian students to participate through self-selection. For Ms. Hardy this gap seemed to lead to a negative evaluation of Tadashi's performance, as she saw Tadashi's lack of volunteering as a lack of commitment or enthusiasm. This suggests that she
perceived Tadashi's silence as resistance to or avoidance of communication. On the other hand, the other teacher neither mentioned Tadashi’s silence nor evaluated him negatively. However, he was careful and defensive in his interview comments.

A close examination of turn-taking patterns in classroom interaction revealed Tadashi’s lack of participation in interaction among peers. Furthermore, when a shift occurred from one-on-one interaction to dynamic multi-party interaction, Tadashi withdrew from speaking. Analysis of the interaction data provided a number of possible explanations for this withdrawal. First, Tadashi may not recognise opportunities for participation. Second, even if he recognises the opportunities, his peer students participate before he secures his turn. Third, he may avoid picking up the opportunities either because of lack of pressure or lack of confidence. Finally, the teacher's perception of Tadashi as unwilling to participate can discourage his/her effort to include him in discussion.

However, it was also found that even when Tadashi was explicitly nominated by the teacher, a combination of his management of timing in turn-taking and his peer students' strategies to quickly secure their turns may have silenced him.

Formality of language use in classroom interaction was also examined concerning its impact on silence. The results suggest that there may be an incongruence in politeness systems assumed by Tadashi versus his Australian peer students and teachers. Tadashi's lexis showed properties of formal language while the reverse was found in the language of his peers and the teachers. Overlapping talk and interruption were not uncommon in discussion, but Tadashi's turn-taking was generally careful to avoid overlapping talk. As to the types of interactional moves, jokes and confronting comments were made by students to other students as well as to the teacher, however Tadashi was not involved in those situations at all. It seems that Tadashi had a negative politeness orientation in classroom interaction whereas his peers and the lecturers tended towards a positive politeness orientation. This would mean more silence on Tadashi’s part as well as problems in establishing rapport between Tadashi and other participants.

Finally, the topical preference of classroom participants was discussed. It was revealed that Tadashi's speech concentrated on technical and administrative matters which requires a memory search of facts. However, his Australian peers' speech extended to more personal accounts of their experiences and life outside university. As a result, 'recounting' or 'story-telling' extending over multiple turns, observed in Australian students' speech, was missing from Tadashi's speech. This not only reinforces the image of Tadashi as a
silent student but also contributes to the perceptions of the lecturers of him as 'business-like' or 'not engaging'.

Overall, Tadashi's performance seems to reflect most of the characteristics described by Japanese students in Chapter 4 in that participation is often restricted to other-selected turns, that it is difficult to jump into discussion among native speakers, that jokes and confrontation are usual among local students but not with Japanese students and that personal accounts are brought into discussion by Australian students. However, it is worth noting that the differences between the two lecturers in their approaches to classroom interaction and decision-making in moment-by-moment actions seemed to influence the perception of Tadashi's silence.
Chapter 6  Silence: An Empirical View - Case Study 2

6.1 Background to Case Study 2: Miki

Miki is a 24-year old female postgraduate student enrolled in an MA Japanese Studies program. She came to Australia after completing her BA in English in Japan. While she was enrolled in her BA program, she had one year at an Australian university in a suburban area of Sydney. After completing her degree in Japan, she decided to come back to Australia to study in a Master's degree program.

At the time of the research, she lived with a Japanese student studying at another university in Sydney. Among the three Japanese students in the case studies, Miki's time in Australia was the shortest, 2.5 years. As to her spoken language proficiency, her ISLPR ratings were 3+ given by the native-speaker rater and 3 by the researcher.

The class in which Miki was observed throughout the term was Intercultural Communication offered in the Faculty of Arts for both postgraduate and upper level undergraduate students. Twelve students were enrolled in this course and around ten attended the two-hour class each week. Except for the first few weeks of lectures, each class consisted of straight lecturing by the lecturer and presentations by students either on one of the readings from the course reading package or on their final project on intercultural communication. The first few lectures were not recorded and thus not included in the analysis. The duration of each presentation was set for 20 minutes followed by ten to fifteen minutes of discussion.

The class had three female Koreans (Jay, Nakki, Joyce), one Japanese (Miki), two female Filipino- Australians (Sophia, Cindy), one female Finnish-Australian (Fay), one male Chinese (Mike), three male (Bill, Gary, Tony) and one female (Molly) Anglo-Saxon Australian. There were four undergraduate students in the group. The postgraduate students were mostly part-time mature students who had full-time jobs, although Miki was a full-time postgraduate student. In addition to these students and myself who attended the classes as an auditing student and a researcher, a female visiting lecturer from Japan attended the class every week and a female visiting lecturer from China joined the class half way through term. The lecturer in charge of this class (Dr. Telfer) was a middle-aged female Anglo-Saxon-background Australian.
6.2 Quantity of participation

In the Intercultural Communication class, there were generally three major types of communication. Firstly, there was straight lecturing by the lecturer, Dr Telfer, which was almost never interrupted by the students. Secondly, there were occasions for students to present their papers, which also was one-way delivery of talk. Finally, class discussions took place after each student presentation. Due to the monologic nature of the first two types of classroom communication, the third type of classroom communication was selected for data analysis in this case study. Furthermore, the quantity of participation after presentations, student's own or others’, should be considered separately as students tend to speak more in their own post-presentation discussion due to the nature of the role given to the presenter. Contributions by two female and two male students other than Miki were considered for video coding analysis. This sample group had three Anglo-Australians and one female Filipino Australian who were all native speakers of English educated in Australia. The participation of other participants was coded but not included in the sample group for comparison since it is beyond the scope of this case study. However, the performance and perceptions of these participants will be referred to where relevant.

Looking at patterns of participation among the students in the sample group, we can see that in discussions after others’ presentations (hereafter Regular Discussion), Miki speaks much less frequently than other students, as shown in Table 6.1 below, although Tony speaks less frequently than Miki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Number and length of turns in Intercultural Communication (Regular Discussion: Total)

Let us now look at participation in discussions after student’s own presentations (hereafter Presentation Discussion). Table 6.2 below shows the total number and length of turns of three participants from the sample group.
Table 6.2 Number and total lengths of turns in Intercultural Communication (Presentation Discussion: Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki 1st pres.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miki 2nd pres.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miki Average</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the number of turns in Table 6.2 with the number of turns in Table 6.1, it is possible to see that Miki spoke with greater frequency in her Presentation Discussion. She had sixteen turns in the discussion after her first presentation, and nine turns after her second one, while her average number of turns per class in Regular Discussion was 2.3. Tony, who took the least turns per class (1.8 turns) in Regular Discussion, also spoke with greater frequency in Presentation Discussion (8 turns). As for Bill, he was one of the most active participants in the group, and the results show that he made substantial participation in class discussions in both Regular and Presentation Discussions. Indeed, Bill was described by Dr. Telfer as being one among students who 'don't need encouragement' to participate. Dr. Telfer in fact mentioned in the recall interview that all the local Australian students seemed confident in this class.

On the other hand, Miki was perceived as one of the 'two [students] that spoke the least' by Dr. Telfer, and as 'reticent' by Bill in recall interviews, despite more active participation in her own Presentation Discussions. This suggests that Miki's modest contribution in Regular Discussion had more impact on perceptions of her silence. As Table 6.1 shows, Miki's average number of turns per class in Regular Discussion is 2.3 while the average for the whole sample group is 8.5. From Dr. Telfer’s perspective, it was surprising that Miki delivered her presentations successfully and confidently:

[Interview excerpt 1: Dr. Telfer 95-97]
L: From my experience of Australian students, if you had an Australian student who doesn’t say anything, then that usually indicates that they are feeling unconfident, so if I had a Japanese student who doesn’t say anything, and who’s quite confident, um...
I: Big surprise.
L: It’s a bit of surprise.

She further indicated that it was 'impressive' that Miki delivered her presentation and handled questions without 'obvious signs of nervousness' despite Miki's silence in Regular Discussion. In her view, those who do not participate actively in a normal seminar-type lecturing situations tend to be 'shy' and 'unconfident’. Thus, students such as Miki who are
silent in Regular Discussion cannot be expected to participate confidently in Presentation Discussion either. Dr. Telfer further mentioned as a similar example that she was surprised at the 'outstanding work' (in her written assignment) of a Korean MA student who did not say anything in class. It seems that there is a strong reliance on classroom participation in evaluating students' overall academic ability, which was also implied in the comments by Ms. Hardy in Case Study 1 (cf. interview excerpt 7, section 5.4.1). It is worth noting here again that Japanese student interviewees in the present research indicated (section 4.1.3.6) that they feel unfairly judged by lecturers because of their silence in the classroom.

Aside from frequency of participation, the results indicate that Miki produced long turns. Unlike Tadashi, Miki provided accounts of her own experience in a story-telling manner like her Australian peers (see 6.5 for further details on topical preference). Her average turn length in Regular Discussion is 14.0, which is the second longest in the sample group. Interestingly, the student with the longest average turn length was Tony, who spoke least frequently in the sample group. This however, can be explained in terms of personal principles of participation. Tony mentioned in his follow-up interview that when other people are talking, he waits until they finish speaking, because he does not like interrupting and overlapping. Tony was actually almost never observed to interrupt or overlap others. However, it was also observed that when he spoke, he spoke coherently, confidently and extensively. His average turn length is longer than any other student in the sample group, and in fact, he was the one who produced the longest turn of 72 seconds in the data. It is possible, however, that Tony had other reasons for not participating as frequently as other students, such as his personality, as he did not speak when the floor was open to the whole class and there was a long enough period of silence to start speaking. In any case, he was included in the 'confident type' of students by the lecturer. As for Miki, her longest turn was 66 seconds and the next longest 51. The active contributors such as Molly and Bill in the sample group also produced long turns but not as long as Miki's 66 seconds or Tony's 72 seconds. Thus, as far as the quantity of participation is concerned, it appears that the frequency of participation rather than the amount of participation in length in Regular Discussion affected perceptions of Miki's silence.

6.3 Quality of participation (1) Turn-taking and sequence organisation

As in the preceding case study, the results of the video coding will be presented and analysed in terms of turn-types before a turn-by-turn analysis of classroom interaction. The analysis of overall patterns of participation focuses on participation in Regular Discussion,
since not all the students’ Presentation Discussions are available for analysis. However, participation in both types of discussion will be discussed to examine how the quality of participation can affect silence in classroom interaction.

6.3.1 Overall patterns of turn-taking and sequence organisation

The tables below show the sample group’s patterns of participation in Regular Discussion. First of all, comparing the frequency of self-selected turns (Table 6.3) and that of other-selected turns (Table 6.4), it is possible to see that all the students in the sample group take their turns more frequently through self-selection, however Miki's turns are almost evenly taken through self-selection and other-selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Number and length of self-selected turns in Intercultural Communication (Regular Discussion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Number and length of other-selected turns in Intercultural Communication (Regular Discussion)

The percentage of self-selected turns in total turns for each participant is shown below in Table 6.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total number of self-selected turns</th>
<th>Total number of other-selected turns</th>
<th>Ratio of self-selected turns in total turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Ratio of participants' self-selected turns in total turns in Intercultural Communication (Regular Discussion)
The fact that Miki took fewer turns than the others through self-selection was noted by Dr. Telfer in her interview:

[Interview excerpt 2 Dr. Telfer 258]

I would have thought - because she never asked me, because she never volunteers any comments, I would have automatically probably, until discussing with you [the researcher], (inaudible) I would have automatically said oh she is an unconfident shy person.

Analysis of video-recorded interaction reveals that Miki actually did volunteer her comments a few times, but Dr. Telfer was correct that Miki never asked a question in her class except for confirmation questions in her Presentation Discussion.

Nevertheless, the above comment by the lecturer suggests that voluntary questioning and commenting is expected from students and speaking only when selected by others could be seen as unsatisfactory. At this point, Dr. Telfer's description of her perceptions about Miki should be treated carefully, since she often uses the words 'unconfident' and 'shy' but no words which directly entail lack of competence. Thus, the question arises as to whether 'unconfident' or 'shy' could also imply 'incompetent'. Although there is no direct mentioning of incompetence, Dr. Telfer commented that Miki’s performance in her presentations was 'surprisingly good'.

Therefore, as discussed in the preceding case study, it is likely that perceptions of silence are affected by the frequency of voluntary participation through self-selection. At the same time, perceptions of silence seem to be strongly related to evaluations of students' academic performance, as was the case with one of the lecturers in Tadashi's case study.

6.3.2 Interactional roles in opening and closing discussion

Since the overall patterns of participation have been presented, an attempt will be made to describe and discuss exactly what the participants in the classroom are doing in bringing about these patterns. To explore this question, Miki’s performance in all types of classroom interaction will be considered. This is not only because there is not enough data on Miki’s speech in Regular Discussions but also because looking at as much data as possible supports a better understanding of Miki’s orientation to classroom communication in the Australian classroom.

In the Intercultural Communication class, due to the large amount of time dedicated to presentations and post-presentation discussions, students had plenty of time and opportunities for questioning their presenters. Questioning and responding among students were observed relatively more frequently compared to the two classes in which Tadashi
was observed in the preceding case study. However, there was often a short period of silence after Dr. Telfer or the presenter opened the floor to the whole class, encouraging students to ask questions or make a comment. Dr. Telfer in fact called this short period of silence 'embarrassing silence'. The 'eagerness' to participate found among the Education students in Tadashi's case study was not found in the Intercultural Communication class. It is possible that the relatively reduced competition for the floor in this class could be due to the fact that it began at 6:30pm and many students came to class after a day's work.

In this class, the selection of students' speaking turns by other students was made frequently, and students talking across the class was also frequent. The following interaction excerpt shows one of the instances of students taking various interactional roles in a discussion:

[Interaction excerpt 1: M2 2 Mike]

1 Mike: You you are wearing a sweater.(0.4)
and one of your friends (0.5) meet you, and say oh what a nice sweater you have got.(0.3) and how do you (0.4) reply.
5 (1.2)
6 ? : Can you ( ).
7 Mike: hhh: what a swe- hhh what a swhhh (0.2)
8 what a nice sweater. (0.5) you look great in it.
9 (0.4)
10 Jay: Is it you look great in it, (0.2) not
to the sweater looks nice on you.
13 (1.0)
14 Nakki: You look great in it.
15 Mike: [you look] great.
16 (2.8)
17 Bill: I'd go: (0.3) :rea\{lly? do you :think so?
((class laugh - overlaps with Miki and Sophia's turn))
19 Miki: Yeah. I would say real\{lly ]
21 Sophi: [I(wa)nna have it]on
22 too.
23 ((more laugh 0.2))
24 Gary: Here. you have it.
25 ((class laugh))

Here, the presenter is a Chinese overseas student Mike, and he asks the class a question for discussion after his talk. A student asks him to repeat the question (line 6), and he repeats part of it. After that, another question about Mike's question is asked by Jay, but this question is answered by both Nakki and Mike with an overlap. Then, after 2.8 seconds of silence, Bill provides his answer, which triggers laughter from the class as he talks with a greater range of pitch. Overlapping the laugh, Miki joins in, followed by Sophia. The lecturer does not come in for a while until students have shared their reactions to Mike's question. As we can see, in this stretch of talk, students take the roles of discussion leader
In the above excerpt, Mike opened the discussion after his presentation with a question. There were also other students who asked questions or raised issues after their own presentations. In Miki's case, however, she concluded her paper and then stayed silent until Dr. Telfer addressed the class, as we see below:

[Interaction excerpt 2: M2 1 Miki]

After the class applauds, Miki remains silent for 3.0 seconds until the lecturer looks around the class and softly says 'Questions'. A further 9.2 seconds of silence follows this, with Dr. Telfer still looking around the class. She then opens the discussion by giving 'a suggestion'. The silences of 3.0 seconds and 9.2 seconds above, however, tell us a number of things. The transcription below shows the non-verbal communication of Miki and the lecturer during these silences, with a focus on gaze direction and body movement. The line numbers correspond with those lines (12 to 17) in the interaction excerpt 2 above. The conventions can be found in Appendix 6 and are a modified version of Goodwin (1981).

[Interaction excerpt 3 (non-verbal) M2 1 Miki]
In the above excerpt, Miki is looking down at her paper for 3 seconds after the applause (line 13.1), while Dr. Telfer appears to signal to the class that they can ask questions or make comments, her gaze directed towards them (line 13.4) and with her hand gesture (line 13.5). Miki explained in her interview that at this stage, she was not sure what to do:

[Interview excerpt 3 Miki 82]
I was wondering whether someone was going to ask me questions. I was not sure what to do as I could not bring this up. I wondered whether I should go back to my seat and perhaps wait for the questions there.

Then, Dr. Telfer, having received no response, says 'Questions' softly still looking at the class in line 14. Miki is still looking down, but then she holds her paper and draws it nearer (line 15.2) as if she is leaving the presenter's seat, although Dr. Telfer's gaze is directed to her (line 15.4). She looks up to Dr. Telfer, and Dr. Telfer's gaze meets hers (lines 15.5 and 15.7). However, Dr. Telfer, not hearing anything from Miki, turns her gaze to the class, still being met with no response. After a while Miki looks down again, and Dr. Telfer's gaze goes down for a short while as well. Miki then looks up to the class, while Dr. Telfer looks back and forth between Miki and the class (lines 15.8 and 15.10) before she finally starts her suggestions in line 16. Dr. Telfer explained that her gaze shifts indicated that she was 'looking around hoping someone asks questions', but when she gave up on questions
from students, her gaze shifted to Miki to signal her that she is looking at her 'in preparation to asking questions'. As for Miki, she explained her silence then that she 'was wondering if the teacher would tell me what to do'. Thus, the discussion was, in the end, opened by Dr. Telfer, but there was a complicated negotiation of participation within these periods of silence. It seems that Dr. Telfer's non-verbal invitations for Miki's as well as other participants' participation were not picked up but rather avoided, resulting in a long silence. Miki's insecurity and uncertainty about appropriate behaviour after her presentation appeared to have made her gaze shift either downwards or towards the lecturer, and Dr. Telfer's gaze moved back and forth to search for any signs or to encourage students to raise issues. The other students also tended to look either down or up in the air to avoid eye-contact with Dr. Telfer if they did not have things to say.

In Miki's second presentation, which was on one of the reading materials for the course, a similar pattern of discussion opening can be found. After she says '[t]hat's the summary of the paper' to conclude her presentation, Dr. Telfer looks at Miki for about one second and then turns to the class for about half a second in silence. At this stage, Miki is gazing towards the class. Then Dr. Telfer says 'All right' with a nod, which is followed by applause. At this point, Miki shifts her gaze down to her paper. This does not send a signal for initiating discussion. Thus, the lecturer almost immediately says ‘Questions and comments’, but this is followed by 7.0 seconds of silence in which students in the class look down. Miki also keeps her gaze down on her paper flicking through it until the lecturer says 'I've got a couple [of questions]'.

It is worth noting then, that Miki appears to avoid initiating discussion after her presentations. However, once Dr. Telfer raised issues or made suggestions, she provided long accounts. These accounts, prompted by the lecturer, went on for 26 seconds after her first presentation, and for 66 seconds after her second presentation. Thus, it is possible to see in these instances that Miki does not exercise control over opening and closing of sequences verbally or non-verbally, although she provides her own views and lengthy accounts when prompted. In relation to this, it should be mentioned that in the peer assessment of the presentation, one of the students wrote for Miki's second presentation, 'No issues raised', though overall Miki's peer students gave her positive comments such as 'clear' or 'well organized'. There was also a comment for Miki's first presentation, which was 'not enough discussion'.

Another silent negotiation can be found in the excerpt below. It is a closing section of one of Miki's Presentation Discussions, and the class was talking about English 'sorry'
used when someone knocks over a drink which is positioned slightly in their way. Prior to this section, Miki responded to a question of how she would react in Japanese if her drink was knocked over.

[Interaction excerpt 4: M2 I Miki]

251 Molly: I mean the other reaction might be that you
252 would say YOU IDIOT.
253 ((laugh))
254 Gary: ( ) Possibly one knows.
255 ((laugh))
256 Lect: ( ) it depends on how close you are.
257 (0.4)
258 Bill: That’s [true.]
259 Lect: [If you] are a really close friend,
260 you can say you idiot. (0.2)
261 Miki: Mm: mm.
262 Lect: If it’s [ strangers ,]
263 Bill: [(If you don’t] know), um.
264 Miki: Depending on the relationship, how close
265 you are. (0.8) Um.=
266 Molly: =Or how you feeling that day,
267 ((Laugh))
268 Miki: Yea:h true.
269 (1.0)
270 Lect: hh you could also say it with gritted
271 teeth,(0.3) SORRY,
272 ((laugh))
->273 (6.2)
->274 Miki: °Thank you very much.°
275 (0.5)
276 ((applause))

Miki appears to find the aspects of apology discussed here important as she takes notes of Dr. Telfer's comment in lines 256, 259 and 260, and summarises the point in lines 264 and 265. After Dr. Telfer’s joking comment in lines 270 and 271 and the laughter, there is a long pause of 6.2 seconds. During this long pause, Miki looks down at her paper while Dr. Telfer looks around to see if anyone has any more to say. In the end, Miki looks up and as her eyes meet with Dr. Telfer's, and the lecturer's nodding seems to trigger Miki's concluding 'Thank you very much’. During the silence of 6.2 seconds, negotiation to decide the stage of discussion took place without a word, just as in the long silence at the beginning of the discussion. Miki noted in her interview that she 'wanted it [the discussion session] to come to an end' when people started to joke, but was not sure whether it was an appropriate time to close the discussion. It appears that Miki used silence with a downward eye-gaze to signal Dr. Telfer that she required a prompt to end the discussion.

At the end of her other Presentation Discussion, Miki had withdrawn from discussion long before it came to the end (analysis of the relevant interaction will be presented in excerpt 7 and excerpt 8 in section 6.3.6). When Dr. Telfer diverted from the discussion to
the next presenter, Miki took this diversion as a cue, and without any explicit marking of closing, she quietly left the presenter's seat to go back to her seat. The class moved on to discuss who the next presenter was and who was presenting their paper the following week.

This section presented the ways opening and closing of discussion were performed in Miki's presentations. The silent negotiation among Miki, the audience and Dr. Telfer resulted in Dr. Telfer's move to take charge of the presentation discussion, although a more active role is assumed from students in Australian university classes (cf. Marriott 2000). The passive role of Miki through the use of silence in negotiating the direction of interaction suggests that she is even more passive and silent in Regular Discussion in which there is less pressure to take charge of interaction.

6.3.3 Interactional roles in questioning

Miki's tendency to wait till others initiate, described above, can be found throughout the data. As we have already seen, Miki tends to rely on participation through other-selected turns in Regular Discussion. Furthermore, in her Presentation Discussion, although she self-selects more often than in Regular Discussion to ask questions, those questions are entirely confirmation questions to initiate repairs to others' genuine questions, comments or explanations. The following interaction excerpt illustrates this:

[Interaction excerpt 5 M2 2 Miki]

164 Molly: But- sometimes you could also say sorry
165 when: maybe you haven' (0.9) done enough.
166 (0.8) You feel like you:: (0.5) something’s
167 happened and somehow you feel like maybe
168 you should’ve done something more?=
169 Miki: =More,
170 (0.3)
171 Molly: Yeah.
172 (0.9)

->173 Miki: I- i- is that because you are (0.3) making
174 some- (0.2) you are causing some problems
175 before, (0.5) to some oth[ers?]
176 Molly: [U::m] not so much
177 of that, but u:m (0.5) what’s the good
178 term, (0.2) u:m (3.0)u:m (0.9) like m- may
179 be if you had helped mo:re, (0.2) if,
180 (0.2)o:r even done something it might not
181 have happened

Here, Molly is talking about an English meaning of 'sorry', in Miki's Presentation Discussion on English and Japanese apologies. In lines 173 to 175 Miki asks Molly what causes her to use 'sorry' in the situation she has described. In this discussion, Miki positioned herself as a researcher collecting information about the English apology, finding that 'it was good to hear about English apology from other students'. However, she did not
raise new questions to elicit new information herself but followed what her native-speaker peers raised in the discussion.

Thus, although she participates and self-selects her own turns as frequently in her own Presentation Discussion as other students do in their Presentation Discussions, her contribution is often triggered through initiating moves by other participants. As suggested in Dr. Telfer’s comment earlier, voluntarily questioning is an important action in evaluation of classroom performance, but Miki did not ask the expected issue-raising questions. Hence, Dr. Telfer’s comment: ‘She never asked questions’.

6.3.4 Participation in ‘open floor’ situations

Another point to be made here in relation to initiative in interaction is that Miki never took her speaking turns in ‘open floor’ situations in Regular Discussion. An ‘open floor’ situation, as described before, refers to a situation in which a participant in class provides a certain stimulus requesting the whole class to volunteer a comment or a question. In this situation, even though a response to the stimuli takes the position of a second pair part, greater initiative is required by the speaker. The pressure to speak is distributed equally to all the students, but the first respondent has to take a risk in participating. This is because the first response to the stimuli and the feedback to it can provide guidance and groundwork for relevant discussion to follow. Table 6.6 below shows the sample group’s participation in ‘open floor’ situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 Number and length of turns in open floor situations in Intercultural Communication (Regular Discussion)

Although ‘open floor’ situations themselves tend to occur less frequently than other participation structures, in these ‘open floor’ situations neither Miki nor Tony volunteer responses. Dr. Telfer also noted this in her interview:
Although Dr. Telfer mentions Tomo, Shirley and the participant-observer researcher as those who 'come in' in the 'embarrassing silences', Table 6.6 above shows that students such as Molly and Bill often volunteer in the 'embarrassing silences'. In fact, in interaction excerpt 1, Bill provided the first response to the presenter's question after a 2.8 second silence, as Miki and others follow in alignment with Bill's response. Thus, it appears that whether a student volunteers in 'embarrassing silences' in 'open floor' situations could also be a factor influencing the perception of silence in the classroom.

6.3.5 Being in control through expansion

So far the results have presented an inactive image of Miki in classroom discussion. However, while Tadashi (Case Study 1) did not take turns which expanded on other participants' turns as his peer students did, Miki showed her initiative in classroom interaction by expanding on other participants' talk voluntarily. The excerpt below shows Miki being in control and sharing her view on a certain topic, which continues over a number of turns:

[Interaction excerpt 6: M5 1 Jay]

1 Ikuko: ... But I _also_ think it's family thing as
2 well,
3 (0.2)
4 Miki: I think it's um family thing,=
5 Ikuko: Ye[a:h,
6 Miki: [Parents really ( ) what
7 (0.2) children sa:y,
8 Ikuko: Yeah,(.) [It _used_] to be like- yeah.
9 Miki: [and ’um]
10 Miki: Yeah. (0.6) uh I- my mum sent me a ( )
11 (0.5) um program in Japan, she _taped it_
12 for me and I watched the TV program, that
13 was talking about the high school
14 students in Japan? (0.4) And um (0.6)
15 (played) (1.2) there was one mother who
16 was trying to (1.3) trying to: (0.6) how
17 do you _say_ (1.2) uhm (0.4) there was one
girl who really do- (0.2) does not respect

Miki: [does]

Molly: [S-s-] scold,

Miki: Yeah. um-

Molly: =the mother has scolded her,

Miki: Yeah, yeah. [Sco-] scold?

Molly: [Um. ]

Molly: um:

Miki: but um (0.5) the girl doesn't change at all,

Lect: Um:

Miki: So (0.4) the interviewer, (0.2) came to her family, and asked (0.2) why, like that that was a program.

Bill: [Um.]

Miki: [The]n uh they wanted to know why the girl was behaving like that, and mother- mother (1.2) she said mother said she was trying to scold her,

Molly: [scold],

Miki: [ so ]

?: um huh,=

Miki: = and uh but she does because: the girl doesn't listen to her, she stopped.

?: Uh: [:m].

Bill: [Um] huh:

Tony: She never ( ).=

Miki: =Yeah she never. (0.5) I think that's happening especially to high school students, so they think, (1.1) they think like is (. ) right.

In the excerpt above, Miki expands on Ikuko's comment about recent changes in politeness behaviour in Japan. She first shows her agreement with Ikuko by repeating her comment (line 4), and then provides her observation in more specific terms (lines 6 to 7). Following this, from line 10 onwards, she gives a long account of a video-recorded television program from Japan to illustrate her point. Furthermore, after Tony's comment (or question) in line 52, she not only responds but also expands on it to summarise the observation illustrated by her long account.

The interaction above also deserves special attention in that Miki appears to be in control of the classroom interaction, a rare event in the data set for this case study. Although it is apparent that she is struggling with her English (lines 16 to 26), she comes through it, and her pauses become shorter and less frequent towards the end. Moreover, she does not leave long pauses after other participants' utterances. In particular, she uses conjunctions effectively to continue her talk (lines 29, 32, 44, 46). We can see that hesitation and pauses follow those conjunctions, but by using them, she can put her TRPs
on hold for a while, and this allows her to hold the floor. This type of control was not observed in Tadashi’s case. It appears that in Miki’s case, if she wants to have her say, she will, and she is capable of doing it using discourse strategies to hold the floor.

In addition, the direction of Miki’s speech, unlike Tadashi’s, is not exclusively concentrated on the lecturer but diverse, as found in all the interaction excerpts above. In interaction excerpt 1, she made a comment agreeing with a peer student’s response to the presenter’s question. In interaction excerpts 5, her questions were directed to another peer student Molly. The diversity of Miki’s directions of speech in the classroom can also be detected in her non-verbal behaviour. When Miki spoke, her eye-gaze was mostly directed towards the whole class or mid-air space as if she was addressing the whole group, even when she was nominated by Dr. Telfer to comment. She also used gestures frequently, moving her arms up and down with her hands open and extended towards the class, which was noted by Dr. Telfer who found the gestures ‘fairly sort of confident and assertive’.

6.3.6 Being out of control: silent presenter

Keeping in mind the picture of Miki being in control, let us now turn to a case in which Miki seems to lose her control and thereupon remains silent. The excerpt below shows part of a discussion after Miki’s presentation on American and Japanese backchanneling behaviour. Molly asks a question about Miki’s impression of ‘Westerners’ filling conversation spaces, but Miki seem to have difficulty grasping the question:

[Interaction excerpt 7 M5 2 Miki]

62 Molly: Do- do we: lik- do generally um: (0.6) I
don't know how can I say it right do Western
people: (0.3) do their ow- do their own
fill-in: stuff?
66 (0.2)
->67 Miki: Do their, sorry?
68 (0.4)
69 Molly: L- like um (0.4) um? hu(h)h (0.2) li- do we
(0.2) instead of um: li- >I don't know< we
have pauses instead of um: (0.6) I don't know
we have pauses instead of (0.5) um (0.2)
the: (0.2) those ( ) you know saying
something with: nodding or whatever, (.) do
we fill it in instead? (0.2) more?
76 (3.6)
->77 Molly: Er the are the: se backchannel:s(0.4)um(0.2)
after: like specifically after sentences but
the person keeps(. )the speaker keeps talking?
80 (1.2)
->81 Molly: Because I think um (1.2) cause I- I
(really think) Western people they tend to:
put a lot of um fill-ins when they are
talking? (0.8) all the time? you know like
ums and ers and=
86 Miki: =ah *(yeah).*
After Miki’s repair-initiating clarification question in line 67 Molly rephrases her question, but this is followed by a pause of 3.6 seconds (line 76) in which Miki’s gaze stays on Molly. This suggests that Miki’s silence is a propositional message indicating lack of understanding. Following this silence, Molly makes another attempt to clarify her question, but this is again followed by silence, 1.2 seconds. Molly keeps trying, and when she replaces the term ‘fill-ins’ with ‘ums and urs’, Miki shows a sign of understanding in line 86, although she does not move on to answer. Instead, Molly further elaborates on her point, laughing at herself for being clumsy in her explanation, and the class also giggles softly. At this stage, although it seems that Miki’s silence due to lack of understanding is interpreted by Molly as it was intended to mean, since Molly attempts to clarify her question. However, the interaction becomes clearly more and more problematic, and this is reflected in the laughter and giggles.

The next excerpt shows the subsequent interaction. Here, Miki asks a confirmation question to check her understanding of Molly’s point (lines 93-4 and line 95). However, although the exchange between line 93 and line 99 seems to indicate that they achieved mutual understanding, Miki’s answer is not heard before Dr. Telfer comes in. It is difficult to know whether Miki is clear about Molly's question at the point of ‘chance’ (line 99). Miki could have started to give her response or indicate her understanding of the question during the short periods of silence between lines 99 and 100, even though they are short or far from a TRP, as the repair sequences for the same question were repeated a number of times. She could also have responded at the end of ‘you’ or ‘something’ in line 101. However, this does not happen, and as Molly’s speech becomes fragmented, Dr. Telfer joins in to clarify the nature of backchanneling.
Between lines 104 and 117, Molly and Dr. Telfer compete for the floor, but Dr. Telfer holds onto the floor to make her point that Molly’s view of backchanneling as a ‘fill-in’ is wrong. It should also be mentioned that Molly was regarded by Dr. Telfer as a problematic participant in discussion. Dr. Telfer commented in her interview that she often wished Molly stopped talking during discussions.

She further points out how cross-cultural misunderstanding can occur due to different interpretations of backchannels. With this shift in focus issues, answering Molly’s original question in lines 62 to 65 (interaction excerpt 7) becomes less relevant, since the whole point of Molly’s question was denied by Dr. Telfer at this point. However, Molly comes
back to her question in line 133, and Miki is put on the spot with the return of a question she had left unanswered. The long silence of 4.2 seconds in which she shakes her head indicates that Miki is confused, and her response after the long pause can be interpreted either as 'I don't know whether Westerners do that' or 'I don't know what you are asking me about'. Miki looks down at her paper after this while Molly nods four times in silence. This suggests a serious breakdown of communication which the lecturer attempts to restore by bringing in a new perspective on the topic as if adopting a face-saving strategy to overcome the 'embarrassing silence'. Her suggestion, however, ends with 'and' in a soft voice followed by a 2.0 second silent pause. After this point, 13 minutes more discussion followed, in which other students voluntarily joined in or were invited to speak, but Miki never spoke a word until the end of her presentation, at which point she quietly went back to her seat when the topic of discussion gradually shifted to the next presenter.

In the interaction in the above two excerpts, it appears that the breakdown of communication and Miki's withdrawal from the discussion was caused by a combination of 1) unclear repair by Molly; 2) Miki’s extensive and ambiguous use of silence; 3) shift of focus topic in the middle of a repair sequence by a third participant (Dr. Telfer) and 4) sequential conflict of actions in interaction between Molly and Dr. Telfer. It is possible to say that using silence to cope with a problematic interactive situation in her own Presentation Discussion put Miki in a difficult situation in the end, but on the other hand, it is also the case of two conflicting interactional forces leaving Miki out of control.

6.3.7 Management of turn-taking: in and out of control

So far, Miki's performance appears to present a mixed picture. She seems to be silent in terms of her frequency of participation in Regular Discussion and take relatively passive roles in classroom interaction in general, using silence to negotiate her involvement in interaction. On the other hand, she produces long turns expanding on other students’ comments, directing her turns not only exclusively towards the teacher but also to the whole class in a 'confident' manner.

What follows is a step-by-step analysis of the interaction in one of her Presentation Discussion session with a series of excerpts. In this discussion, Miki seems to be in and out of control, leaving sporadic silences in classroom interaction. Through this analysis, an attempt will be made to explain how interactional control is lost and maintained.

The following is a stretch of talk from one of Miki's presentations, in which she talked about her in-progress project on English and Japanese apologies. At the beginning of the
excerpt below, the lecturer suggests that unlike the examples of 'sorry' Miki had given, sometimes people can say 'I'm sorry' even when they do not feel guilty:

[Interaction excerpt 9: M2 1 Miki]

47 Lect: But I think very often people do say I am sorry, hhh when there's absolutely no intention to admit guilt at all.
48 Molly: Yeah. Like for instance my flatmate or one of my acquaintance got broken into?
49 (0.4) And I am sorry to her.
50 (0.5) And I am not saying that I have broken into her flat, just saying I am sorry that it happened to her.
51 (0.7)
52 Miki: Yeah, uh this is one of the confusing (0.3) uh confusion for me?
53 Molly: [Mm.]
54 Miki: [When someone li- when someone if someone dies? (0.4) people say I'm sorry to hear that. And because I had this sense (0.2) that I am sorry really means (0.9) uh guilty? (0.4) when I learned English in Japan. So I thought oh there might be a different aspect, (0.2) different meaning in I am sorry in English. So I want to see, hh (1.2) in: what other situations (0.5) I am sorry can be used also.
55 (0.5)
56 Molly: I think it's just in: like in terms of not-all: the people are very careful about what they say? (0.9) Like in other situations. I mean I often say I'm sorry (0.2) just wondering what would you like (if I) done anything (you know). (0.8) Yeah. Just- that it happened.
57 (0.3)
58 Bill: Well in fact we just I sometimes say sorry when (0.3) someone else's caused something to me, (0.3) they'd- they'd- they'd- pro'ly say sorry too. (0.2) Ah I just I'll apologise and I say sorry even if that's- even in fact it's not- who did it.
59 (0.5)
60 ?: Mm.=

->89 Bill: =In Japanese is the- you have a sorry- w'd that be a- w'd that be a similar um situation?

->92 Miki: [If: ] if (0.4) you are not the one who really caused it [You didn't. ]Yeah-

93 Bill: [You didn't. ]Yeah=

94 Miki: = [Yeah.
95 Bill: [You didn't cause it,=for example someone might um (0.4) knock over this.(0.4) I- I I oh sorr- I could actually say sorry in English. to them. (0.6) At the same time they'd say sorry.

->101 (1.2)

->102 Gary: ( ) So in a car crash, Japanese say sorry ( )=

->104 Molly: =But I think that's jus somebody trying to: get something out of someone else who:

105 didn't quite understa:nd.
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Following the lecturer's suggestion, Molly provides a specific example (lines 51 to 56) to illustrate the lecturer's point. Then, expanding on Molly's turn, Miki refers to another such example which is 'confusion' for her (lines 58 to 59 and lines 61 to 71). She further suggests that she would like to investigate other cases of 'confusion' for Japanese native speakers. For her, this discussion is a good opportunity of her to get information from English native speakers about the meanings of 'sorry'. Hearing Miki's comment, in lines 73 to 79 Molly provides further explanation of the meaning of 'sorry' other than 'admission of guilt'. When we look at Miki's participation up to this point, she seems to be in control, taking initiative in developing the discussion; she self-selects to make comments; and she expands on what Molly has said to further explain what motivated her to take up this project. At the end of the comment, she expresses her intention to investigate various situations in which 'sorry' can be used, which can also be interpreted as an invitation for native speakers of English to provide example situations.

The talk starts to turn to a different direction when Bill offers another example of 'sorry' in English (lines 81 to 87), and asks Miki whether in Japanese it would be 'a similar situation' (lines 89 to 91). Miki asks a repair-initiating question, to which Bill responds with an example situation. Miki's 'Yeah' in line 95 could be interpreted as a positive response to Bill's question, but it is more likely to be an indication of acceptance of Bill's 'You didn't'. At least Bill does not seem to have interpreted it as the answer to his question as he continues his explanation by providing an example situation. Bill's explanation is followed by a 1.2 second silence, and it is during or after this that Miki's response to Bill's question is most likely to be expected. However, Miki does not respond within the 'standard maximum' pause length of one second in English (Jefferson 1989). This prompts Gary to come in and refer back to Miki's example of 'sorry' which Japanese tourists overseas are advised not to say if they are involved in a car accident. Thus, Miki did not talk at a point where she was designated to talk, at least according to English norms of turn-taking described by Schegloff & Sacks (1973) as below:

[...] given the recognizable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type the first is recognisably a member of (p.295).

Due to the partly inaudible comment, it is difficult to judge what Gary was doing here, but it is possible that he either provided an assessment of Bill's point in relation to the 'harmony' function of 'sorry', or elaborated on Bill's question directing his turn to Miki. If it
is an assessment, then Gary diverted the direction of sequence here. Moreover, Molly's turn following Gary's would add an even more diverting force as it would be a disagreement with Gary's point. If Gary's turn is an elaboration of Bill's question, Molly's turn takes up the slot for a response to Bill's question and thus block Miki's opportunity. In either case, it is possible that Miki is silenced here unless her intention was to remain silent concerning Bill's question. Although there has not been enough empirical evidence as pointed out in Chapter 2, the existing literature generally indicates that Japanese may tolerate longer gaps and transfer this style to their communication in English (Davies & Ikeno 2002; Anderson 1992; Pritchard 1995). Moreover, from Bill's turn onwards, beginning line 96, the focus of attention of the class including the lecturer was on the area where Bill, Gary and Molly were sitting, which was the other side of the table from Miki with the lecturer in between (see Figure 6.1 below), therefore it is also possible that for Miki to signal her intention to speak was difficult.

![Figure 6.1 Configuration of the Intercultural Communication class](image)

However, the possibility of Miki’s intentional silence also has to be considered. Miki may have remained silent because of a lack of confidence, as she herself mentioned that she was not quite sure about the point of the question at this stage. It is however important to note here that she may have been silenced when she was about to verbally indicate a need for more clarification. Another interpretation of silence is that she did not know what to say. The silence may have been intended as an 'off-record' strategy (Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997) which indirectly encoded the message of 'I don't know'.

Going back to the end of the interaction in the above excerpt, the attention is on Gary and Molly who sit across the desk from each other. The following excerpt shows the talk occurring directly after the excerpt above:

```
[Interaction excerpt 10 M2 1 Miki]

107 Gary: [( )]
108 Gary: Yeah well,
```
In the excerpt above, Gary and Molly are still talking about possible interpretations of the meaning of the 'sorry' which Bill had referred to. However, in lines 133 and 137, there are two long silences. In line 133, Dr. Telfer's head turns from Gary to Miki, but as Molly starts to speak (line 134), she turns back toward Molly. Then in line 137, she turns back again to Miki. Dr. Telfer described in her interview that she turned her head to Miki in these two silences 'in the hope', as it 'was HER [Miki's] seminar paper' and therefore 'she's the one who has the right to comment on it'. What Miki was doing during these silences was looking down at the paper in front of her with a pen in her hand, though not writing. It is likely that noting down what Gary and Molly were saying was important to her, since she mentioned in her interview that comments by native speakers of English were informative and useful for her project. At lines 125 and 126, Miki was actually writing something. However, in the first long silence in line 133 and in the second one in line 137, she was not writing. These non-verbal features suggest that by this stage of discussion she was in a listener mode of communication aiming to note down what seemed important for her project. However, Miki's mode of communication at that point did not match the expectations of Dr. Telfer, who turned her gaze towards Miki 'in the hope' that she would take advantage of the opportunity to interact with her classmates.

After the 4.5 silence and a cough at the end of the excerpt above, Nakki, a Korean student, talks about Korean and English apologies. Molly then provides a similar situation
in which 'sorry' can be used in English. It is after this comment that Miki comes back to the interaction, as shown below (the first part overlaps with interaction excerpt 5):

[Interaction excerpt 11: M2 1 Miki]

164 Molly: But- sometimes you could also say sorry
165 when: maybe you haven’ (0.9) done enough.
166 (0.8) You feel like you: (0.5) something’s
167 happened and somehow you feel like maybe
168 you should’ve done something more?=
169 Miki: =More,
170 (0.3)
171 Molly: Yeah.
172 (0.9)
->173 Miki: I- i- is that because you are (0.3) making
174 some- (0.2) you are causing some problems
175 before, (0.5) to some oth[ers?]?
176 Molly: [U::m] not so much
177 of that, but u:m (0.5) what’s the good
178 term, (0.2) u:m (3.0)u:m (0.9) like m- may
179 be if you had helped mo:re, (0.2) if,
180 (0.2)o:r even done something it might not
181 have happened like u:m
182 Lect: Well just like the example he gave;
183 Molly: Umm[m.
184 Lect: [where he’s- she knocked his
185 (0.4)
186 Bill: This is my drink. (0.5) He knocked it
187 over,= I say say sorry (1.2) even though he
188 caused it.
->189 (0.8)
190 Molly: Yeah might be that you feel
->191 Miki: Ah:
192 Molly: that you shouldn’t have that drink
193 [{}
194 Bill: [Well he’ll he’ll probably ] say sorry
->195 Miki: [Yeah
196 Bill: ( ), I expect (0.5)
197 ((soft laugh from other students followed
198 by louder one transcribed below))
199 huh [huh ha ha ha hahahaha huh]
200 Bill: [him to say so(h)rry as well], (0.3)
201 and if he didn’t then (we’d get sort of)
202 ((fists on the chest))
203 Jay: Well why would you say sorry in that case
204 then.
205 (0.4)
->206 Miki: [Becau-
207 Bill: [I guess the:
->208 Miki: [Because (0.2) you put that one there,]
209 Bill: [impression is that I am sorry that I pla]
210 ced in the position that ]caused
211 Jay: [[Aa:
212 Bill: [it {}
->213 Miki: [cause-
214 Jay: ahhh.=
215 Molly: =Yeah.
216 (0.4)

In this excerpt, Miki asks a question in lines 173 to 175 about Molly's comment in lines 164 to 168 on another possible situation and the meaning of 'sorry' in English. Molly struggles to find an appropriate way to explain. At this point, Dr. Telfer brings back Bill's example of English 'sorry' used even when the speaker is not the one who caused offence
(lines 81 to 92 in interaction excerpt 9). Thus, although Bill's question in interaction excerpt 9 was left behind unanswered, Molly's renewed reference to another meaning of 'sorry' in English brings it back. In line 186, Bill takes over the lecturer's description of the situation and provides a description of the situation which he has already referred to. After Bill's turn from lines 186 to 188, there is a 0.8 second silence in line 189. Since the turns between lines 176 and 188 were produced to respond to Miki's question from line 173, they are expected to receive a certain type of response expressing either acknowledgment, further questioning or non-comprehension by Miki at this point. It is clear from the video-recording that Molly, Dr. Telfer and Bill direct their explanations to Miki at least up to line 188. The silence here can indicate that Miki is either still unsure or thinking about what she has heard. However, before she speaks, Molly comes in to provide her own account of saying 'sorry' in the situation described by Bill in line 190. Miki then produces an utterance 'ah:', which implies that she is either backchanneling or trying to say something more than a backchannel such as, in this case, further questioning about the use of this particular 'sorry'. In either case, Molly continues her turn suggesting that the reason why the one whose drink was knocked over would say 'sorry' is that the bottle was positioned at an inappropriate spot, but after mentioning this, she is overlapped by Bill modifying Molly's comment in line 193 as well as with Miki's 'Yeah' in line 195.

It is important that Bill's long overlap with Molly in line 194 suggests that Molly's explanation was not satisfactory for Bill, since his focus was more on the aspect of 'harmony'. This difference in the interpretation of the particular 'sorry' between Bill and Molly could have confused Miki, but she appears to have accepted Molly's interpretation, since she overlaps Bill extensively in response to Jay's question in lines 203 and 204, persistently providing her own answer, based on Molly's earlier account of 'sorry'. The overlap starts in line 206 and continues until Bill speaks in the clear space in line 210, but then Miki overlaps with Bill again in line 213 at the end of Bill's explanation. Bill's explanation this time is similar to that of Molly's (and thus Miki's), but he uses the expression 'I guess' and 'the impression is that’, accompanied by a gesture of shaking his hand with its palm down which means 'more or less’, as well as a facial expression suggesting scepticism, which also suggests that the owner of the drink does not bear any sense of guilt.

Examining the above stretch of talk in this way, it can be said that the short silence of 0.8 seconds in line 189 plays a crucial role in the direction of talk, as this silence belongs to Miki. It is possible that Miki was convinced by Molly's interpretation because Molly
provided hers before Miki could absorb Bill's explanation and either acknowledge or question it. As with the diversion of talk by peers in interaction excerpt 9, this is another case in which the direction of talk is diverted by peers before Miki makes a move. As a result, Miki is put in a passive interactional role which actually causes confusion and misunderstanding in discussion. The point of Bill’s initial question about the 'harmony' element in English ‘sorry’ has been distorted.

However, if we look at the last part of this excerpt, although Miki has been 'receiving' explanation from Molly, Bill and the lecturer up to line 202, her talk overlaps extensively with Bill's after Jay's question. Up to that point in this discussion after her presentation, she has almost never overlapped with others or forced her turn in. Even more significantly, she also seems to have left a few silences in the slots where she was expected to provide a comment or a response, as has already been pointed out. Moreover, since Jay was facing Bill diagonally, had eye-contact with him and was in closer proximity than with Miki at the time of her questioning, eye contact was physically impossible between Miki and Jay. Therefore, Jay's question was most likely to be directed to Bill and not Miki. Why, then, does Miki appear to suddenly push her way through in the discussion at this point? One possible explanation is that by this stage she had more information about the 'sorry' which Bill had referred to at the beginning of the discussion (lines 81 to 100 in interaction excerpt 9) because of Molly's explanation in lines 190 and 192. The other explanation is that Miki has an already established rapport with Jay since Jay and Miki are good friends who decided to enrol in this subject together, and they sit next to each other every week. In either case, while Bill completes his response to Jay's question, Miki's response becomes fragmented because of the overlap.

Let us now examine the last part of the discussion. The following excerpt is the end of the discussion which is directly after interaction excerpt 11 above.

[Interaction excerpt 12: M2 1 Miki]

```
217 Gary: I think it’s um (          ).
218 Bill: (It’s a good point).
219 Molly: Mm:: [yeah.
220 Gary: [Yeah. I don’t know °(               )°
221 Just °it's automatic probably°. (0.2) An
222 accident happens and you just say sorry,
223 °(1.0)
225 °(0.4)
226 Miki: When-
227 °(0.5)
228 Bill: I-in th[at [situation].
229 Molly: [You ]spill]ed (0.3) the-
230 Miki: [I  just ]
231 °(0.4)
```
Gary: If someone spilt (. ) your drink would you say sorry to them? 

Miki: °Uh: yeh;° Yeah, I would say s- (1.4) sorry, I mean >sumimasen in Japanese=that- means< sorry; because I put that- one (0.4) there, (0.2) ((students and lecturer nod))

Molly: Yeah.=

Miki: =an’ it was on his way, (0.2) to move.

Bill: So there is that- cross over there; (0.4) between Japanese and English.

?: Mm

?: Mm

?: Mm

Miki: Yeah=Because I’m the one who put the- (0.3) the bottle there.

At the beginning of this excerpt, Gary offers yet another observation of the particular use of 'sorry' on which most of the discussion has been based. Although exactly what Gary said could not be retrieved due to the quality of recording, it appears that he is referring to a conventional use of 'sorry' which does not encode 'admission of guilt', as he says 'accident happens and you just say sorry'. During this talk from lines 217 to 222, the attention of the class is in the area across the table from Miki, where Bill, Gary and Molly are seated (see Figure 6.1 above). Then, during the 1.0 second silence in line 223, Dr. Telfer turns to Miki and in line 224 asks her the question 'Well what would you do in Japanese'. Miki responds with 'When' with a slightly rising intonation after a short pause of 0.4 seconds. This 'When' is also followed by a pause of 0.5 seconds, which seems to have prompted Bill and Molly to provide the responses in lines 228 and 229. 'When' as a genuine clarification of the lecturer's question would be odd here since Miki has already demonstrated her understanding of 'the situation' which Bill has referred to by her attempts to respond to Jay's question, competing with Bill. In addition, Bill has already explained 'the situation' twice in the preceding talk, and the question by the lecturer is a rephrased version of Bill's question at the beginning: 'In Japanese is the- you have a sorry- w’d that be a- w’d that be a similar um situation?'. Bill himself indicates his puzzlement:

[Interview excerpt 5 Bill 131]

[...] when we got to a stage where she still required Dr. Telfer to rephrase it, I was there thinking well...that’s (awkward?) I think it may be sli- ...not annoyance, but some slight....fractures coming in there [...] 

What needs to be questioned here is whether Miki genuinely required clarification at this stage. It is possible, as we can see that Miki still required 1.2 seconds to respond to the clarification by Gary (lines 232-233). Moreover, hesitation including a 1.2 second pause
can also be found at the beginning of her response in line 235. Judging from the orchestrated responses from Bill, Molly and Gary, it is likely that these three peers interpreted Miki's 'When' as a genuine clarification question.

However, it is premature to interpret Miki's 'When' in line 226 exclusively as a genuine request for clarification. The repair sequence with a clarification question could be being used in order to earn time. Even if she has already understood the 'situation,' she may not have thought about the same situation in Japanese. Moreover, the attention of the class had been on interaction among Bill, Molly and Gary between lines 217 and 222 until it was suddenly shifted by Dr. Telfer's question. Miki, who was actually looking down at her paper with her pen in her hand, may have been taken by surprise. It is possible that in this condition Miki required time to put her thoughts together. In addition, Miki says 'I just' in line 230, overlapping with Bill and Molly without waiting for their responses to her clarification question to be completed. Whether Miki's 'I just' in line 230 is a beginning part of a response to Dr. Telfer's question in line 224 or the continuation of her repair-initiating question starting in line 226, it is possible that she actually does not need to hear those responses by her classmates but needs a while to think about her answer.

In her interview Miki said that by the time Dr. Telfer asked her the question she was keeping up with the discussion, although she was not sure earlier at the beginning of the discussion shown in interaction excerpt 9. This supports the second interpretation of Miki's repair-initiating question as a way of 'buying time'. The following interview excerpt illustrates Miki's point of view as a non-native speaker:

[Interview excerpt 6 Miki 34-39]

M: Um when I speak with native speakers, ... I tend to end up being passive.
     Listening...
I: Is that because they talk a lot?
M: Mmmm. what can I say, it is already a lot of work for me to understand, and I don't get to
     the point where I offer my own opinions. Mm.
I: You mean to keep up with the talk?
M: So, when I am asked 'What do you think?' I need some time to think about it. I don't come
     up with an idea straight away. So on balance, something like, you can take your own time,
     for example letters or email, for those things I can say quite a lot. Well perhaps because they
     are one-way [communication].

As she says 'it is already a lot of work' to keep up with what others are talking about, so, even though she may have been asked the same question before, she has to concentrate on the ongoing talk that may have diverted slightly from the original question. Thus, she does not have enough time to think about her own reaction. This can be a possible explanation for 'fractures' from a non-native speaker's point of view. The problem appears to be that
native-speakers assume that she is keeping up with the discussion not only in terms of *reception* but also in terms of her *readiness for production*.

Bill interestingly claims that he did not think Miki was having difficulty in keeping up with the discussion. Neither did Dr. Telfer think Miki was confused. For Bill, it was a 'cultural' factor that caused the 'slight fractures'. He thought that Miki with her Japanese background 'would sit back and listen to people' and 'not suddenly butt in'. Bill had taught English to Japanese students and had found this tendency among them. He describes the thoughts passing through his mind during the discussion:

[Interview excerpt 7 Bill 115]

[...I was perceiving cultural difference here that um...yes, on one hand I thought perhaps she can’t she doesn’t understand what we were saying, or maybe this is (   ) just basically a language problem here, but I didn’t think so. I thought I thought it was cultural. I thought it was cultural behaviour affecting linguistic behaviour. [...]

As to the lecturer’s interpretation of this incident, she provides an interesting observation on the Australian peer students:

[Interview excerpt 8 Dr. Telfer 62,76]

[...] I mean, by saying, by saying you spilled the...or whatever, by ..trying to help her, they are also at the same time saying ‘I knew what the question was.’ It’s an assertion of ... they keeping up to that with the conversation as well as assisting up Miki. I think.

I think there’s two things going on at once. I think there was a genuine concern, a number of Australian speakers that... they should, because, here we are in Australia, here it is non native speakers, here we are in a course in [intercultural communication], we should be helpful.

Whether the lecturer's observation is correct that the intention of the peer students in quickly responding to Miki’s clarification question can be both genuine support for Miki and a display of their ability, Miki may feel rushed into her response to the original question even though she requires more time. Indeed, to some degree she is interrupted between lines 226 and 230. Thus again, this 'orchestrated repair' produces the image of Miki being under the control of other participants rather than being in control herself.

However, the 'fractures' do not end at the point of Miki's response from line 225 through to line 242. In lines 243 and 244, Bill asks a more general question to clarify his point that there is a 'crossover there between Japanese and English' with regard to the 'social harmony side' to 'sorry' and its Japanese equivalent. Miki, however, again takes a while to provide her response, while three classmates utter 'um's. Because of this delayed response and the explanation which suggested that 'sorry' would be appropriate as there is a sense of 'guilt’, Bill felt that Miki 'still hadn't got it’. He explained in his interview:
I think there was a bit of inadequacy there. I think, yes, by her saying just the bottle... that she was placing by the side of ( ) side of it rather than social harmony side of it.

He further comments that this 'inadequacy' was felt 'especially 'cause she waited so long'. This gap of understanding between Bill and Miki is left unresolved, as Molly tells a joke in line 251 and Gary joins in, and after a short exchange the discussion comes to an end (see interaction excerpt 4 in section 6.3.2 for this closing section). Even though Bill indicates his understanding of culture-specific interactive styles, Miki's pause was felt as a sign of inadequate mutual understanding. This is not necessarily unreasonable as Miki does not always take long pauses but can react quickly. Her long overlapping talk with Bill in interaction excerpt 11 illustrates this point. However, it is possible that it is this 'swaying' between different paces of turn-taking by Miki which makes it difficult for native speakers to judge whether her silence is to do with fluency in second language, cognitive processing or transfer of a culture-specific interactive style.

One of the things which this close examination of the discussion presented in interaction excerpts 9, 10, 11 and 12 above shows is that more than once Miki seems to drift away from ongoing interaction, leaving some of the interaction sequences unresolved. Then when she comes back either voluntarily or by invitation after the temporary disengagement from ongoing interaction, pauses which are longer than expected by her Australian peers occur, and as a result misunderstanding occurs.

The 'drifts' were triggered mostly by Australian peer students. In interaction excerpt 9, Gary came in followed by Molly before Miki was able to respond to Bill's repaired question. In interaction excerpt 11, Miki came back to get involved in negotiation of meaning, but then in interaction excerpt 12 a quick but low-keyed exchange among the Australian peers sitting in a circle in proximity seems to have given no chance for Miki to participate. What happened in the end was a sudden return of the question to Miki, who was rushed to give a response by her peers because she paused longer than they expected.

Moreover, because the focus of the discussion was the meaning of 'sorry' in English and Japanese, Miki seems to have positioned herself as a listener or a recipient of information while the Australian peer students shared their interpretation about English 'sorry'. In this sense, the fact that Miki did not take the initiative to focus the topic reinforced the 'drifts'.

Another factor which should be noted here is the role of English proficiency. Although Miki has enough competence to keep up with discussions and convey her ideas clearly, her
fluency and command of academic register appear to hold her behind her peers. In fact, Miki’s proficiency was evaluated to be the lowest of the three Japanese students in the case studies, and lack of fluency in her speech was pointed out. Hence, the gaps which led to Australian students’ self-selection before Miki spoke may be caused by lack of fluency. However, it should be remembered that lack of proficiency does not necessarily cause silence, as it can be overcome by using various strategies, which was observed in excerpt 6 where Miki was in control despite her obvious struggle with the language.

Once 'drifts' from ongoing interaction occur, Miki does not take the initiative to regain her active role in the discussion, although she does occasionally self-select to confirm other speakers' points. This lack of initiative is reflected in her downward gaze or note-taking, combined with the fact that Miki often does not pick up opportunities for participation created by Dr. Telfer's frequent shifts in head movement towards her. She also does not come in during long pauses where she could bring the floor back to herself or change the focus topic.

To sum up, the above analysis suggests, again, that possibilities of silencing and performed silence coexist. To some degree the silence appears to be co-constructed in the negotiation of participation by the multiple parties involved in the classroom and not 'produced' by one particular Japanese student, Miki. The peer students seem to be less tolerant of silent pauses than Miki, which results in their premature 'support' or 'interruption'. Hence, there seems to be an element of 'silencing' by peer students. On the other hand, Miki may either be unaware of the slots where she was expected to speak or remain silent intentionally as a face-saving strategy. However, it was observed that even
when she drifted away from interaction leaving questions unanswered, her peer students and the lecturer did not let her go as they came back to her with the question, which consequently caused further problems in interaction.

In this section 6.3, analysis and discussion of patterns of turn-taking were presented. It was argued that the passive role Miki seems to assume in classroom interaction is reinforced by ambiguous silences and Australian students’ reactions to them in Presentation Discussions. This can explain the more salient silence of Miki in Regular Discussions where although the pressure to speak imposed on the presenter is absent, her Australian peers still show more initiative and engagement in speaking.

6.4 Quality of participation (2) Formality of language

6.4.1 Lexis and overlaps

Looking at the formality of language in the Intercultural Communication class, it is possible to see that Miki's language use shows more informal features than Tadashi’s in that more colloquial lexis as well as overlapping talk can be found in her speech. However, although subtle, there are signs of 'carefulness' in her turn-taking as well as deference and hierarchical politeness orientations, which suggest a formal aspect in Miki's speech.

With regard to colloquial lexis, for example, 'yeah' was used almost without exception instead of 'yes', as found in interaction excerpt 2 (lines 17 and 20) and 6 (lines 10, 24, 26 and 53). Moreover, in interaction excerpt 2, the two 'yeah's by Miki were used as continuers for Dr. Telfer's turns. In interaction excerpt 6, all four 'yeah's by Miki were directed towards her classmates or the whole class including Dr. Telfer. In the same excerpt in line 10, 'my mum' was used instead of 'my mother’. However, 'you know’, which was used by a few Australian students, was not used by Miki, although, in the Intercultural Communication class, it was not as frequently used as by the Australian peers in Tadashi's case study. What was used often by almost all the participants including Miki was 'like-' as a filler, along with 'um' s and 'ur's. Thus, there was no significant contrast between Miki and other students in terms of the colloquial / formal lexis continuum.

In relation to turn-taking, Miki does overlap and interrupt, as we have seen in interaction excerpts in the previous section (for example, lines 6, 9, and 44 in interaction excerpt 6, line 92 in interaction excerpt 9, and in a most interrupting manner in line 208 in interaction excerpt 11). In most of these examples such as line 92 in interaction excerpt 6, Miki makes early starts of her turns, overlapping previous speakers just before the TRPs. This seems to reflect her capacity to precisely time turn transition in English. As this type
of turn transition with overlaps is considered one of the linguistic consequences of informal tenor (Eggins 1994), it is also considered a common feature in smooth turn transition in 'ordinary' conversation (Sacks et. al 1974; Jefferson 1983, 1986; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998). Ordinary conversation can be described as entailing informal properties of language use, and thus Miki's turn-transition strategy suggests her interactional competence in informal English conversation. The following example also shows Miki’s overlap as a consequence of orientation to a TRP:

[Interaction excerpt 13: M5 2 Miki]

34 Lect: =if we are not giving you so much (0.3)
35 backchanneling, does that- (0.8) give you an
36 odd impression at all does that (0.5) trouble
37 you in a conversation, (0.2) [if you don’t]
38 Miki: [that would] =that would give me um (1.2) how do you say
39 Lect: get enough backchannel.=
40 Miki: =that would give me um (1.2) how do you say
41 I would get (1.5) I would think people cannot
42 understand me if they don’t give me (1.4)
43 yeah. ‘backchannels.’

In line 38, Miki starts her response judging that the TRP is at the end of the word 'conversation' in line 37, and overlaps with the rest of the question. She waits until the lecturer finishes the rest of the question (line 39), and without a pause, starts responding immediately in line 40, latching onto the end of the question. This is a classic example of turn transition in ordinary conversation among native speakers of English (cf. Sacks et al. 1974, Jefferson 1983, 1986, Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998). Therefore, it appears that Miki's turn-taking shows informal properties which were commonly found in Australian students' turn-taking behaviour as well.

However, as shown before, there are also instances where she takes long inter-turn pauses after questions or other types of stimuli for participation. Combined with her peer students' quicker moves to self-select their turns, this seems to have caused problems in interaction as already discussed in the previous section. Furthermore, the lecturer described Miki's English as 'careful', and 'a great contrast with' one of the Korean students in the same class who 'lets it pour out regardless how grammatical it is’. This student, Nakki, was perceived by the lecturer as an excellent student, although she was aware that this student did not always attend the class.
6.4.2 Face and politeness in negotiation of meaning

There appear to be three types of silence which need to be addressed in relation to face and politeness. The first type of silence is the inter-turn pause or gap. In sections 6.3.6 and 6.3.7, a number of interpretations of gaps after questions to Miki were given. One of them was an indirect silent message such as ‘I don’t know the answer’ or ‘I don’t understand’. As discussed in the previous case study, this type of silence can be considered as an ‘off-record’ politeness strategy to perform a face-threatening act indirectly (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997). As discussed earlier, there are other possible interpretations of the gaps in question, but it is important to recognise this interpretation of silence as a face-saving strategy. This is because this strategy is used with significant frequency in Japanese classrooms (Chapter 4, section 4.3, see also Harumi 1999). The problem is, as already mentioned, that this use of silence is so ambiguous it can become a source of misunderstanding and miscommunication. Harumi (1999) points out that the same strategy is used by English-speaking learners of Japanese in her study, but the silences were accompanied by explicit gestures. However, as was the case with Harumi’s Japanese participants, there were fewer explicit non-verbal clues in Miki’s case.

The next type of silence to be considered is the ‘drifts’ away or temporary withdrawal from ongoing discussion described in section 6.3.7. Miki’s comments in the interview that she is often preoccupied with keeping up with ongoing talk and she is not prepared to give her own ideas seem to be a reasonable explanation for this. However, it is possible that this type of withdrawal is due to insecurity about her understanding of the ongoing negotiation. For example, in interaction excerpt 8, Miki withdrew from her negotiation of meaning with Molly after Dr. Telfer started an exchange with Molly. In interaction excerpt 9, Miki also temporarily withdrew from discussion without giving a response to Bill’s question as her peers joined the negotiation of meaning, and her interview comment suggests that she was not clear about the point of Bill’s question at that stage.
This in turn suggests that Miki is not prepared to take the risk of losing face by saying something irrelevant or by disclosing that she is not keeping up with the negotiation. It is demanding work for a non-native speaker to keep up with different views offered by various participants in the ‘cut and thrust’ of discussion and, at the same time, to express one’s own views without disrupting the flow of interaction. It would be highly face-threatening to cause a problem in discussion because of a lack of understanding or being irrelevant. Thus, avoidance of participation can be a strategy to save face in this situation, as previously mentioned in the case of hearing-impaired people (Jaworski & Stephens 1998). This can also explain the fact that Miki is in control of timing of turn-taking in classroom interaction, in harmony with other participants, when she does not need to negotiate meaning but can share her own ideas and experiences in a story-telling type of talk, as we saw in interaction excerpt 6.

However, there seems to be a tension between silence as a face-saving strategy and pressure to provide a response to a question. From the perspective of the students who asked Miki a question, they expect a response. This pressure appears to derive from an interactional constraint but at the same time social and practical constraints in classroom talk. The interactional constraint comes from the force of adjacency pairs that expects a response after a question as a ‘preferred second’ (cf. Schegloff & Sacks 1973; Levinson 1983; Gardner 1996). If responses are not provided for questions, it can be noticed as a ‘deviant’ case in interaction (cf. Schegloff 1968; ten Have 1999; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998). Moreover, verbal responses to questions are preferred second pair parts while silence after questions is dispreferred (Levinson 1983). The social constraint comes from the fact that it is considered rude to remain silent when asked a question (Scollon & Scollon 1981, 1985; Malone 1986; Kurzon 1997). The practical constraint is that in the classroom, questioning and responding are core processes in achieving educational goals.

On the other hand, it seems that Miki's need to avoid voluntarily participating in discussion may override the pressure to provide responses. The problem could lie in a gap in perceptions of the pressure to provide responses between Miki and her peers/lecturer. For both Miki and her peers, interactional as well as social pressures reduce as the topic and/or sequential organisation shift with other students coming into discussion before Miki can provide a response. However, the practical pressure still seems to remain in peer students' perceptions while it may be more important for Miki to avoid an uncomfortable disruption of flow in communication.

The last type of silence to be mentioned in this section is silence triggered by loss of
face. As observed in Tadashi’s case, there was an incident in Miki’s case in which loss of face was caused by being forced to acknowledge an inability to answer a question (interaction excerpts 7 and 8, section 6.3.6). As already mentioned, after this incident, Miki remained silent for 13 minutes until the very end of the discussion despite being the presenter. Even though the analysis of the relevant section explained the communication breakdown as being jointly created and did not attribute it entirely to Miki’s linguistic or intellectual abilities, it is possible that she herself attributed the problematic communication to her lack of these abilities. Anderson (1992), referring to Clancy (1986) and Bowers (1988), points out that in Japan, because ‘the main responsibility for interpreting a message is often said to fall on the listener’ (Anderson: 106), students are often too embarrassed to ask for clarification. The question asked of Miki was not clear, but she may have blamed herself for not understanding it, and felt too embarrassed to speak. This was not directly confirmed in the interview, but she mentioned that her presentation did not go well as the topic was not on her own project but on a reading material, which implies her view that lack of grasp of the topic was the problem.

As shown above, face is an important factor in understanding Japanese students’ silence. However, in addition, we may need to consider how lecturers deal with face, since it appears that their preferences in dealing with face-threatening situations can affect Japanese students’ silence as well. That is, some lecturers seem to avoid making attempts to include less vocal students because they do not want to embarrass the students. Dr. Telfer commented:

[Interview excerpt 10 Dr. Telfer 276-8]
A: […] the direct questions (     ) the habit of doing, for two reasons. First, because I worked in (   ) Aboriginal communities and habit into it that singling out (   ) a direct question was a bad thing to do. And, second, because working with undergraduates in big classes, if you ask them direct questions you often put them on a spot.
I: Um...you don’t like to do it to (   )
A: No, we don’t. We worry about doing it because if someone doesn’t know the answer, it is really bad if they don’t have things to say, so... but, it doesn’t ...from the semester (     ) in order to get better participation from the students like Miki and Mike, I should ask direct questions.

Dr. Telfer is worried about direct questioning because students may be embarrassed if they do not know what to say. This means that an avoidance of nominating a student in the classroom is a negative politeness strategy to avoid imposition on others or loss of face. Ironically, as Dr. Telfer herself notes in the comment above, ‘better participation’ by students like Miki can be expected from direct questioning, as she elicited relatively long accounts from normally inactive students by direct questioning after becoming aware of
issues in classroom participation in the first recall interview. This is actually an instance where the presence of me as a researcher and a participant observer affected classroom interaction in the data, but in fact the consequence of this influence brought an insight into classroom participation. Returning to the issue of politeness, Ms. Hardy in Case Study 1 also mentions that students should not be embarrassed by being forced to speak:

[Interview excerpt 11 Ms. Hardy: 75]

[...] there are many other kids like him [Tadashi]. And the Australian kids that should not feel embarrassed - and to a certain extent, you know, as a tutor, I think you've got to be aware - if they don't want to speak…

She also feels that the ‘quietness’ of students such as Tadashi ‘has to be respected as well’, and she ‘won’t impose that [speaking] because you [they] don’t want it to happen’. She also says she is ‘scared of’ breaking down the ‘barrier’ she feels. However, as discussed before, the students are likely to be evaluated negatively by not participating actively, and unless the ‘barrier’ is broken, the negative consequences of silence will remain.

Thus, we can see that the politeness orientation of the lecturers can also affect the silences of Japanese students and that there seems to be a mismatch between the politeness orientation of the lecturers and the desired manner of participation of Japanese students.

6.4.3 Orientation to politeness in classroom communication

Apart from the avoidance of participation as a politeness strategy, another aspect of politeness is to be taken into consideration, and it is to do with participants’ orientation to politeness systems (Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995). In classroom performance, it seems that Miki tends to keep a distance from others while a stronger tendency to involvement is seen among her peers. This is also found in Tadashi’s case in the previous case study. As shown in the above section, Miki appears to use silence as negative or off-record strategy. Moreover, although, unlike Tadashi, she shared her own experiences with the class, she rarely negotiated interpretations of issues with others. In other words, no counter argument or alternative interpretation of issues was raised by Miki. For example, in the following excerpt, Miki is asked to give her view on the presentation by Gary. She indicates that she is not sure what would be the case in Japanese communication. Following this, Nakki, who lives in International House, shares her impression of Japanese male students who she finds 'really quiet'. Nakki's gaze is directed to Miki at this point, but there is a silence of 2.2 seconds (line 32), after which Sophia speaks about her views on gender differences in communication. Miki does not come back to the discussion after this.
[Interaction excerpt 14: M3 1 Gary]

1 Lect: I've got one more question, (.) it's related
to your (.) Japanese question, so we have
three [Japanese] speakers here,
4 Gary: [yes].
5 Lect: Miki, what do you think about it. (0.5) um
(0.6) the idea of male versus female ways
of responding to compliments.
8 Miki: =I don- I don't know if- (0.4) if (0.3) it's
9 because of female (0.2) and male, (.) but I
10 think it's true that (0.4) um female's
11 conversation goes on en en en on,=
12 ?: =Heh [hhh]
13 Miki: [be ]cause they tend to say (.) oh
14 that's not true but (this is true,)
15 Lect: Um [hum]
16 Miki: [just] like this,(example of)/(it's
17 like this? (1.2) yeah. (0.4) I don't know,
18 (0.2) if (0.3) it's general idea but (1.8)
ma-le, (1.4) like men, (.) really don't
19 that much as (1.0) do it (0.4) 'yeah.'
21 some (0.2) some men do but (3.2) I don't
22 know if - (.) I don't know if it's: cultural
23 (0.2) thing or, (1.5)'(maybe/I don't know)'
24 (1.2)
25 ?: 'Mm:::::::'
26 (1.4)
27 Nakki: Maybe it's too much generalisation but I've
28 had about twenty people (0.3) like in (.)
29 in and out all Japanese guys they're all
30 really quiet. (0.5) they won't say anything
31 unless you talk to them.
-32 ((Nakki smiles, gazing towards
Miki))
33 Sophia: Well I think um (0.6) men are like ( )
35 doesn't capture ( ) (0.5) what's
36 acceptable to say ...

Nikki's comment from lines 27 to line 31, with her gaze direction towards Miki suggest that Nikki expects a reaction from Miki. However, silence follows and Sophia comes in to offer a more general comment on male-female differences. Nikki's comment here is not a disagreement with Miki's comment but a second response to Dr. Telfer's question which provides an alternative view on the issue. Therefore, the pressure for Miki to speak at this point is not so strong, but nevertheless this example illustrates that Miki does not participate in 'negotiation' processes in discussion but withdraws from them. The following example also shows Miki's one-off participation pattern similar to the one shown above:

[Interaction excerpt 15: M5 1 Jay]

36 Tomo: [...] So I think (.) the students who come
37 from Japan or uh Korea China or
38 ( ), um:: might find
39 ( ) difficult I think.(0.3)
40 (Yeah.)
41 (0.2)
Miki: ye[ah]  
Miki: [when I am in]  
when I (0.3) when I am asked to: (0.2) give  
my own opinion, (0.3) I have to take some  
time to think (0.5) what my opinion is,  
(0.3) why ‘I (do) this’ (0.7) argument,  
cause (0.6) even when I was writing (0.3)  
something in Japan for school (0.2) work for  
(0.3) homework, (0.4) I wasn’t asked to: (.) give  
(0.3) my opinion. (0.2) I just (0.2) could  
get something from the book what it  
says, (0.8) and um I could say (0.5) I  
will agree or I will not agree, but  
I couldn’t give much of my opinion why I  
agree or why I don’t agree. (0.8). so: I  
sometimes still (0.2) find it hard  
for me to ‘give my own opinion.’  
(0.5).  
Lect: It’s also hard even for Australian school  
kids, (0.3) because (0.3) the- the question  
i:s, okay, the kids give their opinions  
(0.2) but is your opinion ( ) acceptable.  
(1.2) and are there a whole set- set of  
answers ( ) which the  
teachers will accept and those they won’t  
accept. (1.0) so to produce that- (  
), (0.4) teachers can be forming the  
opinions of the students by saying this is  
what’s acceptable ( ), so you  
know, (1.2) ((Lect facing the class))  
Miki: ((head and gaze go down))  
Lect: what about in Korea?  
WS: I (0.2) um when I was in Korea, the teacher  
is (wise) because ( ) students, u;m,  
...  

In the excerpt above, Miki talks, in a long turn, about her difficulty in adapting to a new educational environment (lines 45 to 59). She takes this turn by nomination, but she signalled her willingness to speak by leaning forward and making eye-contact with Dr. Telfer (around lines 41 and 42). The uptake of this signal by Dr. Telfer is obvious in that she instantly nominates Miki in line 43. Hence, Miki’s long turn here is almost self-selected, and she is ready to share her views with the class. However, after Miki’s comment, Dr. Telfer brings up a different perspective to Miki’s point, though not disagreeing or dismissing it (lines 61 to 71). A silent period of 1.2 seconds follows Dr. Telfer’s comment, and Miki’s head moves down. After a short pause of 0.3 seconds, Dr. Telfer nominates a Korean student in line 75. Again, after making one move for contribution, Miki does not come back to the discussion. Contrary to the eye-contact and body movement of Miki (lines 41 and 42) signalling her wish to speak, in line 73 during the silent pause, Miki looks down as if she is signalling that she does not have any more to say, although she could be
sensing pressure to talk. The lecturer's move to elicit more accounts from other students in line 75 implies that Miki's non-verbal signal is picked up by her.

This lack of reaction by Miki to the possibilities for negotiation can be explained by one of the characteristics in Japanese educational discourse in which negotiation of knowledge and interpretation of issues has almost no place (Yoneyama 1999; Harumi 1999; Kato 2001). Miki herself commented in her interview as well as in the above excerpt that she is not used to giving her opinions. It is not entirely true that she is not used to give her opinions, as she gives her opinions immediately more than once when she is asked for them. The difficulty seems to lie in the negotiation process in which one is required to find one's own position by considering alternative views provided by other participants. In Miki's case, it was not possible to find if the lack of reaction comes from the social perspective of avoiding conflict with others or from the cognitive aspect of unfamiliarity with the negotiation process. In fact, her dysfluency in interaction excerpt 14 seems to indicate that she is nervous because she did not have her ideas ready to be shared, and thus suggests her unfamiliarity with opinion exchange processes. Within the accessible data set for this case study, no further evidence for an appropriate interpretation could be found, but Miki's own account of the difficulties she feels in classroom communication supports the idea of a lack of familiarity with the negotiation process, while her fluency may also prevent her from reacting quickly enough. A preference for avoiding conflict, which Tadashi mentioned in Case Study 1, was not mentioned by Miki.

In relation to withdrawal from participation in negotiation processes, it appears worth pointing out that this may have affected the way Dr. Telfer perceived Miki's personality. Dr. Telfer mentioned in her interview that Miki appeared to be a 'very self-contained' person, and further noted that Miki 'didn't say anything spontaneously'. On the other hand, Miki actually expressed her concerns that she feels like a different person when she talks with native speakers of English. If she perceives the classroom interaction to be formal and, although unconsciously, puts her 'formal' face on, it is possible that her use of language and manner of communication reflect this orientation. It was also observed that in general the Korean students were more relaxed and lively than Miki. Nakki joked and smiled often, while Miki’s facial expression appeared tense compared to other participants. Another
Korean student Jay was also observed to participate more actively and in a more relaxed manner than Miki.

It should also be noted here that Miki may not have been socialised into the politeness system of the Australian classroom which is more informal than its Japanese counterpart, as she had not been studying in Australia for a long period of time. Moreover, the presence of a visiting scholar from Japan and the Japanese researcher as co-participants in the class may have deterred her from participation if she had a sense of inferiority regarding her background knowledge about Japan and its language.

6.5 Quality of participation (3) Topical preference

As a general tendency in the Intercultural Communication class, the content of students' comments and questions concentrated on students' own cultural experiences and knowledge. Dr. Telfer commented that she recognised what students from various cultural backgrounds had to say as valuable resources. Thus, accounts of personal experiences and participants' own cultural knowledge were frequently given in this class, and technical issues or theories were rarely discussed but provided in straight lecturing periods. However, issues concerning the methodology of intercultural studies as well as interpretation of results were also discussed in more neutral and abstract terms.

Miki's speech content also shows that almost all of what she said in class had to do with her background knowledge and experiences as a Japanese, or with her intercultural experiences in Australia. Thus, unlike Tadashi, who did not make comments based on his personal experiences and background, Miki expressed her personal views and shared her own experiences with the class. This preference is at odds with the pattern of participation emerging from Japanese students' comments in Chapter 4. It is possible that the differences are found not only because Miki preferred speaking about her own experiences but also because the focus issues of the Intercultural Communication class required and encouraged students to talk about intercultural issues.

However, it should be noted that Miki rarely voluntarily referred to or asked about other cultures than her own, while other students in the class did. For example, in interaction excerpt 14, Nakki gives her observation on Japanese male students in International House. Bill also asks about other cultures frequently, one example of which is his question about a crossover between English and Japanese apology in interaction excerpt 9. Mike, although he was described as one of the least active students in the class by Dr. Telfer, asks an open question of the class in interaction excerpt 1 to elicit how they
would react to a certain situation in their own culture. Similarly, Molly in interaction excerpt 7 shows her interest in how 'non-westerners' would find 'westerners' filling in gaps by themselves with 'um's and 'ur's. The absence of comments and questions in Miki’s speech regarding unfamiliar topics can be explained either in terms of face or in terms of relevance. She may have kept to her own territory from negative politeness, assuming a distance from other participants in class. It is also possible that Miki avoided a potential loss of face from saying something irrelevant on unfamiliar issues. On the other hand, it is also possible that she did not find the other participants' cultural backgrounds relevant for comment, as talking across or expressing interests in other students’ comments are rare in Japanese classrooms.

Considering this aspect of silence in addition to the lack of initiating moves and reactions mentioned earlier, refraining from showing her interest and involvement may have made her appear 'reticent' and 'self-contained' by her peer students and Dr. Telfer. However, the fact that she made moderate contributions with long accounts of her own experiences is a significant difference from what was found in Case Study 1.

6.6 Summary of the chapter

In this case study, the Japanese student Miki was found silent by other participants in class. Although she participated to an average degree in her own Presentation Discussions, a strong reliance on other-selected turns for participation was found. Moreover, Miki did not participate in ‘open floor’ situations at all in Regular Discussions, which could have further reinforced her silent image.

Another aspect of classroom interaction which may have influenced the perception of a silent image is the degree of control exercised by students. Miki was found to leave the control in interaction to the lecturer in opening and closing both of her Presentation Discussions. Furthermore, although Miki self-selects to ask questions, these were mostly clarification questions following her peers' topic-opening questions. There also seems to be a swing between being in and out of control which affects the silence. Once she is given full control of classroom interaction and finds the topic relevant, silence tends not to be found. However, when her control is threatened or taken over by her peers and the topic becomes external to herself, conspicuous silences may occur. When she is brought back to control by others, it can cause problems and further silence since she is not prepared.

However, the passiveness of Miki's participation was suggested to be a co-production of participants in classroom discussion in that gaps in interpretation of pauses and the
normative tempo of classroom discussion seem to have affected the course of discussion negatively, preventing Miki from full participation. Other participants' interpretations of the various silences used by Miki were found to bring misunderstandings and problematic conclusions to discussions although the intention may be genuine concern and support for a non-native speaker. Thus, the micro-analysis of classroom discussion revealed that Miki's participation is peripheral to the main arguments by other participants.

Finally, Miki's turn-taking patterns, her non-verbal behaviour as well as the types of topics on which she focussed suggested that she assumed a more formal speech situation and distance in the classroom than her peers and the lecturer, although her speech features show some informal properties of language. Consequently, a 'self-contained' or 'unconfident and shy' image was perceived of Miki.
Chapter 7  Silence: An Empirical View – Case Study 3

7.1 Background to Case Study 3: Aya

Aya is a 23 year-old female third year student studying for a Bachelor of Arts. Her degree program includes Japanese Studies, Korean language and Secondary Education. Before university, she went to a secondary school in Sydney from Year Nine to Year Twelve. Her original motivation to study in Australia was to acquire English skills. However, as she wanted ‘more than English’, she stayed on in Sydney to study at university. During her secondary school years, she stayed with an Australian family, but after moving on to university, started to live on her own. She has an Australian boyfriend, with whom she attends a church youth group regularly. She hopes to become a Japanese language teacher, and after completing her BA, she is to move on to a Master of Education program in LOTE (Languages Other Than English). Her spoken language proficiency was rated ISLPR 4+ by the native-speaker rater and 4 by the author.

The data set for this case study was offered by a Faculty of Education subject which will be referred to as History of Secondary Education. Four tutorials in which Aya participated for this course were observed. The duration of each was one hour. The lecturer, a middle-aged male Anglo-Saxon background Australian, Dr. Lucas, was also course coordinator. Three tutorials were held in his office, as this particular tutorial group had only four students, and one in a small classroom across from his office. The tutorial group had one male student from the UK (Henry), two female Australian students (Robin and Kathy) and Aya. Three of the four tutorials observed were individual tutorial paper presentations, each of which was allocated the whole hour. All the students were majoring in Education except Aya, who was doing this subject as part of her Arts degree. Aya, Dr. Lucas, Henry and Robin all participated in individual interviews.

Although the data set was mostly obtained from the class mentioned above, one two-hour observation in a class from Japanese Studies was also organised. This arrangement was made after Aya mentioned this class in her follow-up interview, but it was not possible to arrange video or tape recording in time since the term was coming to an end. The lecturer in charge was also not available for a substantial interview, but nevertheless valuable information was obtained in a short exchange with her immediately after the class observation.
7.2 Quantity of participation

As in case study 2, participation in tutorials given by other student presenters was considered for each student separately from participation in a student's own tutorial presentation. Following the conventions used in case study 2, hereafter the former type of situation will be referred to as Regular Discussion and the latter as Presentation Discussion. The contributions of all four participating students were coded for analysis, as the group was small enough to identify speakers in all the recorded data. The contribution made in Regular Discussion includes one one-hour tutorial in which Dr. Lucas delivered a class using newspaper articles.

Looking at Aya's contribution in Regular Discussion in Table 7.1 below, her participation shows almost average frequency in the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Number and length of turns in History of Secondary Education (Regular Discussion: Total)

The results above show that Aya is not significantly inactive. On the other hand, Henry participates twice as frequently as the second most actively participating student Robin. In addition, his total turn length is overwhelmingly longer than Robin's. From these factors, it appears that Aya is an average participant in terms of frequency of contribution, and not necessarily a silent student. However, in the follow-up interview, she was perceived as a 'quiet' student by Dr. Lucas:

[Interview excerpt 1: Dr. Lucas 33]

[... ] My general impression was that she was very quiet and very retiring so it needed some real, I suppose, a real decision on my part whether I was going to ask her questions or bring her in because I felt just that she would have been quite happy to be in the corner and not really part of it.

[...]

As the comment above shows, Dr. Lucas not only found her 'very quiet' but also lacking in interest and engagement. One of the peer students, Robin, also commented on Aya's silence, saying 'she's really - she seems quiet', although she said another student, Kathy, was also 'pretty quiet'. Another peer student, Henry, mentioned, 'She didn't really ask - I have rarely heard her ask too many questions'. However, the results of coding actually show 4 questions by Aya, 6 by Robin, 1 by Kathy and 6 by Henry in Regular Discussion, which in fact does not support Henry's perception. Aya also asked seven questions during
her own tutorial presentation. Hence, there is incongruity between the performance and the perceptions. To explain this incongruity, more details of participation patterns will be examined.

7.3 Quality of participation (1) Turn-taking and sequence organisation

As with the other two case studies, this section will look at turn-taking based on the results of coding and patterns emerging from turn-by-turn conversational analysis of interaction. Regular Discussion will be the main focus in discussing overall patterns of turn-taking, and a discussion of patterns at a more local and detailed level will mostly focus on how each presenter managed control in their Presentation Discussion.

7.3.1 Overall patterns of turn-taking and sequence organisation

First, Table 7.2 below shows that Aya is the second most frequently participating student after Henry through ‘bidding’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Number and length of turns through bidding in History of Secondary Education (Regular Discussion)

This has an important implication for perceptions of silence. In the two preceding case studies, the Japanese participants’ low frequency participation through ‘bidding’ seemed to have contributed considerably to the perception of them as 'silent students'. However, despite Aya’s participation through ‘bidding’ as often as her peers, she was still regarded as a quiet student. Although her total number of self-selected turns falls short of Henry’s and Robin’s, they are almost double Kathy's. However, Kathy self-selected her turns most frequently in Presentation Discussion, as shown in Table 7.3 below. We can see that Kathy’s turn number is twice as many as Aya’s.
Although in class Kathy was generally silent, looking sleepy and slumped in the chair often with her head bowed and arms crossed, when she gave her presentation, she was completely in control to the degree where it was difficult for other participants to have a say (see further details in section 7.3.2). Almost all the answers to the questions which Kathy prepared were answered by herself before others managed to respond, while Aya let others respond first. In this sense, Kathy demonstrated initiative and motivation when she was responsible for the tutorial paper. Nevertheless, Aya can still be described as an average participating student when the frequency of her contribution in her Presentation Discussion is considered.

Another important finding is the number of turns in ‘open floor’ situations. The results show that Aya is the least frequently participating student with only two turns. Table 7.4 below shows that Kathy is still low in her frequency here, but her average turn length is by far the longest of the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 Number and length of turns in open floor situations in History of Secondary Education (Regular Discussion)

In the preceding case studies, a low frequency of participation in ‘open floor’ situations was commonly seen in Tadashi and Miki, and in this regard, Aya shows the same tendency. What seems crucial is, however, that ‘open floor’ situations in Aya’s case were often created by either the teacher checking on the key facts discussed in preceding classes or by a student presenter asking questions for discussion. These questions for discussion are important in that the ratio of teacher-talking time in this tutorial was relatively high. However, the lecturer also expected the students to contribute to discussion and ask questions, as in his explanation below:

[Interview excerpt 2: Dr. Lucas 3]
[...] Relatively limited expectation in terms of performance because I'm a great believer that the written word is more reliable, more important than the spoken word because I think that under the circumstances of oral presentation, students can become easily flustered. It's sometimes difficult to create logical arguments, so I'm more concerned that the tutorial should be a forum where things are explained one way or another. So the assessment of students is not high on my agenda. I do like to see students listening, engaged, asking questions and contributing to the discussion but I don't have any particular expectations about performance as such, although they do give one presentation during the semester [...]

Moreover, the questions for discussion at the end of a presentation directly address the key points each week, and the presentation is assumed to provide guidance on these points. Thus, responding to these key questions in an ‘open floor’ situation can be a good indicator of engagement, interest and understanding of the subject. The average number of turns in ‘open floor’ situations was larger than that in the ‘bidding’ category for all the students in the class except Aya. This could have resulted in the impression that she is 'quiet and retiring' as described by Dr. Lucas (see interview excerpt 1). One of the reasons that Aya did not participate in ‘open floor’ situations can be found in her comments, which suggest that her withdrawal from participation in ‘open floor’ situations is due to her lack of confidence in grasping the content of the class:

[Interview excerpt 3: Aya 109]

[This subject] is difficult. [Dr. Lucas] has really, so, got his principles, and I think he is a very good teacher, and the way he talks makes it very easy to listen, so that is good, but you know, my knowledge doesn't keep up with it. When I can understand, really, I understand, I find it useful, but after all, how can I say, um... I also [attend the class] thinking, 'I don't understand.'

She also mentions that she feels that her English skills are inadequate to grasp the content of the reading materials. She explains that she cannot speak as much as she wants because of her lack of confidence:

[Interview excerpt 4: Aya 153-155]

A: [...] This, to be honest, with this subject I don't have any confidence ['confidence' spoken in English], so you know, yeah, I want to speak, even if I want to speak more, I can't.
I: Um, so you had things you wanted to say but you couldn't.
A: So um, I really wished I could have read more. Yeah.

These difficulties in fact lead to a lack of interest, according to Aya, who commented that the class 'was a bit awkward, so I didn't enjoy it at all', and that her motivation for this subject was '40 percent, less than half'.

In Table 7.5 below, we can see that Aya has the largest number of other-selected turns, all selected by Dr. Lucas. It is possible that Dr. Lucas made attempts to include Aya, as she did not respond to the key questions after the discussion as often as others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>No. of classes included</th>
<th>Total number of turns</th>
<th>Total turn length</th>
<th>Average no. of turns per class</th>
<th>Average turn length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5 Number and length of other-selected turns in History of Secondary Education (Regular Discussion)

In fact, Dr. Lucas noted in the follow-up interview that the researcher's presence and project made him 'sensitive to Aya's position in the group'. As found in interview excerpt 1, he could have let her 'be in the corner and not really part of it'. This in turn suggests that if he had not become 'sensitive to Aya's position in the group', she would not have been nominated as many as the nine times shown above. Dr. Lucas’ comments, including the one in interview excerpt 2, suggest that although quantitatively Aya made an average level of contribution, she was negatively evaluated in terms of her engagement and commitment to the subject. This is despite Dr. Lucas’ self-reported low weight on participation performance in assessing academic competence and commitment of the students (see interview excerpt 2). The negative evaluation of Aya's participation must come from certain aspects of classroom performance other than the overall frequency of participation. If so, how were the lack of interest and engagement communicated to Dr. Lucas and the peers, when she was not significantly silent in terms of the quantitative aspect of participation? This question will be explored in the following sections.

7.3.2 Interactional roles in presentation

In the session other than the tutorial papers given by the students, Dr. Lucas delivered a class similar to a lecture, but occasionally nominated students for an answer or asked an open question to the whole group. In the three sessions of student presentations, the student presenter read out a summary of two papers designated as the compulsory reading for the week. While the summary was read out, Dr. Lucas gave comments or asked questions from time to time in relation to the issues in the paper. Any students who wanted to make comments or ask questions could also do so during the summary presentation. Once the presentation of summary was over, key questions for discussion were asked of the group by the presenting student. However, responses were often directed, although not always explicitly, to Dr. Lucas for feedback. The following excerpt is an example from the discussion after Aya's paper:
A frequently observed pattern in Presentation Discussions can be found in this excerpt. That is, when the student presenter asks a question (e.g. lines 10 to 14), a student responds (lines 16 to 18), and Dr. Lucas gives feedback (lines 20 and 21). Although the question was asked by Aya, who is the tutorial leader, Dr. Lucas provides feedback to Robin's response and takes over the question. Robin's question is a multi-unit turn with a latched sentence towards the end which minimises the possibility of another speaker coming in until it is completed. Thus, it is not likely that Dr. Lucas responds to Robin because of Aya's not providing feedback to Robin's response or a response token such as 'yeah'. Instead, there seems to be a general assumption in this class that the lecturer is the person to provide feedback to responses to discussion questions. Thus, after providing feedback, Dr. Lucas implies that there is a more important answer to the question (line 23 'But it's not just demand') and in lines 23 to 27 rephrases the initial question asked by Aya. In addition, although it is not possible to ascertain to whom Robin directed her question from the video recording, Robin's interview comment supports the above assumption:

Robin further comments that students 'were talking towards the lecturer' in her tutorial as well. She also mentioned, 'If they ask me, “Is that right?” I'm going to sort of say, “I don't know”, you know, “ask him” '. Thus, it is reasonable to say that in general, Dr. Lucas seems to exercise a considerable control over discourse in this class.
However, when we examine each tutorial paper presentation closely, the presentations are different in a number of ways, in particular in terms of control and interactional roles. Aya seems to be having difficulties in managing control and takes a passive role, which is likely to have resulted in her silent image. The following analysis and discussion will focus on how each student presenter dealt with control in their tutorial discussions.

First of all, let us look at Kathy’s presentation. Although the above-mentioned pattern of Question (student)-Response (another student)-Feedback (lecturer) was common in tutorial papers by Aya and Robin, Kathy answered almost all her questions by herself, leaving no time for others to respond. The excerpt below is one example:

[Interaction excerpt 2: A2 Kathy 20]

```
52 Kathy: The third question was um (0.2) what
53 forces (0.2) led to the new academic
54 schools for girls which competed with boys
55 in public examinations (.) and for places
56 at universities and how did they reconcile
57 such activity with conservative ideologies
58 concerned with women's place in society?
59 ->59 · hhh (.) I think the first (0.3) force
60 (. ) which led to these schools was the
61 church, ( . ) · hh I mean state controlled
62 (0.4) the primary education of (         )
63 church becoming (0.2) interested in
64 secondary education, ( . ) so it was a
65 (    ) (    ) they certainly wanted
66 to move into?
```

In line 59 above, Kathy breathes in immediately after the end of the question which she herself asked and starts giving her own response to the question, creating a monologue rather than a discussion. Her rate of speech, moreover, is faster than others. This can be found in the above excerpt as she only pauses 0.1 second between lines 54 and 58. Only after Dr. Lucas’ feedback and rephrasing of questions did other students provide their views, if they had any to share.

Kathy’s dominance in discussion in her own tutorial paper can also be found in interaction excerpt 3 below:

[Interaction excerpt 3: A2 Kathy 20]

```
 1 Kathy: So certainly by no means was some (      )
 2 stereotype (    ) commands of this
 3 time, (0.2) it was very much justified as
 4 a good school.
 5 (1.1)
- >6 Kathy: Any comments?
 7 (1.3)
->8 Kathy: No,
 9 (0.3)
10 Lect: Well just to say that there were broad
```
11 Kathy: range of these schools.
12 Lect: Yeah that just that
13 Kathy: I'm=
14 Lect: =And some of them are horrible little ones
15 were pretty horrible so,
16 (0.2)
17 Kathy: So (. ) I mean from the (0.2) the articles
18 really it's just a generalisation, (0.5)

In the above excerpt, Kathy gives a response (lines 1 to 4) to her own question, after which there is a pause of 1.1 seconds. As no one speaks, she asks if there is any feedback by saying 'Any comments?'. She waits, but after a 1.3 second silence, she attempts to close the sequence by saying 'No' in line 8. With the continuing intonation at the end of this, and a short pause of 0.3 seconds, she could even have continued on. Up to this point, Kathy fills all the slots in the interactional sequence, namely Question-Response-Expansion sequence [question-(silent response)-closing]. Only in line 10 does Dr. Lucas provide the 'comment' that Kathy asked for, preventing her from closing the sequence. Kathy's control in the discussion can be described as a powerful one since she manages to elicit a comment from Dr. Lucas in an explicit manner rather than to have Dr. Lucas voluntarily providing his feedback. Moreover, she frequently counter-argues Dr. Lucas or reasserts her point on the same issue after Dr. Lucas provides his comment, which is exemplified by the excerpt above in lines 12 and 17 to 18. In line 12, she overlaps Dr. Lucas near a TRP (transition relevance place), trying to make her point, although she is interrupted by Dr. Lucas (line 14). In line 17, she takes over Dr. Lucas' 'so' in line 15 and makes yet another attempt to get her point heard. The 'So' in line 17 can be interpreted as a signal to reintroduce or round up a previously discussed information or a topic (Schiffrin 1987). Hence, with her fast rate of speech and turn-taking moves along with the strategic use of discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987) such as 'So', Kathy manages to keep the focus on her own line of argument and exercise control almost as much as Dr. Lucas does. Kathy's manner of delivery was such that it excluded others from discussion and made Dr. Lucas suggest that the views of other students should be heard.

Let us now turn to the case of Aya in her presentation. She was actually the opposite of Kathy during the question time in terms of control. The first response to each question was without exception given by another student, and the feedback was always given by Dr. Lucas. In all, she gave one response to discussion questions in her own tutorial session. This response by Aya came after Dr. Lucas' feedback to another student followed by his rephrased question, which can be found in interaction excerpt 4 below. This stretch of talk
overlaps with the end of the exchanges in interaction excerpt 1, in which Robin is the first respondent to the question:

[Interaction excerpt 4: A3 Aya 9]

23 Lect: But it's not just demanded there's been
24 demanded (0.5) from (1.2) the eight
25 fforties (0.3) But why is it in this
26 period (.) the state really (0.2) starts to
27 pick it up<.

28 Aya: is it competition (0.8) between (0.2)
29 state and ( )

30 Lect: =competition between,
31 Aya: =State and (            )°=

32 Lect: Yeah=except that competition actually
33 suppressed the state for a long time that
34 (0.2) the privates and the cooperates
35 really tried to stop the state (0.4) So
36 again it's the question of why did the
37 state (0.2) really ( . ) set these schools up
38 ( . ) when there was so much opposition ( . )
39 very powerful people.

What is noticeable here is the pause of 9.3 seconds between the question and the response in line 28. When Aya responds, her response often comes after a long pause, which forms a sharp contrast with Kathy, who does not leave long pauses before she speaks as shown in interaction excerpts 2 and 3 above. Moreover, voice projection is another issue here. Because Aya's question is inaudible towards the end, Dr. Lucas initiates a repair in line 31, but Aya's voice remains soft. A similar incident occurs once more towards the end of the same discussion when Aya comments on one of the issues raised through a question. Dr. Lucas in fact indicated in the interview that it was difficult to hear Aya in class. From the observation and the video recording, it is also clear that Aya's voice was soft and difficult to hear compared to her peers'. This can be another reason why Aya was perceived as 'quiet' and 'retiring' by Dr. Lucas and her peers.

Finally, when we look at Robin's tutorial presentation, she appears to be a mixed case. Just as Aya waited for other students to respond to her questions, Robin also had other students respond to her questions and most of the time had Dr. Lucas give feedback to the responses. What is different from Kathy's or Aya's case, however, is that she provided feedback to her peers' responses, as we can see below:

[Interaction excerpt 5: A1 Robin 14]

1 Lect: When I ( ) (meet) people who went to my
2 high school, (0.4) um (0.3) I always know
3 who everyone at high
4 school was but none of them th(h)ey never
5 remember me, I(h) was so insignificant.
In the excerpt above, Robin responds (from line 17 to 24) to Henry's answer to the question (line 15), instead of immediately having Henry's response evaluated and commented on by Dr. Lucas. It is however possible to see that in line 24, her intonation goes up, which suggest that she may be addressing Dr. Lucas to have her views evaluated. To support this interpretation, she repeats the main point of her feedback to Henry in lines 26 and 27, after receiving no response for 4.6 seconds. From a 'performance' and 'engagement' perspective, Robin's move to take the role of providing feedback is effective, since being able to evaluate a response to a discussion question can indicate one's grasp of the tutorial topic and commitment to the course. The assessment for the tutorial presentation included 'leadership', and this meant that student presenters were required not simply to read out their summary but to 'lead' the tutorial. In this regard, Robin seems to have been effective.

In addition to the discussion questions provided in the course information, she made up a couple of questions for discussion herself, including the one in the above excerpt, while other students took all their questions from the course information. As mentioned earlier, Robin commented in her interview that the questions prepared by Dr. Lucas were difficult and she would be happy to see other students directing their responses to Dr. Lucas since she could not be sure about the answers herself. By making up questions by herself, however, Robin made it possible to take the role of discussion leader and to control the discussion. It should also be noted that she gave feedback to a response to the questions prepared by Dr. Lucas as well. In this regard, Kathy also seemed to be in control of her tutorial paper because of her careful preparation and good grasp of the content of articles,
as she manages to justify her points of view by quickly referring to supporting information from the article.

On the other hand, Aya indicated in her interview that she 'hadn't prepared enough' and 'hadn't read enough' for her presentation. It is possible that Aya's lack of response or feedback to responses in her tutorial paper discussion is due to her inadequate understanding and preparation as well as lack of confidence in her grasp of the subject matter. This is further supported by her non-verbal behaviour during her tutorial discussion. For all the questions for her presentation, she kept her gaze down after she had read out each question until someone else volunteered a response after a long pause. Only when someone started to speak, did she look up. This suggests that she avoided eye-contact with Dr. Lucas who was sitting directly across from her so that she would not receive any signals encouraging her to speak as a tutorial leader. This interpretation was also reflected in the comments of one of the peer students Robin:

[Interview excerpt 6: Robin 91-95]
  R: [...] I suppose she was sort of quiet in that maybe-
  I: Who? Aya?
  R: Yeah.
  I: Okay,
  R: That may be she wasn't sure of the answers herself. That was what
  it was like in my tutorial.

It is interesting that Robin says that she was not sure about her own answers in her tutorial either, although analysis of interaction in Robin's tutorial and Aya's reveals different turn-taking behaviour by the presenters. Robin's eye-gaze was frequently directed downwards onto her notes, but she provided more responses and feedback in relation to her own questions than Aya. From Robin's interview comments, it appears that she tries to speak even if she is not sure. She says, 'Dr. Lucas expects us to make our contributions’, and if the students are noticed for being 'quiet’, they have to 'make up something’. She also mentioned that she made an effort to participate because she was aware of being marked for participation.

This section showed how the student presenters managed control of discussions revolving around key questions. The analysis suggested that Aya’s silence and non-verbal behaviour did not give her interactional roles to maintain control, which was required in the presentation.

7.3.3 Controlling shifts and boundary in discussion: pause and discourse markers
Turning from interactional roles to the management of shifts and boundary in classroom interaction, it is possible to find various strategies used by the student presenters in handling shifts in stages of presentation. It appears that the presenter's management of shifts in discussion can be one of the key factors affecting control in interaction and silence.

Let us first examine Aya's strategies around the shifts. To begin with, one of the common features of Aya's talk around shifts is the long pause. The pauses which occur between Dr. Lucas' comments and Aya's preface to questions (i.e. announcing that a question is going to be asked) in Aya's tutorial paper discussion are often as long as around 10 seconds, as seen in the following short excerpts:

[Interaction excerpt 6: A3 Aya 9]

145 Lect: . . . I mean you can have a
146 scientific education which is the one
147 you want. But um (0.7) during this century
148 ( ) curriculum is still (0.5)
149 historical, literary () subjects.
->150 (7.3)

->151 Aya: U:m (1.0) next question? U:m how did they
152 relate to the often older cooperate cooperate
153 school.

[Interaction excerpt 7: A3 Aya 9]

204 Lect: All high schools (0.4) were selective high
205 schools (0.3) until after World War Two.
->206 (11.2)

->207 Aya: And the fourth one, (0.2) What assumptions
208 were made (.) about curricula (.)
209 appropriate to females and males?
210 (8.9)
211 Henry: That girls would be doing the domestic
212 classes.

In the interaction excerpts above, there is a long pause between Dr. Lucas’ comments and Aya's prefaces to questions. In these pauses, Aya keeps her gaze down on her notes, looking up briefly towards Dr. Lucas who is sitting across from her, just before she puts her gaze back to her notes to look at the questions. It is possible that the long pauses are the consequences of the downward gaze to her notes which makes it difficult for her to have eye-contact with Dr. Lucas to negotiate the timing of the next turn. However, it should be noted that when other students present their tutorial papers, they also tend to have their gaze down while Dr. Lucas is talking, in order to take notes of the relevant information for their essay assignment. Nevertheless, transitional pauses as long as those in
Aya's presentation are not found in the other presentations. In this sense, Aya’s use of silence is more extensive than the other students.

Another feature which seems to characterise the shifts in Aya's presentation is a combination of 'um' or 'and' and a short pause before the question preface is given, as seen in interaction excerpt 6 above. This does not guarantee a shift from Dr. Lucas' talk to the next question, although it signals the presenter's wish to speak regardless of the intended act to follow. They still allow space for participants to talk about the preceding topic. The following excerpt shows Aya using 'And' in a similar context and actually being intercepted by Dr. Lucas.

[Interaction excerpt 8: A3 Aya 9]

169 Lect: . . . Another (King) School Parramatta, 170 what he wanted (Fort street) today. But um 171 (0.3) it's not to be sg:. 172 (2.2)
->173 Aya: "And" 174 (0.9) 175 Lect: A love hate relationship=I would say ( ). 176 (2.3) ->177 Aya: Um (0.6) third question? (. ) Um were the 178 early state high schools founded on 179 principals of universal or meritocra (. ) 180 tic? access.

Here, Aya’s eye-gaze is on her paper in line 172, and as she says ‘And’ in a soft voice she turns the page, getting ready for her next question. However, The lecturer continues to talk about the previous topic. If Aya had projected her voice more in her 'And' in line 173, she may have directly moved on to the preface to the next question. As Dr. Lucas took a turn in line 175, intercepting the softly pronounced 'and', Aya had to do her negotiating work again by waiting a few moments and start again.

However, we can also see a shift without the short pause following 'um' or 'and' such as the one in interaction excerpt 7 above. In this particular case, because the previous question was of a 'one way or another' type, it was clearer for participants to know the concluding part to the section before a new question was asked. Another explanation is that with 11.2 second silence after the lecturer’s turn, Aya may have thought that she spent too much time on note-taking instead of leading the discussion. During the 11.2 second silence, Aya writes for around 9 seconds and then glances upwards at the class and then brings her gaze back on her notes. Thus, it is likely that she rushed through in line 207 due to the unusually long pause which preceded this turn.

Turning now to tutorial sessions with Kathy and Robin as presenters, we find that not only are the transitional pauses shorter but also their questions are often prefaced by 'okay'
or 'so' rather than 'um' or 'and'. There are also instances of shifts in which the question directly follows the end of Dr. Lucas' comment after a short pause without any preface. 'Okay' in this context in which the discussion on one question comes to an end and the shift to the next question is about to take place serves as a boundary marker to signal the shift in the focus of discussion (cf. Sinclair & Coulthard 1975; Schiffrin 1987; Dorr-Bremme 1990; Hatch 1992; Beach 1993; Rendle-Short 2000). The excerpt below is an example from Robin's tutorial paper:

[Interaction excerpt 9: A1 Robin N2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lect:</th>
<th>It's a huge social revolution. (0.5) with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>all sorts of <strong>terrible</strong> consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I think).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&gt;5</td>
<td>Robin:</td>
<td>Okay, (0.2) ↑what led to high schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>taking this approach to youth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above excerpt, 1.6 seconds after Dr. Lucas' comment, Robin marks the shift from the discussion on the previous question to the next question by saying 'Okay'. In this way, although Dr. Lucas has not explicitly signalled the end of his comment, Robin's decision that it is time to move on to the next question can come into effect. Compared with the comment-question transition with Aya as tutorial presenter in interaction excerpts 6 and 7, both the inter-turn pause and first pause within the presenter's turn are shorter. In addition, 'okay' is a more powerful expression to decisively signal boundaries than 'um'. While 'okay' can signal 'readiness to commence the next section of talk' (Rendle-Short 2000: 26), 'um' and 'and' signal continuity in talk. It is then possible to say that Aya's strategies are
less powerful in terms of control over the discussion, and consequently this could lead to negative judgements about her 'leadership' and 'engagement' in tutorial discussions.

Similarly, 'so' can function as a boundary marker (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975; Schiffrin 1987). Its basic and common function in classroom discourse is marking the 'concluding' act (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975: 43), and thus is often used to mark an end to a topic in order to move on to the next topic. The excerpt below is a case in point:

[Interaction excerpt 10: A1 Robin 14]

1 Lect: When I ( ) (meet) people who went to my
2 high school, (0.4) u:m (0.3) I always know
3 who ever- I knew who everyone at high
4 school was but none of th(h)ey never
5 remember me, I(h) was so insignificant.
6 Robin: Ya hah hah hah hah hah ha ha ha
7 ((other students also laugh but softly))
8 Kathy: Huh huh huh huh huh
9 ->10 Robin: So. (0.2) What was the: most dramatic
10 development (?) in the lives of American
11 adolescence in the twentieth century=do
12 you think.

Dr. Lucas in the above excerpt has been speaking about the significance of 'popularity' in high school social life. Towards the end of the comment he reflects on his own popularity at school and makes the class laugh by telling them he was 'so insignificant'. This personal reflection is related to the 'popularity' issue, but it is peripheral to the main track of the discussion and becomes a joke, as Robin bursts into laughter in line 6 and everyone else laughs. However, after a while Robin positions herself as tutorial leader and in line 10 brings the track of the tutorial discussion back to the next key question by signalling the shift with 'So' with falling intonation and stress. It is almost like saying 'Okay, back to the discussion question now', and thus this use of 'so' also can function as a powerful tool in controlling discourse.

The use of 'so' as a typical 'conclusion' marker to enable a shift in classroom talk as described by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) and Schiffrin (1987) is also seen in interaction excerpt 3 in Kathy's talk in her own tutorial paper. After trying to make her point in line 12 unsuccessfully because of Dr. Lucas' interruption, she waits a while and then takes advantage of Dr. Lucas' use of 'so' and a short pause to give her own opinion about the article. Kathy seems to assert her views with her 'so' and overpower Dr. Lucas frequently, assisted by her speech rate being faster than Dr. Lucas'.

Apart from the use of 'okay' and 'so', Robin also uses 'and' before she signals a shift in the focus of presentation from the first article to the second, just as Aya did at a transitional
In this stretch of talk, a number of things affect Robin's performance positively despite the use of 'And' as a part of a boundary in discussion. First, Dr. Lucas gives an explicit signal to mark the end of his comment and gives a cue to Robin in line 7 with 'All right'. This prompts Robin to quickly take control and move onto the next focus of the paper. Second, Robin's 'And' is clearly pronounced although not stressed. Moreover, the pause before 'And' is short. Third, as mentioned, Robin's 'And' is immediately followed by a boundary marker of 'okay' to clearly signal the shift. Finally, 'now' following the 'okay' also reinforces the message that the class is finished with the first article and a new topic is being introduced at that point. Thus, the transition in this excerpt is more decisively and clearly signalled than that in interaction excerpt 8 although both presenters used 'And' at a boundary. The following excerpt illustrates the differences in the approaches to presentation further:

[Interaction excerpt 12: A3 Aya 7]

1 Lect: So um (0.3) 'you know' (1.0) that's where
2 [Lecturer] disagrees with Bassant. So (1.4)
3 but it's a still good essay that one. (1.3)
4 and it's partly true. (0.6) °It's partly true°.
5 (2.3)
6-> Aya: And um (0.4) an the second article (0.4)
7 and (0.3) talks about the emergence of the
8 state secondary education, (0.6)
Although Aya is not intercepted in introducing a shift of focus from the first article to the second, the use of ‘And’ followed by ‘um’ and a pause preceding the announcement of the presentation on the second article indicates the continuation of her talk in her presentation and thus makes her talk more monologic rather than interactive. According to Dorr-Bremme (1990), 'framing words' (p. 388), which are equivalent to boundary markers, can play important roles as contextualisation cues in controlling and regulating classroom talk efficiently, and an absence of these ‘framing words’ is likely to cause problems in 'enacting authority' and 'maintaining the floor' (p. 389). Thus, it is possible that the perceptions of Aya being ‘quiet’ and ‘retiring’ are partly due to the lack of these ‘framing words’ in her presentation.

However, it should be noted that shift management is not simply affected by the presenter’s behaviour but also by other immediate contextual factors of classroom interaction. In Robin’s case in interaction excerpt 11, the explicit cue in line 9 by Dr. Lucas guarantees that the shift will take place. It also appears that Aya had a disadvantage in that her seat faced Dr. Lucas so that she had to rely mostly on non-verbal negotiation before she made a move, while Robin was given relatively more explicit cues by Dr. Lucas as she was sitting beside him where eye-contact was difficult.

When it comes to shifts occurring without any boundary markers but by directly putting out the next question, one could say that this is even more powerful than using boundary markers such as 'okay', although there is a possibility of blocking other participants from pursuing the previous topic without negotiation. The shift of discussion takes place the moment the question is spoken and it would cause a great degree of disruption to reconstruct the discourse to bring the focus back. Thus, asking a question without any preface or boundary marker can imply a strong assertion of control by the tutorial paper presenter. Below are a couple of examples:

[Interaction excerpt 13: A2 Kathy 20]

44 Kathy: We[l]l that]'s just (to) provide ( ) these
45 Lect: [ Yea:h ],
46 Lect: Yea:h.
48 Kathy: the- the accomplishment ( ).
49 (1.0)
50 ?: tsk
51 (0.4)
->52 Kathy: The third question was um (0.2) what
53 forces (0.2) led to the new academic
54 schools for girls which competed with boys
55 in public examinations (.) and for places
at universities and how did they reconcile such activity with conservative ideologies concerned with women's place in society?

[Interaction excerpt 14: A1 Robin N2]

1 Kathy: (prosperity) (.) for our society and °that
2 sort of [(thin)gs]°.
3 Lect: [Yeah:].
4 (2.4)
5 Robin: How did Stanley Hall's work on adolescence affect these processes[:],
6 Lect: [W]oo, (.) sorry,
7 (1.0)
8 Robin: °(Why), (      )°=
9 Lect: °(I think I deaft (too) °(      )°,
10 (0.5)°(I just) answered °(that)°.
11 (0.3)
12 (0.3)
13 Robin: Okay. (0.5) Um: so we just move on to
14 the next one then,< (1.2) The last one's
15 >sort of< (0.4) answered that question,
16 (0.2) Um: how did the high schools deal
17 wi:th: (0.2) relations between the sexes
18 (0.2) and students of different ethnic
19 and racial origins (.) °do you think°,

In both cases, the students ask the questions directly after the pause, although in Kathy's case (interaction excerpt 13), she prefaces the question by saying 'The third question was'. Nevertheless, the format of the sentence conveys the message that the question is coming as an embedded clause within the same sentence. Although there is an 'um' and a short pause just before the question itself, it will be an interruption if Kathy is intercepted here, as the 'um' and the pause are nowhere near the TRP.

In Robin's case (interaction excerpt 14), she goes directly to the question itself in line 5 without referring to the act of questioning. What is interesting here is that Dr. Lucas mentions that he has already answered this question in his comments for the previous question. Thus, the question asked without any preface is blocked, which requires recovering work (line 9 to line 15). Hearing the reason for the blocking, Robin says 'Okay' in line 13, which in this case can be characterised as a response token which acknowledges the receipt of information as well as a marker to 'close off a previous action' (Rendle-Short 2000: 25). However, having acknowledged that the question was already answered, Robin announces the change of plan in discussion in line 13 and provides an explanation for this change in a more 'public' and 'formal' way by rephrasing what Dr. Lucas has said in response to Robin's 'why' (line 9) in a soft voice in lines 10 and 11. It is possible that the pauses in line 13 and in line 14 could be there for negotiation of the next move, and this could be interpreted as a compromise or an emergency fix to the interactional situation in which the question in lines 5 and 6 has been blocked by Dr. Lucas. Nevertheless, by
announcing her judgement and decision regarding the shift of focus questions, Robin appears to make a public assertion that she is the tutorial leader.

So far, it has been shown that Robin and Kathy use more decisive strategies in controlling shifts than Aya. Aya's strategies appear to reflect a monologic rather than interactive style of her talk in her presentation and are often accompanied by extensive uses of silence. However, it is premature to assume that the patterns of strategies for shifts are due to individual or even cultural differences. As pointed out with Robin's case in interaction excerpt 11, various contextual factors, particularly the local context of talk, can affect the choice of strategies. It should be clarified at this stage whether Aya actually used strategies similar to other students' in handling a shift in interactional direction. Direct questioning without any preceding markers was not found in Aya's presentation, and 'so' as a boundary marker was not found either. However, there was a single instance in which Aya signalled a shift using 'Okay', as shown below:

[Interaction excerpt 15: A3 Aya]

312 Lect: [ . . . ] (0.3) The academic course
313 for girls was (0.5) French:, Botany,
314 (.) History. (0.4) The academic (0.6) uh::
315 subjects for boys were (0.3) mathematics:,=
316 Aya: =Mm hm,=
317 Lect: =physics, (0.4) uh: chemistry, (1.1) Latin.
318 (2.2)
319 Lect: They were still going strong in the mid
320 ninety sixties when I was at high school.
321 (0.4) °High school (        )°. (0.3) Yeah.
322 (1.0)
313 Aya: Mm.
314

->315 Aya: Okay the last question? (. ) What role
316 did university controlled public
317 examinations play in the early state high
318 schools.

In this stretch of talk, Aya makes a move for a shift from Dr. Lucas' comment to the next key question in line 315 by using the boundary marker 'Okay' with a stress on [ei], and without any pause she makes an announcement for the last question. Moreover, the pause before the boundary marker 'Okay' is shorter than pauses in other cases of shifting in Aya's presentation examined earlier (cf. interaction excerpts 6,7,8 and 12). Thus, Aya in fact uses the same strategy as her Australian peers to maintain control in the tutorial discussion.

However, this is unusual for Aya, as this is the single case in which she showed a similar pattern to her peers in shifting. One possible way to explain this particular case would be that the temporary 'rapport' established through the exchange between Aya and Dr. Lucas directly before the shift assisted Aya in making a quick and decisive move. In
the talk which precedes the stretch of talk in the above excerpt, Aya has volunteered a comment and received feedback from Dr. Lucas. She further asked a question during which no other students took a turn. Thus, it is possible that 'the turn order bias' which Sacks et al. (1974: 713) describe as 'last being next speaker' had been at work through the exchange between Aya and Dr. Lucas. If the 'turn order bias' was in favour of her securing the next turn, careful negotiation through a long silent pause and a hesitation marker may not have been necessary. It is also possible that she was more certain that Dr. Lucas had covered all he needed to say regarding the previous topic, since she was the one who raised the last issue on the previous topic. This observation in turn suggests that in other contexts of shifts in her tutorial paper, it may have been difficult for Aya to be in control because she rarely participated in discussion except for reading out her questions. On the other hand, if she had used more powerful strategies such as using boundary markers 'okay' or 'so' without long pauses, it could have given her more control in discussion even if her general participation was not frequent.

Another explanation can be given as to why Aya did not use ‘okay’ or ‘so’ in contexts except the one above despite the fact that these strategies were in her repertoire. Aya may have adopted a subordinate role of student rather than exercising leadership in the tutorial, particularly since she found Dr. Lucas ‘strict’ and this class uncomfortable. Further discussion of this issue in politeness in classroom communication in relation to silence will be in section 7.4.2 and 7.4.3.

Looking at how students handled their own tutorial papers and comparing them, Aya's approach to negotiations of shifts in discussion is found to be relatively subtle, silent and non-verbal while her peer students tend to be more explicitly vocal and verbal in their approach. However, it should also be remembered that the immediate context of talk including other participants’ communicative behaviour affects the choice of strategies.

Although a micro-analysis of non-presenters' turn-taking patterns has not been discussed here, non-presenters' contributions will be discussed below in the sections on formality of language use and topical preference where relevant.

7.4 Quality of participation (2)  Formality of language
7.4.1 Lexis and overlaps

With regard to formality of language expressed in lexical items, colloquial expressions such as 'like', 'I mean' and 'yeah' mentioned in the preceding case studies are also found in the data for this case study, and they were used by both students and lecturer. However, the
tutorials were more formal than the classes in the other case studies in that there was almost no use of 'you know' by the students and overlaps and interruptions were less frequent. Although the lecturer in fact used 'you know' frequently in his speech, it is possible that 'you know' may have been avoided by the students out of deference for him. In addition, students in this case study did not overlap or interrupt the lecturer’s talk as frequently as students in other case studies in the present research did. These factors suggest that in this case study the lecturer’s authority was felt more strongly than in the classes in the other case studies.

As to the formality of Aya's language in terms of lexical choices, it included the above mentioned colloquial expressions such as 'like' and 'yeah,' although 'I mean' was not found in the data. It was only Kathy who frequently used 'I mean,' and the other students rarely used it. Kathy's interactional style in fact exhibits more characteristics of informal language use than that of other students. She overlaps and interrupts more frequently and uses more positive politeness strategies such as using 'certainly' frequently (for example, line 65 in interaction excerpt 2 and line 1 in interaction excerpt 3) to provide her views on issues. The use of expressions such as 'certainly' reflects the positive politeness orientation to language use in that it functions as a modalisation to express an opinion rather than a suggestion (Halliday 1985, Martin 1992, Egginss 1994). Other politeness phenomena will be discussed further with examples, but apart from Kathy, Aya's lexical choice can be interpreted as neutral formality in this class.

As mentioned above, overlapping and interruptions in this class were not as frequent as in other case studies. Since Aya did not overlap as frequently as others but rather had longer silent pauses before she spoke, and, as we have seen in the previous section, she often used silence to negotiate the timing for shifts, more formality is observed in her language use than in that of the other participants.

7.4.2 Orientation to politeness strategies

Examining politeness phenomena in this class, there is a striking contrast between Aya's language use and that of the other students. Aya's language use in general suggests deference politeness strategies towards Dr. Lucas, while others were found to show more solidarity with Dr. Lucas with positive politeness strategies. The exchange below shows an incident in which Aya's deference strategy can be clearly seen:

[Interaction excerpt 16: A3 Aya 8]
Aya: This was in the period of economic recession, when ways and means were being used to cut government expenditure.

Lect: What would you say if I thought that your nineteen twenty three was a mistake.

Aya: Possible. Yes, very very possible.

Lect: Cause the nineteen thirties are great depression. In Australia, in most of Europe, most of North America, certainly in South Australia. They put fees on in high schools. I'd be very surprised if that shouldn't be ninety thirty three.

Aya: But I could be wrong. I've (Aya looks through the paper).

Lect: Maybe it's not worth checking now, but [um]

Aya: Sorry = Yeah.

Lect: But if it is, thirty three=

Aya: Oh no I haven't-

Lect: We'll check it later.

Aya: (Ye)ah. Yeah, um education and unemployment, During the depression, the greater education and the growth, of a skilled labour force would help to lessen the most pressing social problem of the thirties, that of unemployment ...

In the excerpt above, Dr. Lucas points out that the year 1923 which Aya has on her handout may be a mistake. He asks Aya whether it is possible, and Aya replies that it is 'very very possible' after 1.0 second in which she turns the pages of the article on her lap. It is unlikely that Aya spotted the error during the 1.0 second pause in line 9, as she still tries to find the relevant page in the article between lines 19 and 21. This means that without having strong evidence of her error, she deferred to Dr. Lucas’ suggestion. She also apologises in line 23 for suspending the paper presentation for a while to check the facts. In line 27, Aya also blames herself ('Oh no I haven't') for the confusion. Notice also that her apology (line 23) and agreement with Dr. Lucas’ suggestion to check the facts later (line 30 'Yeah') overlap with Dr. Lucas' turns, and her admission of her shortcomings (line 27) latches onto Dr. Lucas' turn (line 26). This also seems to indicate that Aya is trying to show deference to Dr. Lucas. This deference to Dr. Lucas was also noticed by one of her peer students:
[Interview excerpt 7: Robin 75]

[...] she said it's very possible, I think she said - or something like that. So that sort of showed that she was - like maybe she wasn't sure of herself which is very possible because it's - I suppose it's uh more detailed in the course or whatever. It probably shows that she's got a lot of respect for the lecturer as well. In that way, like that 'it was very possible,' like straightaway she said without hesitation like 'Oh no.' You know, 'That's what it said' or something, you know, she didn't say that at all. She's - yeah, whatever he's saying, you know.

Thus, in Robin's eyes, Aya's quick admission of her error stands out as it gives the impression that Aya has 'a lot of respect for the lecturer'. From Aya's perspective, whether or not she has 'a lot of respect for the lecturer', she certainly feels 'a very strong pressure' to make sure that she behaves properly and is well prepared:

[Interview excerpt 8: Aya 113]

[Dr. Lucas] is very, you know, experienced, and certainly his own knowledge, he knows his own subject well, and yeah, he is very well organised, so in that sense, I am not unhappy about him. To some degree, yeah, because he is too strict, or rather than strict, he is disciplined, I myself in turn have to be disciplined, that sort of pressure is very strong, so - yeah.

In the comment above, Aya expresses her mixed feelings about Dr. Lucas. She respects his knowledge and good organisation, but on the other hand, she feels pressure because of his 'strict' attitude. She tries to rephrase the negative word 'strict' in her comment, but as an impression of the teacher it may be what she had in mind. It is possible that this 'pressure' which she felt, along with the difficulty of the content (cf. interview excerpt 3), made the subject less attractive and enjoyable for her.

On the other hand, both of the two peer students interviewed commented not only that they liked the way Dr. Lucas delivered the tutorials but also that the small tutorial made the atmosphere relaxed and easier for students to make contributions, as shown by the comments below:

[Interview excerpt 9: Henry 17 ]

[...] because it's a small group, we have it in his office so it's a lot more - it seems a lot more informal than a tute. You feel a lot more relaxed because you're in his office and you get to sit down and talk. I find it's really good. I really like that a lot better.

[Interview excerpt 10: Robin 14-17]

I:  Do you think it's [the tutorial is] good?
R:  It's good because you can ask more questions and he can sort of - he's got the time to answer your question and it's less threatening, I suppose.
I:  What do you mean by less threatening?
R:  Like there's less people to sort of show their view over yours or something like that. Less threatening in that you're just in small cosy situation.

[Interview excerpt 11: Robin 53]

[...] it's good, because we're in the group situation so it's like he's sort of one of us, he will listen to us. I suppose he does the most of the talking, but I mean that's all right because at least getting informative - He keeps to the topic as well which is good.
However, it also seems that there is a combination of discipline and solidarity in the tutorial from these students' points of view. For example, Robin describes the tutorial as a 'small cosy situation', while she also mentions, 'if you haven't got your facts right, he'll pick you up and he'll say "No"'. Thus, the 'pressure' to keep up with the work and contribute appears to be perceived positively by these two students, whereas it is felt negatively by Aya. She also does not seem to feel the 'relaxed' or 'cosy' atmosphere in the tutorial, as she mentions it felt 'awkward' and she 'could not express' herself well.

A stretch of talk below which occurred during Robin's presentation illustrates this contrast in politeness orientation:

[Interaction excerpt 17: A1 Robin 12]

9 Robin: And okay, now, (0.4) Ueda? (0.4) who
10 looked at um Avenues to adulthood? the origin of the highschool and social
11 mobility in American suburb.
13 (0.4)
14 Robin: [A:nd]
15 Lect: [Now ] ca y um place Somerville for us::, and also in time and place (.)
17 where and when we're talking about with
18 this one.(0.3) Cause it's quite important
19 it ranges from hhhhh the turn of the
20 century to: the nineteen ninety
21 [( ) the first ar]ticle. But we need
22 Kathy: [ ((cough)) ]
23 Lect: to (0.5) look at where and when.
24 Robin: Okay, Somerville's in: (0.4) it's near
25 Boston? (0.3) um (. ) which is in
26 Massachusetts, (0.4) um]
27 Lect: [No] u.(0.4)
28 Lect: Massachusetts.
29 Robin: °[Massachusetts]. (0.5) EM EI
30 eh huh huh huh= 
31 Lect: =Uh huh huh huh [ hah huh huh ]
32 Robin: [here you go: ]
33 Lect: hah huh=
34 Robin: =Um uh heh heh (0.5) a:nd we are talking
35 about- (0.6) just the end (0.2) of the
36 eighteen hundreds, and early ninety
37 hundreds.

In this excerpt, Robin was asked to provide information about the time and the place she is talking about regarding the article (lines 15 to 23). She responds to this request from line 24, but pronounces 'Massachusetts' incorrectly (line 26), which Dr. Lucas corrects in the next turn (lines 27 and 28). Dr. Lucas points out the error in a direct manner with stressed and lengthened 'No' and provides the correct pronunciation. Robin starts her repair overlapping Dr. Lucas in a soft voice, but after a short pause, says the abbreviated form for Massachusetts, 'MA [em ei]’, in a loud voice with sudden pitch changes. This last part of
line 29 can be interpreted as a return of the repair to Dr. Lucas because in a sense she repairs the correct 'Massachusetts' given by Dr. Lucas. In this way, she plays a 'cheeky' trick. It also suggests Robin's perception that the pronunciation error is not a serious issue here. Dr. Lucas reciprocates the humour and laughs with Robin. With this return of repair with a joke, Robin successfully manages to turn the situation around from the tension created by Dr. Lucas pointing out an error made by a student to solidarity and a relaxed atmosphere. It is possible to see that by line 32 Robin is back in control, as 'here you go' suggests that the problem is solved. The tutorial paper is back on track, with Robin providing details about the time in history about which she is talking (lines 34 to 37).

In contrast, the exchange in interaction excerpt 16 above where Dr. Lucas pointed out the possible error on Aya's tutorial paper keeps Aya in a deferring position, as she admits her shortcomings without hesitation and the situation is solved by Dr. Lucas suggesting it is better to check the problem later. As a consequence, tension seems to remain, and Aya's nervousness can be inferred from her stutter in lines 31, 33 and 34 when she resumes reading her paper. The pressure to present herself as a well organised and well prepared student can explain her nervousness in a situation such as this.

This ‘pressure’ appears to have affected Aya's behaviour in other situations as well. She showed a tendency to avoid risking revealing her lack of knowledge. In the following excerpt, Dr. Lucas asks the group to give the name of the chancellor of Sydney University:

[Interaction excerpt 18: A2 Kathy 17]
After Dr. Lucas asks who the chancellor of Sydney University is, there is a 1.0 second silence, and Kathy starts to giggle as she does not have any idea. In response to this giggle, Dr. Lucas rephrases the question, to which Robin utters 'um:' (line 8) to indicate that she is trying to remember. However, Kathy comes in at this point to say she has no clue. Robin, on the other hand, says that she can picture him in her mind (lines 10 and 14), although she cannot come up with the name. Dr. Lucas tells Robin that the chancellor is not male (lines 15 to 16), and gives the answer.

It is interesting to see how the two students handled the situation in which they did not have the 'correct' answer to the question. Kathy openly admitted she did not have a clue. Her straightforward response without hesitation as well as her giggles seem to show her resistance or immunity towards the pressure to provide a 'correct' answer. On the other hand, Robin made attempts to show that she had some clue, even though she could not come up with the name. Robin’s responses are useful strategies in two ways. One is that she can show Dr. Lucas (and the class) that she at least has some idea and at the same time that she is engaged. The other is that she can fish for hints or clues from Dr. Lucas by indicating that she has some idea. Thus, Robin manages to cope with the pressure to present herself as a committed student although she does not know the answer by showing he engagement and requesting more clues to the answer.

In Kathy's case, as mentioned above, rather than attempting to comply with the pressure, she appears to beat back the pressure. With her it is generally clearly indicated by her language as well as her non-verbal behaviour whether she has ideas to contribute to the class or not. She either clearly indicates that she does not have much to say or stays silent with occasional yawns with her arms open wide or rubs on her eyes with her hand. However, when she has things to say, she overlaps frequently and takes long articulate turns. She also laughs more frequently than the others, which suggests that she is more relaxed.

As to Aya in the particular stretch of talk above, she was in fact the only one who stayed silent, as Henry was absent in that session. She also giggled when Kathy did, but she did it silently. It is possible that her silence, in contrast with Kathy's straightforward response and Robin's attempts to show her involvement, does not communicate her reaction to the question or engagement in the discussion. However, if Aya was sensitive about giving 'wrong' answers because of the 'pressure' which she felt to give a 'correct' answer, she may have opted for silence rather than losing face. In the following excerpt, we can find a silence attributable more specifically to Aya:
Here, a question by Dr. Lucas is directed to Aya in lines 7 and 8, but a 1.0 second silence follows. Dr. Lucas gives the first half of the answer in line 10, but the response is not heard for 0.4 seconds. At this point Henry gives the answer, which suggests that he judges that Aya does not know the answer. This would be a reasonable judgement, since there seem to be two opportunities for response given to the whole group before Aya’s name was spoken in line 7, and the pauses in lines 7 and 9 were opportunities for Aya to speak. Hence, altogether four possible slots for a response appear to have been missed by that stage. If this is the case, Aya’s silence can be interpreted as the ‘off-record’ politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997) to indirectly communicate that one does not know the answer or what to say.

When non-verbal behaviour is examined, Aya looks up as Dr. Lucas nominates her in line 7, and stays still with her gaze up and her chin in her hand until Dr. Lucas acknowledges Henry’s response in line 14. In line 14 at the short pause, Aya takes notes of the answer, nodding. Thus, it is likely that Aya had forgotten about the ‘cardinal principle’, but remembered it as Henry’s response was acknowledged by Dr. Lucas.

What is worth noting here is that Aya’s silence and non-verbal behaviour did not seem to clearly indicate whether she was thinking, had some ideas, did not have any idea or was embarrassed by being taken by surprise. As reported in the previous chapters, similar cases have been observed in the other case studies with the Japanese students. This type of silence was also found in my visits to Japanese high schools (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.2.3). Harumi (1999) also found this type of ambiguous use of silence among Japanese learners of English in Japan, and reports that the ambiguous silence was viewed negatively as ‘rude’ or ‘uninterested’ (p.171) by the English informants while the Japanese informants
‘interpreted its origin as cultural’ (p.173). This ambiguous silence may project an image of a student who is not interested or committed, as it is likely that silence is not interpreted as lack of confidence or understanding but rather as non-communication.

What the analyses of the above excerpts along with the comments by the students suggest is that Aya perceives the History of Secondary Education class as a formal situation in which power difference and social distance are assumed. As a consequence, Aya's orientation to hierarchical and deference politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995) and use of silence as one strategy are likely to have contributed to an image of herself as a 'quiet' and 'retiring' student, which is reinforced by the contrast with the solidarity-oriented politeness strategies of her peer students.

7.4.3 Silence and politeness in different contexts

In the above section it was argued that Aya seems to communicate based on a perception of the History of Secondary Education class as a formal situation while her Australian peers seem to assume a more egalitarian and solidarity oriented context. However, contact with other lecturers who had Aya in their classes revealed that Aya seems to communicate in a different manner and is perceived completely differently in other courses. One reason for this difference in Aya's performance and others' perceptions about her appears to be the influence of Dr. Lucas' approach to teaching as well as Aya’s impressions of different teachers. Another was found to be the content of the courses. In this section, the first reason will be explored. The second reason will be discussed in the subsequent section.

As Robin mentioned in her interview, Dr. Lucas clearly points out if there is a problem with what the students say, as we have seen in interaction excerpts 16 and 17 above. His tone of voice is deep but clear, and his careful but powerful manner of speaking can project an authoritative impression. Moreover, his masculine appearance with generally serious facial expressions can reinforce the authoritative image.

This image actually makes a sharp contrast with the image of a lecturer from Japanese Studies in the Faculty of Arts who spoke of Aya as positive and active. This female lecturer, who will be referred to as Dr. Riley, is always smiling and encouraging students in an explicit manner. Her tone of voice is clear but gentle and high. One of her colleagues described her as a 'sweetie' and her appearance seems to project a feminine image. What is significant about the difference in Aya in a different class is that, in a personal
communication, Dr. Riley commented that Aya's contribution in her class was 'terrific' and she was 'good in volunteering and vigorously talk in class’. In fact, one of Aya's Japanese peer students in Dr. Riley's Japanese linguistics class (who participated in the interviews discussed in Chapter 4) referred specifically to Aya and another Japanese student actively participating:

[Interview excerpt 12: F3 82]

[...] There are Japanese students who responds, but this, there are two girls who responds a great deal, but they went to high school here, so you know I feel that they are a bit different. [...] Japanese, even though they are Japanese, in that kind of way in class, they are not - sort of not hesitant as normal Japanese about participation. I watch these two girls admiring that responses pop out from their mouth. They are [Yuri] and [Aya].

As described by this peer student, and in confirmation with Dr. Riley’s comment, in Dr. Riley’s class Aya appears to be one of the most actively participating students and is admired by her peer student. This suggests that there were circumstances in the History of Secondary Education tutorials which made a difference to Aya's performance. It should be noted here that there were around thirty students in Dr. Riley’s class, which similar numbers of Australian, Japanese and Korean students, and a smaller number of Chinese students attended. (All the students had knowledge of Japanese language.)

One explanation to Aya’s different performance can be the perception of the politeness system which could be affected considerably by the degree of authoritarian image projected by the lecturers. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Lucas projects a more authoritarian image while Dr. Riley projects an opposite image. She shows her own enthusiasm about the topics in her subject as well as about student contributions with gestures, a high tone of voice and her facial expressions. A small number of Japanese students in her class were stunned and overwhelmed by her strong enthusiasm. Aya appears to have responded positively to Dr. Riley's encouragement, as she commented that Dr. Riley had given her motivation to participate:

[Interview excerpt 13: Aya 2-112]

[...] [Dr. Riley], how can I put it, she says we should ask about anything. I mean, she says there is no stupid question, and this, you know, just this makes me think of asking questions, like she says it is okay to say things like 'What is a verb?' So this motivates me very much. I like this kind of way very much.

Therefore, it appears that Aya assessed the atmosphere of Dr. Riley’s Japanese Linguistics class as more relaxed and accepting, which is in contrast with her perception of the 'pressure' in the History of Secondary Education class.
As a student from the Faculty of Arts majoring in Japanese Studies and Secondary Education, Aya is also enrolled in the History of Japanese Literature course, which she says is her favourite subject. Commenting on why she likes the subject, she says:

[Interview excerpt 14: Aya 92]
The subject for which I have the highest level of motivation is Japanese language, and particularly History of Japanese Literature, in Japanese History. [...] The class is also quite casual and so it is relaxed, and even though it is a big class, it is not very strictly controlled. In that sense, I find it comfortable.

The description of the class above appears to be in common with that of the Japanese Linguistics class. On the other hand, it is in contrast with Aya’s description in interview excerpt 8 of the tense atmosphere in the History of Secondary Education class.

However, it should be emphasised that Dr. Lucas did not expect students to present themselves as competent and well organised by giving 'correct' answers. It can also be pointed out that a space for negotiation as well as humour was there in his class. As he commented in his interview, he was well aware of the fact that students may falter in on-the-spot oral communication and that oral performance may not be as reliable as written language (cf. interview excerpt 2 in section 7.3.1). Moreover, the two peer students from this subject indicated their positive attitudes towards Dr. Lucas, both commenting that the tutorial sessions were 'informal', 'relaxed' and 'cosy'. These peer students appear to be aware that there is a space for an informal and relaxed atmosphere in his class as well as pressure for commitment, although Dr. Lucas does not explicitly express this to his students. As a matter of fact, Dr. Lucas himself commented that Aya's communication felt 'formal' to him. Thus, it is possible that the authoritarian image and the 'pressure' to perform well could have been overestimated by Aya, and this could have led her to communicate within a framework of a hierarchical politeness system. If other students in class had indicated or performed in a manner that showed they assumed a formal and hierarchical situation and perceived Dr. Lucas to be an authoritarian figure, Aya's performance may not have stood out as formal or 'retiring'.

7.5 Quality of participation (3) Topical preference
7.5.1 Difficulty of topics and familiarity with topics

In the History of Secondary Education class, it was mostly events, people, schools, and social changes which had taken place in the history of education that were discussed. Occasionally education in the past was discussed in relation to education today, but aspects of the participants' present day lives and personal experiences were not brought up in
discussions as frequently as in the two previous case studies. This suggests that those who have more background knowledge and experience in history and education in Australia or even the United Kingdom which had a great influence on Australian education may have an advantage over those who come from different educational and cultural backgrounds. The tutorial group for this case study had two Australian students, one British, and the Japanese, Aya. Thus, it is likely that Aya had a disadvantage in her background knowledge. Even though Aya had spent three years in an Australian secondary school, her background knowledge would be limited compared to those who were brought up in Australia or in the UK. Therefore, this can be another factor which affected her keeping up with and making contributions to the discussion.

As Aya's comment in interview excerpts 3 and 4 (in section 7.3.1) have already indicated, she does not have confidence in this subject, which makes it difficult for her to participate. This lack of confidence is clearly seen in her voice projection and eye gaze. Aya's voice projection was so soft that more than once Dr. Lucas asked her to repeat what she had said, an example of which can be found in interaction excerpt 4 (7.3.2). She also had a tendency to have her eye gaze down on her lap, and she describes this herself in her interview:

[Interview excerpt 15: Aya 71]

I think that kind of situation is in fact different from the presentation you give standing in front of the class, for example. So I wouldn't read looking down when I stand in front of everyone. I would look ahead or around. But in such a situation, although I try to look up a bit from time to time, if on the other hand you make too much eye-contact it makes me feel 'He might pick me next,' or something like that.

Although it is not only Aya who looks down to avoid being chosen by the teacher for contribution, her eye-gaze was almost always down when questions were asked, including in her own tutorial presentation. Furthermore, Aya never took the role of the first respondent to open questions for discussion. The two occasions on which Aya provided her response to key discussion questions came after other students had responded. One was when she volunteered her answer after Robin's initial attempt, which has been shown in interaction excerpt 4. It should be noted that Dr. Lucas could not hear Aya's soft voice in her response. The other occasion was when Aya was asked for a comment by Dr. Lucas after Kathy and Henry had answered Robin's question. The excerpt below shows a part of this talk, starting from the last part of Kathy's response:

[Interaction excerpt 20: A1 Robin 17]
It is worth noting that there is a long pause of 4.5 seconds in line 29 between Henry's response and Dr. Lucas' nomination of Aya. It is actually unusual for Dr. Lucas to leave more than 1.5 seconds of pause between his feedback to a comment or response from a student, but in this particular case, he does not give feedback to Henry's response immediately. It is possible that Henry's response was not convincing, but it is also likely that Dr. Lucas waited for Aya to volunteer a comment. After the long silent pause, he nominates Aya for a comment. Aya's gaze has been downwards during the silent pause in line 29, so she appears to be taken by surprise by Dr. Lucas' nomination. A number of stutters in her turns suggest her nervousness in being put on the spot, although she provides a long response.

Dr. Lucas, commenting on the way he organises tutorial presentations, indicates the importance of eye gaze:

[Interview excerpt 16: Dr. Lucas 11]
[...] I keep on assessing through their interest, through their eyes, whether or not I'm talking too much, so that's okay. But I do try and question as well although sometimes that doesn't work quite well because they get a bit frightened.

If one of Dr. Lucas' strategies to assess student engagement to the subject is non-verbal communication with 'their eyes', Aya's frequent lowering of eye-gaze around key open questions would affect Dr. Lucas’ assessment negatively.

Dr. Lucas also mentioned in the interview that he could not see Aya as a student 'asserting strong personality' or 'projecting mature and confident image’. Instead, he found hesitancy in her communication. On the contrary, Henry was positively evaluated by Dr. Lucas as being 'excited, engaged' with 'genuine passion for issues’, and showing 'personal interest' in the subject. Henry himself had an extremely positive attitude towards the subject and Dr. Lucas, as found in his comment below:

[Interview excerpt 17: Henry 73]
I found that I've learnt a great deal more because of the small tute and the small number of people in there. I find I've been really motivated to learn because I can do the readings each week because you're in small group. If you don't do the readings it's fairly obvious that you've not done the readings and you don't know what you're talking about. Where in a big class of 20 people, you can sit back for a week if you don't do any readings and not say a thing basically. But in a small group, you've got a (      ) of really learning a great deal more because of it and it's really - I think it's a lot better. It's good. I really enjoy the class and I like how it's run. I like how it's organised and things like that. I think Dr. Lucas is a very good lecturer.

As shown above, Henry is positive about the readings he is assigned to do. On the other hand, Aya found the reading assignments difficult and daunting:

[Interview excerpt 18: Aya 83]
The level of interest in this course, well, it was 70 or 80 percent. Then, I went to the lecture, well, the lecture is easy, you know. Just listen to it, take notes and have a look at it at home, thinking this part is talking about this, and so on. But when it comes to the tutorial, just the fact that there is this much reading lowered my level of interest. And perhaps when you look at the questions for presentation and the essay, they are pretty hard, so the level of motivation is - may be 40 percent. Less than half.

She further mentions that it is difficult to express herself because of the difficulty in grasping the concepts in reading. Moreover, she goes on to refer to her lack of competence in English to cope with the subject:

[Interview excerpt 19: Aya 149-151]
A: I suppose in this kind of class - it is difficult to say what I want to say, I think.
I: What do you mean?
A: Because of the lack of preparation, pretty difficult reading and my English competence, I mean the fact that I am not used to this kind of reading, it is quite hard for me to express myself. [...]
Although Dr. Lucas in this subject did not see her as an expressive student who showed interest and engagement, Aya’s comments suggest that she wishes to be one but is not able to be so because of her lack of ability and lack of preparation. As a matter of fact, there are a few incidents which suggest that Aya is not keeping up with the subject in terms of her academic English. The following excerpt gives one such example:

[Interaction excerpt 21: A3 Aya 3]

1   Aya: U:m (0.4) prime focus in the life of those
2   ->2 schools was (0.3) the literal, (0.2) and
3   3 performance of the school assembly in the
4   great hall.
5   (0.6)
6   ->6 Lect: U:m (0.2) that doesn't quite make sense
7   7 I don't think, (1.1) (       ) =what the:
8   (0.3) do you remember what that was about?
9   (0.4) than: the spelling.
10  Aya: I thought was um: (0.6) u:m (0.7) like
11   (0.3) (guess) by children: (0.6) reading,
12   (0.4) listening,
13   13 Lect: R[i:ght.]
14  Aya: ([probab]ly,)
15  Lect: Maybe: (. ) to do with literature or: (0.3)
16   16 the (treading) debate ( ) but
17   17 I'm not quite sure.
18   (1.0)
19  Kathy: ((clears throat ))
20  Lect: (Good),=
21  Aya: =Um (0.3) the curriculum of these schools
22   22 was dominated by the literary and
23   historical subjects [...] ((Aya reads on))

Here, Aya reads out what she had on her handout in lines 1 to 4. However, her sentence does not make sense and Dr. Lucas points this out by asking her what this sentence was about (lines 6 to 9). Aya explains her interpretation, but she does not seem to recognise the problem of 'literal' in the sentence under question. Dr. Lucas' lengthened 'Ri:ght' in line 13 suggests that he understands Aya’s explanation but is not entirely convinced by it. Thus he provides his possible explanation but expresses his uncertainty at the end of his comment in line 17. Nevertheless, Dr. Lucas gives a cue to Aya to continue (line 20), and the misunderstanding is left as it is.

This incident illustrates the problem which Aya appeared to have faced in this subject because of the weaknesses in her English and background knowledge of concepts in the field of education. As a matter of fact, what she did in her presentation was read through
sentences in point form. In the interview, Dr. Lucas commented that the series of written sentences on her handout was a 'collection of things and did not hang together'. In addition, he also commented that Aya's essay which was submitted later on on the same topic was not 'good at all’, and that she was 'reliant on the authority of text’ and not able to 'put the argument together’.

On the contrary, in the History of Japanese Literature class, Aya was evaluated positively by the lecturer as a student who 'stands out’, 'naturally jumps in and speak' and 'knows what to say' in class. She further mentions that Aya is 'always the first' to contribute. These comments are in sharp contrast with what has been presented and discussed in relation to Aya in the History of Secondary Education class. In the previous section on politeness, the impact of images projected by teachers on Aya’s politeness orientation and her silence was discussed. Another important factor affecting performance and perception of Aya’s communicative behaviour appears to be her level of familiarity with the topic. In other words, she has a great advantage in being a native speaker of Japanese in classes such as 'Japanese Linguistics' or 'History of Japanese Literature'. Aya herself commented on this advantage:

[Interview excerpt 20: Aya 92]
In the History of Japanese Literature class] there are quite a lot of readings, but these readings for this subject is not at all hard for me.

[Interview excerpt 21: Aya 99]
[...] [In the History of Japanese Literature class] because it's like we work on translation together, in a sense, you are all right even if you don't prepare properly, yeah. So in that sense there is less pressure. But in this [History of Secondary Education] class, if you haven't done the reading, you definitely cannot keep up, and you cannot enjoy the class if you haven't. So well, it's not really appropriate but it [History of Japanese Literature] is easy, and because it is about Japanese, it is possible to do the translation on the spot. So in that aspect, that subject gives me little pressure and so it is comfortable and easy I suppose. It is one of the means of retreat (giggles).

She also mentions that because her 'knowledge is double' on the topics in Japanese Studies subjects, it is possible for her to participate actively. Comparing herself as a student in different classes, she commented:

[Interview excerpt 22: Aya 151]
In situations like classes about Japanese language or something, I can, not exactly lead, but I can give my own opinion, or it's easier for me to do so. But this [History of Secondary Education] is pretty confusing.

As comments from Aya herself, her peers and her lecturers suggest, one of the explanations for Aya's silence in the History of Secondary Education class appears to be a lack of confidence and motivation in handling unfamiliar concepts in history and education.
expressed in unfamiliar genres of the English language. However, Aya's English in fact is the most fluent of the three Japanese participants in the case studies. A lecturer from the Japanese Studies whose class was observed once for this case study commented that Aya's spoken English is 'native-like'. Aya herself also mentioned that she prefers discussion to essay writing and that she is better at speaking than at writing:

[Interview excerpt 23: Aya 2-49]

[...] Essays, they actually get checked everything, all the words. So, even a little mistake of grammar can be checked strictly, you see. But because I am better at speaking, with speaking, even if your grammar is not good, you can rephrase and say 'Does it make sense?' or something like that to get the meaning across. So in that sense I feel less pressure in speaking.

In fact, Aya was the only one among the Japanese participants who openly indicated a preference for speaking over writing. Thus, we can see that fluency and general command of English do not necessarily guarantee more participation from non-native speakers. Gaps in language in a specific field and in knowledge schema required for each course can create difficulties in participation. However, it should be noted that Aya’s silence can also be interpreted as a consequence of her own lack of commitment, as she admits choosing Japanese courses as her ‘retreat’.

7.5.2 Application of personal life and experiences to classroom subject matters

Another explanation for Aya's silence in relation to topical preference can be that the course in the history of education may not require students’ personal experiences as much as other courses. However, Aya has a preference for talking about her own experiences, her own life and culture:

[Interview excerpt 24: Aya 2-91]

In Japanese Studies classes, how can I put it, more like not just about Japanese language but about cultural differences or something like that, when I can discuss these things, I quite enjoy it. So, in that linguistics class, we sort of, well it's pretty difficult because we don't find one answer, but I quite like saying what I think of other people's opinions or explaining things with my own experiences.

This preference for topic is evidenced in Aya's communicative behaviour in the History of Secondary Education class. There were a couple of occasions, when Aya talked about her own schooling experiences, in which she was more elaborate, and in which more overlapping talk in turn transition rather than long silent pauses was found. These occasions suggest that she was relatively more comfortable and engaged when talking
about herself or her own life experiences than when talking about matters with no association to her life or background. In the following excerpt, when Aya talks about her high school, she elaborates her talk more, and she is quicker in responding than in other instances of her participation:

[Interaction excerpt 22: A1 Robin 16]

1 Lect: ↑Just think about your own high school experiences. (0.4) U:m (1.0) that may be worth if you just sort of talk about sorts of clubs and extra curricula experiences. (0.4) U:m (0.3) that were there, which (0.2) maybe suggestive of the school. (2.0) °( )° importance of ( ), do you see reflections of any of these in yours?
2 Kathy: Oh no just the sport ones,
3 Lect: Yeah, so sport. That’s it.
4 Kathy: °That’s >about it<, (0.4) >that’s all<, °
5 Lect: Okay, what about you, Aya?
6 Aya: °( )°
7 Lect: What sort of high school did you go to where did you go [to] high [school].
8 Aya: [I went] to Christian school,
9 Lect: Yeah.
10 Aya: It’s uh: down Sutherland,
11 Lect: Right.
12 Aya: They didn’t- (0.2) >they had it< like some s- sports but they weren’t really (0.4) doing this. (0.5) Cause (0.4) they had it (0.2) but (0.2) and it wasn’t really compulsory with (0.2) school subjects = =>something like that?< = other than (0.4) say athletics °( )° sort of ° (=)
13 Lect: =°Right°. Now when you say that’s a Christian school, (0.4) U:m (0.7) is it u: m (. ) was it a school of: the sort of the traditional sort of (0.2) religions in Australia, or wha- some of the newer sort of America[ ]n sort of mission].
14 Aya: °Um huh°,
15 Lect: °Um huh°, They had uh: like uh: religious studies,
16 Aya: an- u:m (2.5) I’m- I’m not sure if it was really traditional. (1.0) was more (1.4) it was compulsory subject (. ) ygt, (0.3)
17 Lect: °( )°
18 Aya: I- I- I-(0.2) I think it’s some of the newer
Christian schools, which aren't the Church of England schools or the Uniting schools (.) **often take as their models**, Aya: Umm.
Lect: **American(.) high schools very specifically.**
(0.3) U:m (0.4) although I think >you know<
58 lnds of high schools don't really ( ).=
59 Aya: =Yeah.=
60 Lect: =I was just interested whether or not.
(1.2)
61 Aya: Cause the reform (0.2) churches from (.)
63 **Dutch (0.2)background [and]**
64 Lect: =Ah: right.=
65 Aya: =So u:m (0.6)it's not( )that traditional.
66 (0.4)
67 Lect: Yeah.=
68 Aya: =Um.=

In this excerpt, the students are asked to reflect on their own high school experiences outside the designated curriculum. Kathy's response in line 11 is short and unelaborated, which makes Dr. Lucas ask a confirmation question in line 13 to make sure she has no more to say. When Dr. Lucas’ attention turns to Aya, she responds, overlapping with Dr. Lucas before her name is mentioned. This suggests that rather than avoiding eye-contact, she was ready to pick up Dr. Lucas’ non-verbal cue. Although there is a slight problem between lines 19 and 23 because of Aya’s voice projection and Dr. Lucas’ modification to his question, Aya provides a response to the initial main question which was about extra curricula experiences. Dr. Lucas asks a further specific question about Aya's high school. Aya overlaps again with Dr. Lucas in a slightly interrupting manner at a spot not necessarily close to a TRP to respond to the question. She goes on to provide details of her school in relation to its religious background. Aya makes further comments on the nature of the 'reform church' in lines 62, 63 and 65. In all these exchanges, turn transition and adjacency pairs run smoothly with overlapping, latching and less than 1.5 seconds transitional pauses, although the overlapping talk occasionally occurred in a slightly interrupting manner. This exchange shows turn-taking and pause management which is in contrast with the general characteristics of Aya’s turn-taking and pause management in which expansion of sequences was rare and long silent pauses in turn transition were common.

Considering Aya's comments on her topical preferences along with the observations of Aya's communicative performance in class, it appears that Aya is at her best in situations where the subject matter can be associated with her own life and experiences, while she tends to struggle and remain more silent in expressing her own thoughts in her own way when there are fewer opportunities for her to associate the content of learning with her life and experiences. Gaps in topical preference between Japanese students and Australian
peers found in the self-reports of Japanese students in Chapter 4 contradict with the findings in Aya’s case, as they did with Case Study 2.

7.6 Summary of the chapter

In this case study, the key Japanese participant Aya was found to participate to an average degree of frequency in terms of quantity of talk. Her pattern of participation was different from the other two Japanese participants in Case Study 1 and 2 in that her participation in ‘bidding’ situations is above average in the sample group while Tadashi and Miki were far below average in their participation in the same participant structure.

However, Aya followed the participation pattern of Tadashi and Miki in the ‘open floor’ participant structure. She participated the least frequently in the group when questions were asked of the whole group. This was found to affect the perception of Aya's performance negatively, as participation in ‘open floor’ situations was important in assessing student engagement and grasp of the subject in the History of Secondary Education class. It was revealed that the lack of initiative in this situation was in turn compensated by Dr. Lucas in nominating Aya to try to involve her more in discussion.

When patterns of turn-taking in presentation were examined, it was found that the student presenters used various strategies to manage interactional control in discussion. While Aya used silent and subtle strategies which were likely to leave opportunities other than a shift in classroom talk, her peer students showed more assertive approaches to manage shifts. Moreover, the types of interactional roles that the students took as tutorial leaders show Aya totally dependent on Dr. Lucas while her peers were in charge to a greater degree. These characteristics in management of control appear to have made it difficult for Aya to manage her participation. However, it was also noted that the student presenters' strategies can also be affected by the local context of talk such as configuration of seating, pattern of preceding interaction or other participants' cues for shifts.

With regard to the formality of language, Aya's language showed the same level of formality as other participants' at a lexical level. However, importantly, Aya's performance seems to reflect a politeness orientation which assumes distance and hierarchy, which is in contrast with the solidarity-oriented system reflected in the performance of her peers and Dr. Lucas. Although her peer students did not seem to perceive Dr. Lucas as 'authoritative' and did not operate in a 'hierarchical' role relationship with him, Aya felt 'pressure' which made her feel 'awkward' in participating in the History of Secondary Education class. The effect of Aya’s perceptions about different lecturers on Aya’s contradictory performance in different classes was revealed, confirming the impact of politeness orientation on silence in
the classroom. Under explicit encouragement, the femininity and friendliness of other lecturers, Aya's performance seems to reflect a solidarity-oriented politeness system.

Finally, topics of discussion were found to play an important role in Aya's participation in that she was disadvantaged by her lack of background knowledge of the history of education in Australia. What is more, not only the capacity for the concepts in this class but also her linguistic capacity seemed to be insufficient to cope with this unfamiliar field of study. Familiarity with the topic, background knowledge and language required for a specific field of study were therefore suggested as affecting participation. This also explained Aya’s contradictory performance and differing perceptions of Aya in different classes.

Aya's personal preference for topics which can be associated with her own life and experiences was also shown to be a factor which affected her silence in the History of Education class where there were fewer opportunities to incorporate such topics.

Aya's case is interesting in that although, in one class, she was seen as one of the most voluble students and received a positive evaluation from the lecturer, she was also seen as a 'quiet' and 'retiring' student in another class. The analyses of classroom interaction and interviews revealed the different impacts which various aspects of the classroom context can make on performance and perceptions of silence.
Chapter 8 Conclusion

8.1 Overview

In this thesis, the silence of Japanese students in Australian university classrooms has been explored. First, a review of the existing literature on silence in intercultural communication and silence in multicultural classroom settings set the background to the present research. Next, the description of the methodology which involved a number of micro and macro approaches to the multifaceted phenomenon of silence was provided in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the silence of Japanese students in Australian classrooms emerging from interviews was discussed and compared with lecturer perceptions obtained through questionnaires. The results showed that silence in class was one of the major problems in the learning experiences of Japanese students at Australian universities for both Japanese students themselves and their lecturers. Since the impact of prior educational experiences was mentioned frequently by both groups of participants, classroom practices in Japanese high schools were also discussed by reviewing the existing literature and analysing empirical data from Japanese high school classrooms.

In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, the performances of three Japanese students were presented through case studies. In these chapters, the way silence is constructed in perceptions and performance of participants in Japanese-Australian classroom interaction was explored. By using various data sources and approaches to analysis, silence was interpreted from both micro- and macro- perspectives. The silence of Japanese students was confirmed to exist in participants' perceptions, supporting the findings presented in Chapter 4. However, the degree and types of silence were found to vary among the three Japanese students. Moreover, most importantly, gaps in assumptions about classroom communication and in perceptions of others by both the Japanese students and the Australian participants (i.e. peers and lecturers) were found to contribute to silence in all the case studies.

This concluding chapter aims firstly to integrate the findings from the three case studies in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 with the findings presented in Chapter 4, and to follow up the research questions (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.1.3):

1) Are Japanese students silent in others’ perceptions as well as in their own?
2) Are Japanese students silent in their real performances in class?
3) How is the silence of Japanese students created?
Next, the nature of 'silence' which was discussed in the present research will be summarised, following the framework of the notion of silence given in Chapter 2. Finally, some implications for the teaching and learning of Japanese students in Australian universities and for research in silence in intercultural communication will be suggested. Hence the final two research questions will be addressed:

4) What is silence?
5) What are the implications for improvement of teaching and learning in Australian multicultural classrooms involving Japanese students?

8.2 Reality of silence

First of all, one of the main concerns regarding Japanese students' performance in the classroom was whether the silence of Japanese students reported in the interviews and questionnaires in Chapter 4 could be evidenced in real classroom contexts. With regard to the perceptions, all three Japanese students in the case studies were perceived silent by their lecturers, peers and themselves, except one lecturer (Mr. Fuller) in case study 1. When student performance was analysed, the perceived silence was confirmed by measured frequency with Tadashi in case study 1 and Miki in case study 2. In these two case studies, the measured frequency of participation reflected participants' perceptions about silence (and talk). However, it was suggested that not simply measurable frequency of talk but also how the Japanese students participated seemed to account for the perceptions of silence (see the following sections for details).

With regard to Aya in case study 3, her general frequency of participation was not as significantly low as the other two Japanese participants in the case studies. Her participation occurred almost with average frequency in the whole sample group, which did not match her silent image as found in interview comments (see also the following sections for details).

These findings led to an inquiry into the nature of silence created through interaction using a close analysis of interaction from qualitative perspectives. Therefore the next step was to see how, when, about what and why participants spoke or remained silent in the negotiation of participation in the classroom.
8.3 Various aspects of silence in the classroom

8.3.1 Silence and participant structures

The coding results were examined closely for a more detailed picture of participation patterns in the case studies. What emerged from this were incongruent participation patterns between the Japanese participants and other mostly Australian members of the sample groups in general. While there is an overall tendency toward self-selection of turns in all the sample groups, the Japanese participants relied more frequently on other-selection of turns for their participation. This incongruence can be seen in Tables 8.1 and 8.2 below. It is clear that in all the classes the percentage of turns taken through self-selection is overwhelmingly larger than that of turns taken through other selection of an individual student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes/TURN TYPES</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALLY SELECTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-SELECTED</td>
<td>OTHER-SELECTED</td>
<td>SELF-SELECTED</td>
<td>OTHER-SELECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching as a Profession</td>
<td>82.5% (16.5)</td>
<td>8.5% (1.7)</td>
<td>9.0% (1.8)</td>
<td>100% (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Examinations</td>
<td>67.1% (23.9)</td>
<td>22.5% (8.0)</td>
<td>10.4% (3.8)</td>
<td>100% (35.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>75.6% (6.5)</td>
<td>9.3% (0.8)</td>
<td>15.1% (1.3)</td>
<td>100% (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Secondary Education</td>
<td>37.3% (3.1)</td>
<td>45.8% (3.8)</td>
<td>16.9% (1.4)</td>
<td>100% (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Overall distribution of turn types in the case studies

*Numbers in ( ) are average number of turns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes/TURN TYPES</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALLY SELECTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-SELECTED</td>
<td>OTHER-SELECTED</td>
<td>SELF-SELECTED</td>
<td>OTHER-SELECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching as a Profession</td>
<td>0.0% (0.0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0.0)</td>
<td>100% (1.0)</td>
<td>100% (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 1:Tadashi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Examinations</td>
<td>29.4% (4.0)</td>
<td>24.3% (3.3)</td>
<td>46.3% (6.3)</td>
<td>100% (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 1:Tadashi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>56.5% (1.3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0.0)</td>
<td>43.5% (1.0)</td>
<td>100% (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 2:Miki)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Secondary Education</td>
<td>47.8% (3.3)</td>
<td>8.7% (0.6)</td>
<td>43.5% (3.0)</td>
<td>100% (6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Case study 3: Aya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 Japanese students’ distribution of turn types in the case studies

*Numbers in ( ) are average number of turns.

These incongruent participation patterns confirm the pattern described by Japanese students in Chapter 4. A majority of Japanese students commented that they do not volunteer to participate but speak only when they are nominated whereas Australian peers participate more frequently without being nominated (Chapter 4, section 4.1). Furthermore,
analysis of interaction in Japanese high school classrooms revealed that almost all the participation by students is brought about through individual nomination by the teacher (Chapter 4, section 4.3). Hence, the results suggest that one of the major factors which contributes to the silence of Japanese students is their lack of familiarity with voluntary participation in the classroom.

However, as indicated in Chapter 7, Aya was perceived silent despite her near-average frequency of voluntary participation. One of the explanations for this was that Aya did not participate in the ‘open floor’ structure, although participation in this structure was considered an important indicator of student participation in this particular case. Thus, it was argued that lack of participation in a preferred participant structure in a particular class could give markedness to certain types of silence.

Furthermore, in the case studies, it was revealed that lecturers expect and value voluntary participation from students, so that those who do not volunteer comments or questions are regarded as 'shy', 'unconfident' or even lacking in 'interests' and 'commitment'. It was also found that frequency of contribution as well as engaging in non-verbal behaviour in the classroom can contribute to impressions of overall academic competence, which do not necessarily correlate with actual assessment results. As shown in Chapter 4, some Japanese students consider that they are unfairly judged on their commitment to academic work because of this negative impression made on the basis of oral performance in the classroom.

8.3.2 Silence and interactional mode

Close analysis of interaction in the case studies revealed that there was a general tendency among the Japanese students to react exclusively to nomination by the teacher, as well as to direct their talk towards the teacher. This tendency was in contrast with their Australian peer students who appeared to assume and perform multi-directional modes of communication. Hence, it appears the silence of Japanese students can be observed when their Australian peers are talking among themselves, confirming the findings of interviews and questionnaires discussed in Chapter 4.

This type of silence was particularly noticeable in Tadashi and Aya, unlike Miki who frequently directed her questions and comments towards her peers. However, closer examination of Miki’s participation revealed that it often took place after elicitation or commenting in a sequence initiated by her peers. In addition, she had a tendency to 'sit back and listen' when negotiation started among peers in classroom discussion. In Aya's
case, it appears that the teacher-centred structure of the class shaped her mode of communication, and her peers also showed a similar tendency to defer to the teacher in their communication (although to a lesser degree than Aya). This suggests that it is necessary to recognise the impact which the structure of classroom communication as shaped by the lecturer can have on student participation.

Nevertheless, silence due to an exclusive focus on teacher-student communication can be considered as a consequence of Japanese classroom practices to which the Japanese students had been exposed through socialisation in their country. As shown in Chapter 4, a multi-directional communication system involving student-student talk rarely occurs in Japanese classrooms. This lack of communication among students in the classroom has been associated with assumptions that the teacher is the only authority of knowledge and that learning takes place through reception of knowledge from the authority but not through negotiation and interaction (section 4.3.3; see also Matsuda 2000; Ballard & Clanchy 1991; Milner & Quilty 1996). Thus, as Marriott (2000) indicates, it is likely that Japanese students are not familiar with the Australian 'tutorial genre' (p. 286), and managing speaking in tutorial discussions at Australian universities will cause difficulties for them.

However, it is also possible that proficiency in English as a second language, in particular sociolinguistic proficiency, may have affected the Japanese students' capacity to keep up with interactions among their peers. As the Japanese interviewees expressed in Chapter 4 (4.1), they seem to experience more difficulty in interacting with their Australian peers than with their teachers or with their non-native speaker classmates, as the peers tend to speak not only faster and less clearly than the lecturers but also use colloquial expressions and locally derived information.

It should still be noted, however, that the immediate contextual factors such as peers' initiatives to interact with Japanese students (in Miki's case) or the dominant communicative structure of the class (in Aya's case) affected the Japanese students' modes of communication to a great degree. In other words, cultural or linguistic interpretations of Japanese students' silence in a specific mode of communication should not be overemphasised but instead other factors affecting behaviour should also be taken into consideration.
8.3.3 Silence and control in classroom discourse

Through both conversation analysis and the examination of interview comments in the case studies, it was revealed that Japanese students were often not in control in classroom interaction, and this lack of control appeared to result in silence. Control over discussion can enhance the opportunities to maintain or take the floor (Dorr-Bremme 1990), but on the other hand difficulties in managing control may lead to loss of floor or fewer opportunities to take the floor. Three major factors in relation to the control and management of discourse in the classroom - questioning, managing boundaries of discourse and timing in turn-taking - were discussed in the case studies. The following sections will summarise each of these factors.

8.3.3.1 Questioning

First, what students tend to 'do' with their turns was shown to influence control in classroom discourse. Lack of questioning by the Japanese students and their tendency to be a nominated respondent to a question put them in a passive role and under the control of questioning parties. Questioners exercise control over designated respondents as the respondents' speech is constrained by rules of relevance (Grice 1975; Levinson 1983), and questioning in institutional settings is often associated with power (e.g. Kurzon 1997, 2001; Eades 2000). Moreover, genuine questions to suggest a new topic are moves to control a topic (Itakura 2001), and responding to these questions is a complying move unless the new topic is rejected (Watts 1991, 1997).

In Chapter 4, it was seen that both Japanese students and Australian lecturers indicated that Japanese students do not ask questions, although the two groups had slightly different views on student questioning in the classroom. In the case studies, however, Japanese students, particularly Aya, were found to ask questions. Nevertheless, this occurred in more limited situations and with lower frequency than it did with their Australian peers in the sample groups. The only time when Tadashi asked questions to open a new topic or a new sequence was during a short one-on-one session with his lecturer. With regard to Miki, her questions were not topic-initiating ones but repair-initiating questions following questions asked of her by the lecturer or her peers. Ms. Hardy in case study 1 and Dr. Telfer in case study 2 both mentioned a lack of questioning in relation to the silence of the Japanese students. Only Aya asked topic-initiating questions, but in her case, having difficulties in and avoiding responding to key discussion
questions which was the most important activity in the tutorials seemed to have effaced the positive aspect of her questioning.

Hence, the findings suggest that a lack of topic and sequence opening/expanding questioning by students may affect their level of control in classroom discourse and put them in passive roles in interaction. However, as Aya’s case shows, not performing certain types of performance considered most relevant and important for the course may override voluntary questioning in evaluations of classroom performance.

8.3.3.2 Managing boundaries of discourse

In addition to questioning, approaches to the management of opening and closing of discussions or of discourse markers at boundaries of discussion were shown to contribute to Japanese students' lack of control in classroom interaction. For example, it was found that opening and closing of Miki's Presentation Discussion (Chapter 6) was performed through 'silent negotiation' with the lecturer. Miki's strategy was to wait silently until Dr. Telfer initiated, which in other words was to put herself almost entirely under Dr. Telfer’s control. However, according to Marriott (2000), 'students are regularly expected to assume major speaking roles, whether through discussion or other kinds of presentation activities at the postgraduate level in Australia (p.285). The lecturer in Miki’s class indicated that such silent negotiation was not necessary with Australian students, who would negotiate the opening and closing of discussions verbally.

Similarly, indicating boundaries of discussion with discourse markers to enable an efficient flow of interaction is another way students exercise and maintain control in talk. In case study 3, Aya did not use markers such as 'okay' or 'so' which were frequently used by her Australian peers, but instead used more vulnerable features such as 'um' or 'and,' accompanied by long silent pauses in which she tried to negotiate the appropriate timing for participation. As a consequence, transitions from one topic to another did not flow well and Aya was perceived to be 'quiet and retiring' by the lecturer.

These differences and problems occurring from them in terms of control and regulation of discourse above can be explained by incongruence in schema, interpretive frames and systems of signalling how the current context of talk and roles of participants are to be interpreted (Gumperz 1982). One study which exemplifies this type of incongruence in the multicultural classroom is by Tyler & Davies (1990) who showed how communication breakdown in an interaction between an American university student and a Korean Teaching Assistant occurred. In their study, not only did subtle prosodic miscues affect the
miscommunication but also incongruence in schema, interpretive frame and goals of interaction in teacher-student interaction (p. 403) left the conflict unresolved. Interactional roles expected of students are also a type of schema which affects the interpretive frames of classroom participants. In the case of Miki and Aya in the present research, the way they negotiated different stages of presentations did not give them the control which they needed in order to perform their expected speaker roles. In Tadashi’s case, he was described by Ms. Hardy as ‘not in control’ in discussions. Furthermore in the three case studies, it is possible that the widely assumed view of the student as a 'passive receiver of knowledge' in Japanese schools has an influence on the Japanese students' assumptions about roles in classroom interaction in Australia.

However, it should be remembered that Tadashi had spent 8 years and Aya had spent 6.5 years in the Australian education system at the time of the observations. One would want to question the extent to which language socialisation in Japan has influenced their communicative behaviour. One of the striking findings in the present research is the fact that students who had been living in Australia for more than 5 years provided similar explanations for their silence in Australian classrooms to explanations given by students with shorter periods of residence in Australia. According to Gumperz (1982), the discourse strategies which signal orientation to various types of interaction as described above are 'habitually used and perceived but rarely consciously noted and almost never talked about directly' (p. 131), and they are acquired 'only through prolonged and intensive face to face contact' (p. 152). Although Japanese students may be aware, through exposure, of expected performance in the classroom in Australia, performing a leadership role in a presentation in place of the teacher is not a frequent occurrence. Thus, subtle and unconscious discourse strategies may not yet have been internalised. Moreover, as seen in Chapter 4, Japanese students indicated that they do not have frequent contact with Australian students outside class, which suggests that lack of immersion in subtle discourse strategies is one of the factors holding Japanese students back from participation.

However, there is evidence that an intensive and extended exposure to these strategies will help students to internalise them. Although Aya's control in History of Secondary Education was weaker than her peers, it was revealed that she 'leads' discussions in other classes. Aya was part of a very small minority of Asian students among a majority Anglo group during her secondary school years in Australia. As will be discussed in a later section (8.3.4, 8.3.5 and 8.4), Aya's case is interesting in that her schema and interpretive frame modified through her socialisation into the Australian educational discourse system
appear to be in conflict with the relatively teacher-centred teaching style and a slightly authoritarian image of the lecturer in the History of Secondary Education class.

8.3.3.3 Timing in turn-taking

Finally, timing in turn-taking was discussed extensively in the case studies in terms of managing participation. As discussed in Chapter 4, Japanese students expressed two causes of silence associated with timing. One was their lack of language proficiency which prevents them from moving quickly enough to secure a turn. Another was unfamiliarity with fast rates of speech and turn-taking not only in terms of sociolinguistic familiarity but also in terms of the social discretion of avoiding interruption. There were also comments by Japanese students implying silencing by Australian students by way of interruption. However, lecturer questionnaire results did not touch on this aspect of silence. As discussed in Chapter 2, there have been claims that rates of turn-taking and normative lengths of switching pauses in the first or native language may be transferred into communication in a second language (e.g. Scollon & Scollon 1981; Lehtonen & Sajavaara 1985; Anderson 1992; Pritchard 1995). Moreover, in Chapter 4, data from Japanese high school classrooms showed almost no instance of overlapping talk but long silent switching pauses. Thus, it was left to the case studies to investigate to what extent silencing could be observed in naturally occurring classroom interaction. Another aspect of timing to be examined was whether a gap in speed of turn-taking does actually exist between Japanese students and their Australian peers.

In the case studies, discussions among Australian students with overlapping talk including interruptions were commonly found, but Japanese students did not participate in this type of interaction often. There were instances of overlapping and even interrupting talk by Miki and Aya, whereas Tadashi did not overlap as much as the other two. When these instances are examined, they suggest that 'precision timing' (Carroll 2000: 67) in turn-taking motivated by orientation for 'no gap' in turn transition in English (Sacks et al. 1974) is achieved by these Japanese students. The important point is, however, that overlapping talk and interruption were likely to be observed only when and after the Japanese students were nominated. Thus, it is possible that difficulties in participating with precisely appropriate timing may prevent Japanese students from participating when self-selection of turns is required in discussions.

When interaction around nomination of Japanese students was examined, however, there were also a number of cases where 'delay' in reaction led to their silence. When the
'delay' occurs, it was often interpreted as a sign of a 'problem' by Australian students and lecturers, who tried to compensate for this 'problem' by modifying or paraphrasing the questions or providing responses in place of the Japanese students. As a consequence, the Japanese students lost their chances to participate and remained silent thereon because not only was the floor secured through nomination lost but also there was a loss of face.

The difficult question, however, was the interpretation of 'delay'. It could be caused by Japanese students' lack of proficiency, individual differences in cognitive processing, or sociolinguistic unfamiliarity with the fast rate of turn-taking. Both Tadashi and Miki attributed their silence to the time required for comprehension due to their lack of language proficiency. Tadashi also spoke of difficulties in finding the appropriate timing to participate even when he had something to say. In fact, even when he was not interrupted, silent pauses longer than 0.5 seconds were found before his turns in the data, which supports the idea of transfer of turn-taking pace from L1 to L2. However, at the same time this may be due to Tadashi's personal preference or individual speech style. In Aya's case, even though she can be 'always the first to speak' in other classes, unfamiliar concepts in an unfamiliar field made classroom discussions more difficult for her. Thus, Aya was seen overlapping frequently around TRPs when she talked about her own school or about reflections on her own presentation but not when the class discussed core subject matters.

To make the question of 'delay' even more complex, and as the case studies showed, some instances of 'delays' are more likely to be 'silent responses' intended to mean 'I don't know the answer' or 'I don't understand'. With regard to Australian students, there was no instance of this type of silence when they were nominated to speak. Instead, some of them compensated their lack of knowledge or ideas with verbal expressions.

Thus the problem was that there were occasions when it was difficult to interpret the delays in responses: whether they were language problems, cognitive processing time, indirect speech acts or even, as mentioned, a culturally shaped feature of turn-taking. If there is a mismatch between the cause of silence and the interpretation of silence by the peers or the lecturer, the Japanese students are likely to be either silenced or experience loss of face. If the cause of silence and the interpretation match, then native-speakers' moves will serve as both a face-saving strategy for Japanese students and an opportunity for native speakers to display academic competence.

Hence, silence in the position after a question can have a number of different meanings and functions, which makes it ambiguous and difficult to interpret. Even when Tadashi commented that lack of confidence was the cause of his silence, it was revealed that he had
not discussed the question with his partner and thus it was likely that he did not have any idea. For native-speaker Australian peers and lecturers, it is difficult to accommodate this ambiguous silence which frequently appears in interaction where Japanese students are invited to speak. The case studies revealed how this complexity of interpreting processes can be a source of miscommunication.

The complex issue around the silence of Japanese students after other-selection of their turns also provided an important finding in relation to Japanese students' comments in Chapter 4. In the interviews, Japanese students indicated that they participate exclusively when they are nominated and they do not participate in free-for-all open discussions. However, it was revealed in the case studies that there were a number of instances in which Japanese students remained silent when they were nominated. This means that the Japanese students may not be aware of the fact that they may not be making the best of the limited opportunities given to them. In addition, although there were comments which suggested silencing by peer Australian students, there were also instances of silence 'performed' as an indirect speech act. The ambiguous line between the silencing and performed silences was found to be causing communication problems which led to further silence of the Japanese students.

Finally, it should also be noted that in the case studies it was mostly a limited number of Australian students who tended to dominate classroom discussion and to silence (whether consciously or from supportive intentions) Japanese students. In Tadashi’s case, there was Kylie (with Dave and Michelle behind); in Miki’s case, Molly (with Bill behind); and in Aya’s case, Henry. In relation to this, complaints made by Australian students on a web site set up for a course at the University of Sydney should be mentioned here. The complaints were to do with a minority of students who dominated discussion in their class. Therefore, the role of proficiency in English as well as cultural differences in turn-taking rules and etiquette should not be overemphasised but treated carefully. It was generally as a consequence of interaction among the lecturers, the Japanese students and a small number of dominant Australian students that the silence was jointly created in the case studies. This in turn also suggests that Japanese students' interview comments in Chapter 4 reflected their overgeneralised views on Australian students being voluble and Japanese students being silent.
8.3.4 Silence and politeness

The analysis of formality and politeness in participants' language use in the case studies revealed that the Japanese students' language use seemed to reflect a hierarchy-oriented politeness system in their communication with the lecturers and a deference-oriented politeness system with their peer students (Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995). On the other hand, their Australian peer students and the lecturers interacted in a relatively more solidarity-oriented politeness system (ibid). This suggests that strong authority of lecturers, and distance from peers were assumed by Japanese students, although peers and the lecturers seem to assume relatively more equal and informal social relationships amongst themselves. These findings match the patterns found in Japanese students' interview comments and lecturer questionnaire responses in Chapter 4. According to Scollon & Scollon (1995: 41), involvement (i.e. positive) strategies are associated with volubility while independent (i.e. negative) politeness strategies are associated with taciturnity. These differences in politeness strategies between the Japanese students and their Australian co-participants in the present research seem to create silence.

The different politeness strategies were realised in participants' language in a number of ways. First, although items of formal lexis were frequently seen in Tadashi's language but not in the language of the other two Japanese students', the Japanese students did not overlap as frequently as the Australian students did. As Eggins (1994) puts it, overlapping talk implies informal language use while careful turn-taking reflects formal language use. Tannen (1985) also argues that an inclination towards overlapping talk rather than inter-turn pauses is a manifestation of high-involvement discourse, whereas a tendency for avoidance of overlapping talk reflects high-considerateness.

Second, the Japanese students tend to defer to the teachers and the peers when speaking while their Australian peers were seen to disagree or challenge the lecturer and other students more often. Criticism and disagreement are the types of acts which are 'dispreferred seconds' to assessment (Levinson 1983; Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987). They are also highly face-threatening for the addressee, and thus silence to avoid threatening the addressee's face can be identified as the superstrategy of 'Don't do the FTA' in politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997). However, Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998), referring to studies by Goodwin (1990) and Kotthof (1993), point out that in arguments and disputes, the nature of these speech events can 'remove or even reverse ordinary preference organisation' (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 46). This seems to be applicable to the classroom situation in Australian universities where 'critical thinking' is encouraged.
(Ballard & Clanchy 1991; Ballard 1996; Milner & Quilty 1996; Matsuda 2000). In other words, in Australian university classrooms, criticism and agreement are 'preferred' to open acceptance, even though the features of dispreferred seconds such as preface or initial acceptance token (Levinson 1983) can still accompany them. Moreover, if a solidarity-oriented politeness system is assumed, because of shared grounds, these acts will be more acceptable than in hierarchical or deference politeness systems. In hierarchical and deference politeness systems, confrontation is a high risk and should be avoided. Because of these different approaches to classroom discourse, the Japanese students' avoidance of disagreements or critical comments may be recognised as a 'lack of critical approach to the subject' or 'lack of engagement' by Australian participants, as mentioned by the lecturers in the questionnaire discussed in Chapter 4.

Third, the Japanese students may be using silence as a strategy to avoid loss of face. This type of silence, which was referred to as 'psychological silence' in Chapter 4, can be found in the general lack of frequency in participation but also in situations where the Japanese student is nominated by the teacher for an answer to a question (see section 8.3.3). All three Japanese students were found to remain silent after being selected for an answer at least once in the case studies. This type of silence entails a high degree of politeness in that it is an 'off-record' strategy (Tannen 1985, Sifianou 1997). However, as Sifianou (1997) argues, this type of silence can also place 'high inferential demands on the addressee' and thus can be viewed as one of the 'least polite forms' (Sifianou 1997: 73, based on Blum-Kulka 1987). It should be remembered that there were instances of Australian students verbally indicating they either had no idea, or had some idea but not the complete answer. Thus, it is possible that using silence as the most indirect form of message in Australian classroom contexts can be interpreted as placing more demands on the co-participants and is therefore not preferred to verbal responses. As discussed in the previous section on timing, the numerous possible interpretations of this type of silence could be a source of miscommunication and silencing. Tadashi and Miki had at least one incident each when an answer was demanded for a second time following their silence. This caused loss of face as they were forced to verbalise the fact that they did not know the answer, which from their point of view should have been communicated by their silence. This loss of face also seemed to have led to an overall withdrawal from succeeding discussion, which caused additional silence.

An interesting point regarding loss of face is that at least two of the teachers in the case studies stopped their attempts to include the Japanese students after the Japanese students'
loss of face seemed to have occurred. As Goffman (e.g. 1955, 1967) states, participants in a social encounter constantly work on maintaining or saving face in interaction. It was observed that the teachers made attempts to rectify the loss of face by turning the attention away from the Japanese students and avoiding putting them on the spot again. Moreover, it is possible that the teachers themselves work on saving their own face by avoiding attempts to include these students who could put the teachers on the spot by silent responses. Thus, it appears that there is also an element of co-creation of the Japanese students' silence with their lecturers. Singling out a student is a sensitive act since it can lead to a serious loss of face for both the lecturer and the student.

Finally, in both Chapter 4 and the case studies, it was argued that the difference in politeness strategies can also be found in joking and teasing among the lecturers and students which were not initiated or reciprocated by the Japanese students. Joking and teasing were initiated either by the peer students or the lecturers in the case studies, but this would be inappropriate in a hierarchical politeness system which the Japanese students are likely to assume in their communication with lecturers.

However, it should be remembered that it is not simply the individual or culturally collective tendencies but also the immediate context of interaction which also affects the choice of politeness strategies. Aya's different performances in different classes revealed that the same student can make different choices in politeness strategies, being voluble in one class and silent in another, depending on the conditions provided by the local context. While silence seems to reflect a lack of rapport and solidarity, perceptions of a hierarchical orientation to communication can affect orientation to politeness strategies and create silence.

8.3.5 Silence and schema

In Chapter 4, it was discussed that there seem be topics which Australian students regularly bring up but Japanese students do not. In other words, a possibility emerged that a gap in schema or interpretive frames (cf. Gumperz 1982; Roberts & Sayers 1987; Tannen 1993b) of classroom interaction may lead to silence in certain areas. Roberts & Sayers (1987) describe schema as accumulated knowledge and experiences which become 'a set of knowledge and belief structures' necessary to be shared among participants for successful communication (p. 115). The interpretive frame, according to Roberts & Sayers (1987), 'alerts the listener to what is going on at each stage of the interaction' (p. 116). In Chapter 4, it was suggested that personal and everyday life experiences often brought up and applied
to classroom discussions by Australian students were felt to be irrelevant in Japanese students’ schemas of ‘classroom discussion’. The idea of providing personal and everyday life experiences as part of a response to questions or a comment in classroom discussion did not seem to fit their interpretive frame.

Hence, there was a possibility that this difference may also contribute to Japanese students' silence. However, the Japanese participants' performance in the case studies revealed different pictures. Although it was found that silence could emerge from absence of talk on specific topics, preferred and dispreferred topics of the three Japanese students appeared to vary. Furthermore, a number of factors which seemed to influence not only topic preference but also the ability to speak about certain topics were found.

First, Miki and Aya participated voluntarily and with better control when they talked about topics personally familiar to themselves such as current affairs in Japan or their own experiences as students in Australia. However, this was not the case with Tadashi, who had a tendency to speak more willingly about technical information or administrative matters but not on his personal experiences in relation to the subjects. Tadashi's case seems to be a strong reminder of topical preference in Japanese classroom discourse in which the personal lives of students are generally considered irrelevant for learning (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.3), as well as of the pattern found in the Japanese students' interviews (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.1). It was also confirmed in the case studies that Australian students frequently provide their personal experiences or stories in relation to topics for discussion. Nevertheless, the cases of Miki and Aya were at odds with the Japanese students' comments given in Chapter 4 (section 4.1). It seems that personal preferences, the nature of the subjects and the students’ familiarity with topics which give them an advantage over Australian students can also affect the topical preferences of Japanese students, while Tadashi's silence on personal topics could be due to his pragmatic orientation to his studies and his Japanese educational background.

Topical preference also takes us back to the issue of politeness. As seen in Miki's case, although she seemed to prefer topics familiar from her background and personal experiences, she did not ask or talk about other students' home cultures. On the other hand, her Australian peer students were keen to elicit information about her culture. As to Aya, she not only seemed to prefer talking about her personal experiences but also showed her interest, made comments and asked questions about local issues in Australia. However, Miki and Tadashi seemed to keep themselves in their own 'territory', which suggests that their topical preferences seem to reflect their inclination towards negative politeness.
strategies. It is also possible that refraining from talking about topics which are unfamiliar for them but familiar for other participants may be a strategy for avoiding loss of face.

Another factor affecting topical preference is personal interest. Aya's case revealed that loss of interest in the subject reduced her motivation to engage and participate. On the other hand, her strong interest in subjects from Japanese studies, supported by her confidence in her background knowledge, motivated her to participate actively. It was also shown that the level of difficulty Aya found in different subjects affected her preference in topics. If one cannot grasp concepts and the language related to them in a subject, it becomes difficult to participate. Her native-speaker peers, on the contrary, expressed their interest and motivation in this subject. With regard to Tadashi, his preoccupation with his future work and the imminent arrival of his baby could have set his priority on 'getting things done' and made him appear 'business-like'. This is clearly reflected in his comment about his topic preference on administrative matters, while his Australian peer students were more enthusiastic about the topics even those tasks specifically assigned to Tadashi and his peer student. These aspects of topical preference were not mentioned by the Japanese students in the interviews in Chapter 4, which could be due to an interpretation of this type of silence as 'resistance' to participation rather than 'inability'.

Finally, background knowledge about the subject can either place limitations on or favour a particular group of students in terms of their participation. Topics in Australian classroom contexts can often be derived from locally-generated information and knowledge. This can leave overseas students at a disadvantage. In courses from education, for example, a lack of shared educational experiences and unfamiliarity with the Australian education system appeared to have made it difficult for Tadashi and Aya to keep up with the discussion and participate. This difficulty in participation due to lack of shared background is echoed in comments by the Japanese participants in Chapter 4 (section 4.1).

Nevertheless, it seems that the general topical preference patterns which emerged through Japanese students' comments discussed in Chapter 4 is not supported by evidence from the cases of Aya and Miki. Rather, incongruence between their individual preferences and competence in a specific field and the preferred topics of other participants in class is more likely to affect the silence. While Aya was perceived silent and unengaged when her participation focussed on matters related to her own life and experiences instead of key issues and events in the history of education in Australia, Tadashi was perceived silent and business-like when his participation focussed on technical and factual knowledge of the subject instead of his experiences, particularly those as a student-teacher in training.
Therefore, although there may be general patterns of preference in Australian classroom interaction and among the Japanese students, it is important to recognise that preference patterns in a specific classroom context can also influence silence.

8.3.6 Silence and language proficiency

In Chapter 4, it was observed that Japanese students gave lack of language proficiency in English as one of the major causes of their silence. Furthermore, lack of confidence in English appeared to hold them back from participation. Lack of proficiency and lack of confidence in proficiency were also given by lecturers in their questionnaire responses as major causes of Japanese students' silence. In the existing literature, however, the emphasis on the role of language difficulties in creating Asian students' silence has been replaced by an alternative view in which culturally shaped communicative styles and beliefs about communication are considered to be the most important factors (see Chapter 2, section 2.5.3). Hence, the real performance of Japanese students was examined to investigate to what extent proficiency in English did affect silence, compared with other factors such as cultural differences or the immediate context of the classroom.

In the case studies, language proficiency seemed to vary slightly among the three Japanese students, and so did the degree of silence. Importantly, language proficiency did not seem to directly predict the degree of silence. Before discussing this issue, however, the Japanese students' language proficiency must be described. As mentioned in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, the ratings given by the native speaker rater was 4+ for Aya, 4 for Tadashi and 3+ for Miki. The author rated Aya and Tadashi as 4, and Miki as 3. Apart from ISLPR ratings, short descriptions of each Japanese student's competence in English were also produced by the raters. Both the native speaker rater and the author evaluated Aya's English to be native-like, fluent and Australian, although her lack of command of academic language was noted. Tadashi's English was found to be fluent (not to the degree of Aya's) and to show control of grammar and vocabulary including academic language, although he has an accent. Miki's language was evaluated to be reasonable for communicating her ideas, while her accent, odd grammatical errors and frequent silent pauses contributed to her lower rating.

When the students' own comments as well as their lecturers' about their English are examined, they agree for the most part with the raters' evaluations. For example, Aya mentioned that her lack of vocabulary and knowledge of academic English prevented her from discussing issues in History of Secondary Education, but her lecturer in the class
described her English as ‘reasonable’ and a lecturer in her Japanese translation class said her English was 'native-like'. Tadashi said he was worried about his accent, but his lecturers said his English was '[e]xcellent to very good' or 'he can communicate perfectly well'. Miki emphasised her need to 'take time' before speaking, and her lecturer said that her English is 'careful', and 'she takes trouble when she speaks'.

Concerning the degree of silence found among the three Japanese students, it varied. In terms of measured frequency of participation, Aya appeared to be the least silent of the three. Since Aya's English proficiency was evaluated the highest, the emphasis on the role of proficiency in silence can be supported in her case. However, in terms of perceptions, not only did she perceive herself to be silent but also she was perceived so by the lecturer and her peers. It was found that her lack of academic language to handle concepts in discussion in the History of Secondary Education class was likely to have prevented her from participating as actively as she would have done in other contexts. This means that rather than overall proficiency of her English or general fluency, lack of command in a specific genre of language in a specific context affected silence in both perceptions and performance.

As to Miki, she seemed to participate less actively than Aya but more actively than Tadashi, despite her English proficiency being evaluated the lowest of the three Japanese students. This raises the possibility that variables other than proficiency played a role. The fact that she produced turns much longer than her Australian peers when she was given opportunities to speak could be one of them. The other factor is that the course being on intercultural communication may have given Miki more opportunities and confidence in talking about her own experiences and culture, unlike Aya’s or Tadashi's cases. It is also possible that Miki had stronger motivation to contribute to discussions than Tadashi, although the data does not provide strong evidence for this. However, the long and frequent silent pauses in Miki’s speech suggest that she is more vulnerable to interruptions as found in the conversation analysis of classroom interaction.

While Miki’s case seems to support the proficiency theory for the interpretation of Japanese students' long pauses, Tadashi's case seems to support the theory of transfer of L1 communication style in the classroom context. It would be reasonable to say that Tadashi was the most silent student of the three Japanese students, despite a positive evaluation of his proficiency by his lecturers as well as the raters. He rarely opened his mouth unless he was nominated, and if he spoke voluntarily, it was mostly done during a one-on-one session and a one-on-two session with the lecturer. He did not have as native-like fluency
as Aya does, but instead, he seemed to possess control over technical and academic language which Aya did not seem to manage. Yet he remained silent and was perceived to be silent, at least by one of the lecturers and by his peers. The 'delays' in his turn-taking behaviour were discussed in Chapter 5, and as in Miki’s case, he was also found vulnerable to interruptions. However, his speech did not show frequent intra-turn pauses as did Miki’s, and with his fluency and command of English within his turns and in smooth turn-transitions, it would be more reasonable to interpret his 'delays' as either his personal communicative style or transfer of longer inter-turn pauses from Japanese. In fact, Tadashi's language use as well as his comments in his interviews revealed a strong orientation towards hierarchical and negative politeness, a tendency to use silence as a face-saving strategy, and the schema or interpretive frame of Japanese educational practices. Thus, his silence appears to have been most affected by the Japanese approach to classroom communication which appears to have overridden his language proficiency.

The discussion above suggests no direct correlation between language proficiency and silence when participants are at an advanced level. (To be accepted to the University of Sydney, all international students have to reach at least an IELTS overall band score of 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band or TOEFL 575 with TWE 4.5). However, as argued, fluency still counts to a certain degree, because dysfluency tends to leave more space for interruption as well as supporting moves by native speakers which are likely to create more silence. On the other hand, dysfluency can be compensated for with topics exclusively familiar to Japanese students as was the case with Miki. Furthermore, a more fluent speaker such as Tadashi can be silent due to cultural, personal or immediate contextual factors, and even a highly fluent speaker such as Aya can be silent in certain contexts in which command in a specific genre of language is required. Thus, comparing proficiency levels and degrees of silence among the three Japanese students in the case studies, it can be claimed that the role of language proficiency is important but should not be overemphasised.

8.4 Model of silence revisited

As seen in the integrated findings of the three case studies above, the performance of the Japanese students showed different patterns of behaviour. These different patterns of behaviour which contributed to create different types and distributions of silences were affected by contextual factors at individual, interactive and sociocultural levels of social organisation. In Chapter 4, a model to account for Japanese students' silence was proposed
based on the findings from the interviews with the 19 Japanese students. It is now possible to account for various types of silences found in the case studies by going back to a slightly modified version of this model. This does not mean that all the variables in this model affected the silence of each student in the case studies. Instead, the case studies revealed that different sets of variables contributed to each student’s silence and resulted in different degrees of silence.
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**Figure 8.1 Model of silence in Japanese-Australian classroom interaction**
In the case of Tadashi, it seems that contextual factors at a sociocultural level have strong effects on his silence. The analysis showed that patterns of his behaviour were similar to patterns typically found in Japanese classrooms as described in Chapter 4. First of all, participation overwhelmingly through other-selected turns reflected the pattern. Reliance and focus on written modes of communication were also frequently observed. A strongly hierarchical and deferential politeness orientation (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995) to classroom communication as well as the frequent use of silence as a face-saving strategy were also found. Furthermore, his participation focused on technical and administrative facts while he was silent in discussions where students shared their experiences and applications of the issues to everyday life, which falls into the category of sociocultural norms of relevance. Lastly, the tendency towards a pragmatic orientation to his studies and a 'business-like' attitude could also have played a role in his silence. While one could consider this as a factor at an individual level since family life seemed to be his primary concern at the time, his pragmatic orientation may also be a consequence of his Japanese educational background (Chapter 4, section 4.3, see also Yoneyama 1999). There were also Japanese student interviewees who showed this tendency to undervalue classroom interaction. Hence, both an individual level of commitment and a socioculturally shaped undervaluation of classroom interaction may be operating in this case.

At the interactive level, Tadashi’s management of timing in turn-taking appeared to make him vulnerable to the loss of his turns. Although his lexico-grammatical competence and fluency within his turns are high, his sociolinguistic adaptation to norms of Australian classroom interaction may not be at a level to enable him to participate more frequently.

Factors at the individual level which need to be mentioned for Tadashi are his personal level of commitment and L2 anxiety. As mentioned above, the situation of his private life may have contributed to his pragmatic orientation to his studies, as he was near his graduation, looking for a job and he had a newborn baby in his family. With regards to L2 anxiety, he has an accent and he mentioned his worry that other students perceived it negatively.

It is rather unexpected that despite his 8-year residence in Australia Tadashi appeared to be the most silent of the three Japanese students in his frequency of participation and his silence was similar to the general pattern of Japanese students’ silence found in Chapter 4. One of the reasons for this could be that, because he speaks either Korean or Japanese at home with his family, and goes home immediately after classes to look after his young
family, Tadashi had not had enough exposure to Anglo-Australian discourse to familiarise himself with the sociolinguistic and sociocultural norms of communication in Australian classrooms.

Turning to Miki's case, one could say that the role of factors at all three levels of social organisation seem to be equally important. At the sociocultural level, Miki was also found to rely on participation through selection by others. However, it is possible that her dysfluency, which can be considered as a contextual factor at the individual level, may also have delayed her reaction and made it difficult for her to self-select her turns quickly enough. This dysfluency also seems to have made it difficult for Miki to participate actively according to Australian sociolinguistic norms of participation. The fact that she was living with a Japanese flatmate also suggests that she did not have enough exposure to colloquial interaction among Anglo-Australian or Australian-educated students to enhance her fluency. Nevertheless, factors such as knowledge schema and her norms of relevance appeared to have enhanced her participation, as she seemed to have diverged from the Japanese sociocultural norms in which personal life experiences are likely to be irrelevant in the classroom. The immediate context of the class also seemed to have influenced her readiness to speak as it required her to share her personal observations of Japan and its culture which were obviously more familiar to her than to the Australian students. This familiarity factor also may have reduced the risk of face-threat, which would have increased silence due to psychologically and socioculturally based fears of face loss. However, in terms of orientation to politeness, her lack of participation in the negotiation of ideas and meaning and in inquiry about other students' cultural backgrounds may indicate a socioculturally-based orientation to a deference politeness system (Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995) in her silence. These equally-weighted influences on Miki's silence at different levels of social organisation in fact seem to reflect the stage of her adaptation process to Australian classroom discourse. She expressed uncomfortable feelings of wavering identities associated with English and Japanese, and the sense of an inability to speak with fluency was frustrating her as she wanted to speak more in classroom discussions.

In Aya's case, it seems that mismatch between the immediate context of the particular class observed for the case study and her individually preferred classroom context vitally affected her silence. The academic concepts and language essential for the particular course were not congruent with Aya's knowledge schema and vocabulary, which made her remain more silent than in other courses. However, her silence after key discussion
questions accompanied by non-verbal behaviour implying her wish to avoid eye-contact with the lecturer suggested her inclination to negative politeness strategies. Moreover, the masculine and strict image of the lecturer as perceived by Aya modified her politeness system orientation (Brown & Levinson 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1995) from relatively solidarity oriented (with her ‘less strict’ female lecturers) to more hierarchy oriented. On the other hand, her peers did not perceive the lecturer in that way and tended towards a solidarity politeness system. This suggests that immediate contextual factors triggered the Japanese orientation to politeness in classroom discourse, which is a factor at the level of sociocultural context. However, in terms of participant structures and turn-taking norms, Aya seems to show a high level of adaptation to Australian classroom discourse. She was not as vulnerable as Miki or Tadashi to interruptions, and more frequent voluntary participation was observed. Indeed, Aya was found to be experiencing the most exposure to the discourse of the Anglo-Australian population including young Australians, in that she had an Australian boyfriend, regularly attended church youth group activities where she mixed with local people, and had spent three years with an Australian family during her secondary school years. Thus, her extensive exposure to local Australians who are native speakers may be playing an important role in the level of her sociolinguistic and sociocultural adaptation to Australian classroom discourse. However, as discussed, lack of control in a specific area of language and the perceived authoritarian image of the lecturer seemed to have debilitated her bicultural ability and readiness to participate.

One of the factors in the model which did not seem to be relevant in terms of its role in creating silence in the case studies is personality, although it should remain in the model as one of the individual variables. Judging from observation and interview comments from the three Japanese students, none of them seemed to be ‘shy’ or ‘introverted’. In addition, only one of the Japanese students who participated in the interviews in Chapter 4 mentioned ‘being shy’. Nevertheless, the relationship between silence and personal traits was discussed in the present research. Australian students who are silent in the classroom can often be considered ‘shy’, as one of the lecturers mentioned in her interview. The danger is when this assumption is applied in interpreting Japanese students' silence, as the lecturer referred to above mentioned doing. In the survey by Braddock et al. (1995) discussed in Chapter 4, the first category given for ‘Reasons for students not to ask questions’ is ‘I am too shy and embarrassed’ (p. 22), which was selected by half of the respondents. This reflects the assumption that silence tends to result from a shy personality, and the category may have been derived on the basis of patterns found in Australian
students. Moreover, 'shyness' is ambiguous in that it can not only be a personal trait but also a temporary reticence in a specific situation, and 'embarrassment' can be caused by various contextual factors in different situations in the classroom and should not be put together with 'shyness' to form one category. Thus, it was discussed that silence was often associated with a shy personality, and that this association may have negative impact on intercultural communication in the classroom (cf. Crown & Feldstein 1985; Scollon 1985).

The model proposed above can thus help us understand and interpret Japanese students' silence at different levels of social organisation. The factors at these different levels of social organisation can also be viewed from another dimension of 'inability' or/and 'resistance' (see Chapter 4) regarding participation in the classroom. In Chapter 4, the elements of 'inability' and ‘resistance’ in creating the silence of Japanese students were discussed. In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, when factors in the model which could be affecting Japanese students' silence were considered, a tension between 'inability' and 'resistance' emerged again. Even when there is readiness to speak, 'inability' such as dysfluency or lack of skills in exercising control in classroom discourse can silence the students. On the other hand, even when the students are fully capable of speaking, forces of 'resistance' such as lack of personal interests or socioculturally derived norms of relevance can hold students back from participating. However, in the midst of this tension between ‘inability’ and ‘resistance’, the performance of the Japanese students was found to be greatly affected by contextual factors in the immediate situation specific to each classroom, which is one of the most important findings of the present research. This reinforces the finding that an emphasis on cultural and linguistic factors in interpreting Japanese students' silence in the classroom context as found in existing literature may be inappropriate. In Liu (2000, 2002) and Harumi (1999) which looked at silence of Asian or Japanese students in the classroom, the role of evolving immediate contextual factors in the construction of silence, and the role of individual variables in interaction with such immediate factors have not been given as much consideration as in the present research. Although the sociocultural influence of Japanese classroom practices as well as a lack of fluency was found to affect the silence of Japanese students in the present research, it was revealed that silence was constructed through a complex negotiation process of talk and silence by not only the Japanese students but also by other participants in the classroom.
8.5 What is silence?

The main theme of this research, ‘silence’, must now be addressed. As is clear now from the wide range of phenomena covered in the present research, the question ‘What is silence?’ is rather an impossible question to answer. It will evoke endless argument if one seeks a final answer. Instead, the question can be rephrased as 'What phenomena were perceived as silence, what did they do, and what did they mean?' In other words, what were the forms, functions and meanings of silence?

First of all, in terms of forms, the types of silence found and discussed in the present research are summarised below:

1) intra- and inter-turn pauses
2) silent responses
3) being silenced and silencing
4) not participating in specific participant structures
5) not participating in interaction on specific topics
6) not taking certain speaker roles
7) not performing certain speech acts
8) overall infrequency of participation

Analysis of the data showed that some of these categories can overlap, such as the case of a silent inter-turn pause being indistinguishable from a 'gap' or a 'silent response' loaded with illocutionary force.

Second, silence discussed in this research had various functions. Silence for cognitive processing was one of the most difficult types of silence to identify as it is often necessary to rely on self-report which does not always reflect the real performance, but it was nevertheless reported by Japanese students, and cases of silent pauses which were likely to be due to cognitive processing were observed. Silence was also found as a strategy to regulate or control classroom interaction. It signalled or negotiated certain stages of classroom discourse, often accompanied by non-verbal expressions. This discursive use of silence was used by not only Japanese participants but also their lecturers and peers.

Regarding the social functions of silence, it was revealed that the silence of Japanese students seemed to prevent the establishment of rapport between them and their lecturers. Their orientation to a hierarchical and deferential politeness system which was incongruent with the more solidarity and egalitarian oriented politeness system of the Australian participants appeared to result in silence with a distancing effect. Silence was also shown to be an avoidance of communication used as a face-saving strategy. At a turn-by-turn level, silence may also function as an indirect speech act which was an off-record politeness strategy. This function was found to have a significant impact on Japanese
students' silence. Another social function of silence often discussed in the literature is the relationship between silence and social/institutional power, but this did not emerge as a focus of the present research. Although the Japanese students were in passive roles and often dominated by Australian students, this asymmetry in participation did not seem to reflect or reinforce social oppression of a minority group as in the case of the Mexican American students in Losey’s (1997) study (see Chapter 2). The asymmetry mostly seemed to be limited to interactional dominance and not social or institutional dominance. However, one Japanese student mentioned her experience of racism at her secondary school in Sydney (see Chapter 4, 4.3.1), and the silence of Japanese students in relation to social or institutional power differences requires further inquiry.

Finally, various meanings of silence were found in the present research. As mentioned, there was a tendency to see silence in the classroom as projecting a 'shy' personality. The problem was that with Japanese students this image often did not reflect their personality outside the classroom.

Silence was also interpreted as a negative attitude to studies. In some cases, silence was regarded as lack of commitment to and engagement in the classroom, and the case studies revealed that lack of commitment and engagement did actually exist to a certain degree in Aya’s and Tadashi's cases.

It was also pointed out that silence could be used out of deference in accepting or appreciating others' opinions, but at the same time it could serve to avoid uncomfortable confrontations. Thus, this silence is used as a 'Don't do the FTA' strategy' (Brown & Levinson 1987; Sifianou 1997). However, in the modern Australian classroom, voicing disagreement, questions and critical opinions are encouraged and positively evaluated, therefore not performing these speech acts can be interpreted negatively. This in turn suggests that silence in response to the opinions of other participants or of the lecturer, whether in general or in one-on-one situations, is interpreted as acceptance rather than disagreement in the classroom. There were also cases of silence which seemed to be triggered by loss of face such as not being able to respond to a question or counter-argument, where silence could indicate embarrassment.

Regarding inter-turn pauses, they were seen as a sign of dysfluency or a language problem, but at times also as a consequence of cultural influences on L2 communication. Moreover, inter-turn pauses after questions could be interpreted as a sign of not knowing the answer. The difficulty in identifying the meaning of silence was described in the case
studies, and the way silence can be reinforced due to misinterpretation and miscuing was also discussed.

The meanings of silence attributed to Japanese students found in the present research summarised above are generally negative. This seems to reflect the impact, in the last few decades, of the advocacy of interactive and student-centred classrooms in Australia and other western Anglophone universities (Wells 1999). Despite evidence of positive aspects of silence in the classroom provided by existing studies (e.g. Rowe 1974; La Forge 1983; Jaworski & Sachdev 1998), silence in the present research was associated with lack of competence and commitment, at least from Australian perspectives. Being aware of this, the Japanese students in the case studies held negative views of their own silence. On the other hand, among Japanese interview participants, there were critical views of a strong reliance on verbal communication in the classroom for assessment of academic competence. Thus, it may be necessary not only to address how Japanese students' participation can be enhanced but also to reconsider the nature of 'participation' encouraged in Australian universities. For example, to what extent discussions should be structured and controlled by the teacher can be questioned so that the quality of interaction is ensured. Another question is how to make interactive learning effective for both types of students who find it hard to participate (including local and English-native speaker students) and who are active participants. Moreover, the place of facilitating silence in classroom communication also needs to be considered. This takes us to the implications of this research for the teaching of Japanese overseas students in the Australian classroom and for studies on silence in intercultural communication.

8.6 Implications
8.6.1 Implications for the teaching of and learning by Japanese students in Australian universities

The Japanese students who participated in the present research were studying at Australian universities of their own will. They had chosen to study in Australia rather than in Japan, including those who came to live in Australia at an early age with their family. (They were given a choice of where to study.) However, they were found to struggle between the expectations for participation in Australian classrooms and their silence resulting from a combination of inability and resistance. Moreover, as the participation mark often forms a part of the assessment, particularly in areas of study such as Humanities or Education where most of the participants in the present research were
enrolled, silence can directly affect their academic record. What can then be done to enhance the participation of Japanese students?

First, securing opportunities for Japanese students to speak by way of individual nomination can be suggested. Although lecturers prefer not to single out a student, it is likely that active voluntary participation will not be expected from Japanese students otherwise. This strategy may involve a danger of putting the students on the spot and thus lead to a loss of face in public, but this can be avoided by giving some form of preparation in class before speaking. For example, students can work in small groups beforehand. Making facilitative use of silence as cognitive processing and thinking time by simply presenting a question and giving students time to think about it individually in silence before nomination can help. La Forge (1983) used this strategy with Japanese students and reports a successful outcome. Another way silence can be facilitatively used is to increase the 'wait-time' after nominating a student. As discussed in Chapter 2, studies such as Rowe (1974) and Mohatt & Erickson (1981) show that giving a slightly longer 'wait-time' after questioning increases the quality and frequency of response. The findings of the present research also support this increased 'wait-time', as a possibility of silencing triggered by inter-turn pauses was indicated (see 5.4.4 and 6.3.7). Possible silencing in the present research was mostly observed in interactions involving Australian students, and this means that Australian students can also be notified of this possibility. In fact, an awareness of successful intercultural communication in the classroom among Australian students has not been encouraged. Just as overseas students have orientation sessions to receive input on their new learning environment in Australia, Australian students can be given such opportunities to prepare themselves for interaction with overseas students in the classroom.

However, it should also be remembered that there were instances of long inter-turn pauses which could be an indirect silent response. In this case, increasing wait-time may cause a loss of face and an adverse effect. Nevertheless, if time for preparation is given in advance, it can be regarded as a student responsibility to have something to say. In relation to the issue of silent response, it is also possible to teach Japanese students to verbalise their responses so that silencing can be avoided. Although verbalising responses such as 'I don't know' or 'I don't understand the question' can be face-threatening, more indirect phrases such as 'I am not sure', 'I haven't thought about it before, I need a little more time to think about it', or 'Could you clarify your question a little?' can be taught as strategies to avoid silent responses and to maintain engagement. Hesitation can be handled in the same
way. Students can be encouraged to use phrases such as 'I am not sure how to put it' or 'well' instead of silent hesitation.

Although these strategies can be effective in a participant structure where a student is nominated, the issue of lack of voluntary participation in general is still an issue. Voluntary participation is an important performance for students to be recognised for their engagement, understanding and competence in Australian university classrooms. Yet Japanese students were found significantly inactive in this type of participation. Since one of the major factors in this type of silence was found to be politeness orientation, it appears necessary to address this aspect of communication to enhance Japanese students' participation. One thing which can be done is teaching staff's establishing good rapport with Japanese students. 'Knowing' the lecturer as a person rather than as an authoritative figure seems to be important for Japanese students to feel comfortable when they speak to their lecturers. In addition, assurance that any contribution is appreciated in class can be made explicit. Although these strategies may be unnecessary for Australian students, they are likely to shift the hierarchical politeness orientation of Japanese students and enhance their participation. Both of these strategies were found to have positive effects on participation in interview comments by Japanese students.

Another important issue in voluntary participation is the lack of rapport between Australian students and Japanese students. This was also seen to be the case between Asian overseas students in general and Australian students (Chapters 2 and 4). Lack of rapport was suggested as a factor which made speaking in front of the class more face-threatening and thus kept Japanese students in silence when Australian students are engaged in discussions. Moreover, a lack of interaction between the two groups appeared to prevent Japanese students from adapting to turn-taking and other interactional norms in the Australian classroom which would have allowed them to participate fully in discussions. Although more contact between the two groups outside the classroom may be practically difficult, it is possible to increase contact during class. In the case studies and in the interview in Chapter 4, it was revealed that Japanese students do not tend to sit among Australian students. Seating configurations can also affect the direction of attention in classroom discussion and was suggested as a contributor to the silence of Japanese students. Hence, the physical environment of the classroom can be modified so that more interaction takes place between Australian students and non-Australian students. Seating arrangements can be suggested by the lecturer so students from different backgrounds can mix. Giving motivation to mix would have more impact on increasing opportunities for interaction.
Tasks can be set for a mixed group to work on together, which Volet & Ang (1999) report to have positive effects on student learning experiences. A personal communication with the Business lecturer mentioned in Chapter 4 reveals that mentioning potential business/career opportunities in the future overseas made the members of his multicultural class aware of the benefits they could gain from intercultural communication. The result was active participation from everyone in the class. These strategies above can lead to more shared knowledge, more solidarity and more rapport among students from different cultural/linguistic backgrounds and thus can enhance participation by various groups of students. The same lecturer mentioned that getting overseas students to share their knowledge on situations in their own country in relation to the issues discussed in the classroom encouraged their participation. It was also observed that Aya and Miki were willing to talk about their own language, culture and experiences. Therefore, although there may be constraints in some areas of studies, it is possible to bring in issues in students' home countries in classroom discussions to enhance participation of overseas students, which also would benefit Australian students.

Finally, a written mode of communication can be utilised more as a means of participation, as it was suggested that Japanese students tend to emphasise the written mode of learning. This can be done by giving students opportunities to express their opinions on topics in their course or their concerns about the class itself on the internet website set up for a particular course. It is also possible to ask students to submit written comments or responses in short paragraphs to be shared in class in the following session. The teaching staff only need to cut and paste these comments and photocopy them onto an overhead transparency. These strategies can be helpful in that it not only removes the problem of timing in turn-taking but also gives Japanese students time to edit their language and ideas. The web discussion strategy was witnessed to be highly successful in one of the courses at the University of Sydney. Many Asian students in this particular class participated in discussions, and in fact, Japanese students were one of the most frequent comment-posting groups in this course.

As we can see, there are a number of ways in which the participation of Japanese students can be enhanced. The significant roles played by factors in the immediate context of the classroom discussed in the present research suggest that the negative consequences of silence can be removed or alleviated by modifying that immediate context. Although culture-specific communicative styles and language proficiency were found to impact on silence in the multi-cultural classroom, it is the way these factors are handled in the
classroom which seems to create silence, and which needs to be addressed. It should also be considered that silence can play a facilitative role in learning and in improving the quality of classroom interaction. It is not only how much students talk but also how they talk and what they talk about which matters for excellence in education.

What should also be noted at this point is that although the present research focused on Japanese students as a primary subject group, the implications given above can be applied to overseas students from other Asian countries. This is because there are similarities between the reported silence of Asian students in general and that of Japanese students. However, caution should always be applied so that differences in subcultures and individuals are not overlooked. As seen in the present research, even among Japanese students and among Australian students, different orientations to and degrees of silence were found.

8.6.2 Implications for research in silence in intercultural communication

The present research aimed to show how the silence of Japanese students in Australian university classrooms is constructed through the perceptions and performances of classroom participants. A combination of methodological approaches and data sources such as ethnography of communication, conversation analysis, analysis of coded classroom interaction and stimulated recall interviews enabled the provision of as many accounts of silence as possible and a critical discussion of silence from these various perspectives. While conversation analysis provided an understanding of silence as a product of participants' orientations to face-to-face interaction which often operate at an unconscious level, self-reports given in interviews brought out silences which would not be found otherwise (cf. Jaworski & Stephens 1998) and revealed the types of silence which can be perceived and how they are perceived.

The difficulty faced in this research was specifying the motivations for and interpretations of silence in each context, as there was often a number of possibilities. The ambiguity of silence is magnified in intercultural communication, and this will always be a problem in this field of research. However, one of the important findings of the present research is that when there is a gap in perceptions and performance of silence, interaction between the perceptions and the performance can create further silences, in particular in intercultural communication. This is why interpreting silence using different approaches and from multidisciplinary perspectives is important.
The present research provided a comprehensive picture of silence in multicultural classroom settings, and the continuing accumulation of data on and analysis of the different types and aspects of silence found in this research will be required in future research in this area of study. This will allow us to give even more specific solutions to the problems of silence in specific classroom contexts. In this regard, studying the influence of culture-specific uses of silence requires more empirical accounts of silence in Japanese communication in terms of both micro and macro level silences. The relative length of inter-turn pauses needs to be investigated more rigorously with empirical data. At a macro level, different study-abroad situations can be explored to see whether the same types of silences can be found. For example, Australian students studying in Japan can be focus participants for investigation of the impact of culturally specific communication styles. The ‘culture of silence’ is a large field yet to be fully investigated.
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Appendix 1. Questions for semi-structured interviews with Japanese students (translated from Japanese)

1. What are you studying?
2. What made you chose that field?
3. How long have you been enrolled in the current program?
4. Have you studied abroad anywhere outside Japan before starting your studies here?
5. Have you studied in programs which are run through English medium before?
6. Have you lived overseas before starting your studies here?
7. Can you tell me about your educational background? What type of school/college/university did you go to?
8. What is your occupation in Japan? What kind of jobs have you had?
9. What made you study in Australia?
10. What did you think would be like to study at university in Australia? What were your expectations?
11. Can you tell me your typical day at this university?
12. How different is it to study here from studying in Japan?
13. Can you describe typical classes at this university? What are the typical procedures of these classes? How many students are there? What proportions of overseas students are there?
14. How different are classes here from those in Japan?
15. Can you describe typical tutorials? What are the typical procedures of these tutorials? How many students are there? What proportions of overseas students are there?
16. How different are tutorial here from those in Japan?
17. What do you think of university education in Australia?
18. What courses do you like? What courses do you think are of good quality? What courses do you dislike? What courses do you think are of poor quality?
19. Who is your favourite lecturer? What is he/she like?
20. Who is your least favourite lecturer? What is he/she like?
21. Who are the students whom you are most close? Can you tell me about your friends at university?
22. What do you think of Australian students? Do you have Australian friends? How do you socialise with them?
23. What do you think of students of other backgrounds? Do you have any particular ethnic/cultural groups with whom you tend to form friendship more easily than others? How do you socialise with them?
24. Do you think classes here are different from those in Japan? Can you tell me how different they are?
25. Do you sometimes feel uncomfortable or doubtful about communication in the classroom? How about in personal contact with lecturers? Do you sometimes feel any gaps between yourself and lecturers? How about between yourself and your Australian peers?
Appendix 2. Biographical information of Japanese participants in the interview

M1 Information is given in section 5.2, as he is the focus Japanese student Tadashi in Case Study 1.
M2 M2 came to Australia to study at a secondary school in Sydney. After finishing secondary school he spent a year at Matriculation college, and moved on to study linguistics at the University of Sydney. He is in his third year in BA.
M3 M3 came to Australia with his family when he was ten year old. After graduating a public school in Sydney, he was accepted to Bachelor of Industrial Design program at the University of New South Wales. His parents went back to Japan at this stage, but he and his siblings stayed to study in Australia. He is in his second year at UNSW.
M4 M4 came to Australia to study Industrial Design, as he had not been accepted to a university program in Japan. After studying English for 7 months at a language school in Sydney, he studied at a foundation course at the University of New South Wales for a year, and was accepted to an Industrial Design program at the same university.
M5 M5 is a third year student majoring in Chinese language at the University of New South Wales. Before starting his studies at university, he spent six months in New Zealand at a sports college playing rugby, and studied in an EAP program for 20 weeks in Sydney.
M6 M6 came to Australia with his family when he was thirteen years old. After he graduated from a public school in Sydney, he started his studies in Bachelor of Chemistry since he was interested in genetic engineering. He is in his second year at university.
M7 M7 went to secondary school in a country town in Queensland (Australia) for three years before he started his studies in telecommunication at the University of Sydney. He was not interested in acquiring English but he came to Australia was to avoid the ‘examination hell’ in Japan and to have experiences of study abroad. To fully experience study abroad, he chose to a school in a country town. He is in his second year at university.
M8 M8 is in his second year in his Masters in applied linguistics. He came to Australia after graduating from university with a major in comparative culture in Japan. This particular program is run through English medium. Before starting his Master’s degree at the University of Sydney, he studied at an EAP program in Sydney for 10 weeks.
M9 M9 is in his second year in his Masters in commerce at the University of New South Wales. Before starting his studies in Australia, he worked for a trading company in Japan as he had a Bachelor of Economics degree from a Japanese university. He studied in an EAP program for six months in Sydney before being accepted to UNSW.
F1 F1 went to a public secondary school for three years in Sydney before she started her Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Sydney. She is a second year student majoring in Chinese Studies and Psychology. After her secondary school, she decided to study at university in Australia as she preferred Australia as a place for her education.
F2 Information is given in section 7.1, as she is the focus Japanese student Aya in Case Study 3.
F3 F3 is in her second year as a Bachelor of Arts student majoring in Asian Studies and Politics. She came to Australia after her graduation from high school in Japan, and studied at a language school
which belonged to a university in Sydney for 8 months. After this, she did a one-year tertiary preparation course at TAFE (Technical And Further Education) college before starting her studies at the University of Sydney.

F4  F4 is in her second year as a Bachelor of Arts student majoring in international relations at the University of Sydney. Before joining this program, she did her foundation program for a year in the UK and studied anthropology at a university there for a semester. She did not like the program and decided to study in Australia instead. She had also worked in Canada and in Australia for a year each on working holidays. Prior to these overseas experiences she also worked as an instructor at a computer college in Japan, after graduating from a Japanese university.

F5  F5 is in her second year as a Bachelor of Arts student majoring in linguistics at the University of Sydney. After finishing high school in Japan, she studied in a foundation program for a year at a university about 120 km south from Sydney in order to be accepted to the B.A. program in Sydney.

F6  F6 went to a private school in Sydney for two and half years before starting her degree in Bachelor of Arts at the University of New South Wales. After her experiences at Australian school, she did not want to study at Japanese university but wanted to stay in Australia for her further studies. She is in her second year majoring in Asian Studies.

F7  F7 went to an international school in Sydney for three years. She came to Australia to study English, but then towards the end of year 10 at school, she decided to study something which will be useful for her future career at university in Australia. She is in her second year in a Bachelor of Commerce program at the University of New South Wales.

F8  F8 is in her first year as a Bachelor of Science student at the University of Sydney. Before starting this course, she was enrolled in a Nursing major, but after a semester she changed her major. She had studied at a TAFE foundation course to fulfil the requirements for admission to university. She had lived in Malaysia and spent the first two years of junior high school there. Upon returning to Japan, she and her parents decided it was better for her to study overseas, and the whole family went back to Malaysia for her and her sister to study at an international school there for three years. She lives with her sister who is studying at a secondary school in Sydney.

F9  F9 is in her second year in her Master of Education program at the University of Sydney, specialising in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). After completing her B.A. in English in Japan, she was accepted to a program in Tourism at a university in an outer Sydney area, but after one semester she did not like the program and applied for the TEFL program.

F10 F10 is in her second year in her Master of Commerce program at the University of Sydney. Before coming to Australia, she worked at a financial institution for five years. Her Bachelor’s degree from a Japanese university is in Japanese History, but she came to Australia to develop her career opportunities in financial field with a master’s degree from an English speaking country.
Appendix 3. Lecturer Questionnaire

Dear Colleagues,

One of our research students works on educational issues which concern Japanese students in Australian University classrooms. If would be very much appreciated if you could answer the four questions below. Your answers will be anonymous, and the ethics clearance has been received for this research.

Questions
1. What is your impression of Japanese students in Australian university classrooms?

2. What are particular strengths of Japanese students you perceive in your classes?

3. What are particular problems of Japanese students you perceive in your classes?

4. What is your first and the strongest language?

Your support will be very much appreciated.
Yours sincerely,

International Student Services Unit
### Appendix 4. Video coding sheets

Video ( ) J ( ) Class ( ) Bidding for Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Environment(1)</th>
<th>Bid by (2)</th>
<th>Bid type (3)</th>
<th>Turn Length(4)</th>
<th>Turn management (5)</th>
<th>Turn recognition &amp; feedback (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ttalk</td>
<td>Stalk</td>
<td>Lap</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Jps</td>
<td>Aus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Notes] (1) Environment: speaker or event before bidding. Ttalk: teacher talk; Stalk: student talk; Lap: lapse; Other: other environment such as laugh (2) Jps: Japanese students; Aus: Australian students; MigA: migrant Australian students; OS: overseas students (3) C: comment; Q: question; Clr.Q: clarification question; Other: other types of turns (4) Turn length in seconds (5) Comp: completed; Interrupt: interrupted; Unfini: unfinished (without being interrupted) (6) Turn recognition & feedback: whether the turn was recognised, and notes on reaction to the turn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Stimuli Sender (1)</th>
<th>Stimuli Type (2)</th>
<th>Response by (3)</th>
<th>Response type (4)</th>
<th>Resp Length (5)</th>
<th>Turn management (6)</th>
<th>Turn recognition &amp; feedback (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>VR</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Jps</td>
<td>Aus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Notes] (1) Participant who opened the floor (2) Q: question; VR: verbal other than question; NV: non-verbal (3) Jps: Japanese students; Aus: Australian students; MigA: migrant Australian students; OS: overseas students (4) C: comment; Q: question; Clr.Q: clarification question; F: factual response; YN: yes-no response; S: supporting move (such as ‘right’ or ‘true’) (5) Response length in seconds (6) Comp: completed; Interrupt: interrupted; Unfini: unfinished (without being interrupted) (6) Turn recognition & feedback: whether the turn was recognised, and notes on reaction to the turn
## Video ( ) J ( ) Class ( ) Individually offered Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Stimuli Sender (1)</th>
<th>Stimuli Type (2)</th>
<th>Student given the floor (3)</th>
<th>Response type (4)</th>
<th>Resp Length (5)</th>
<th>Turn management (6)</th>
<th>Turn recognition &amp; feedback (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>VR</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Jps</td>
<td>Aus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MigA</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clr.Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Notes] (1) Participant who nominated the next speaker (2) Q: question; VR: verbal other than question; NV: non-verbal (3) Jps: Japanese students; Aus: Australian students; MigA: migrant Australian students; OS: overseas students (4) C: comment; Q: question; Clr.Q: clarification question; F: factual response; YN: yes-no response; S: supporting move (such as ‘right’ or ‘true’) (5) Response length in seconds (6) Comp: completed; Interrupt: interrupted; Unfini: unfinished (without being interrupted) (6) Turn recognition & feedback: whether the turn was recognised, and notes on reaction to the turn.
Appendix 5. International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ISLPR) levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ZERO PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Unable to communicate in the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>FORMULAIC PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to perform in a very limited capacity within the most immediate, predictable areas of need, using essentially formulaic language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>MINIMUM CREATIVE PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to satisfy immediate, predictable needs, using predominantly formulaic language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BASIC TRANSACTIONAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to satisfy basic everyday transactional needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to satisfy everyday transactional needs and limited social needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BASIC SOCIAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to satisfy basic social needs, and routine needs pertinent to everyday commerce and to linguistically undemanding vocational fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>SOCIAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BASIC VOCATIONAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to perform effectively in most informal and formal situations pertinent to social and community life and everyday commerce and recreation, and in situations which are not linguistically demanding in own vocational fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>BASIC VOCATIONAL PROFICIENCY PLUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VOCATIONAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Able to perform very effectively in almost all situations pertinent to social and community life and everyday commerce and recreation, and generally in almost all situations pertinent to own vocational fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>ADVANCED VOCATIONAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NATIVE-LIKE PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Proficiency equivalent to that of a native speaker of the same sociocultural variety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.gu.edu.au/centre/call/content4c.html](http://www.gu.edu.au/centre/call/content4c.html)
Appendix 6. Transcription conventions
(used for interaction excerpts in Chapters 5, 6 and 7)

[ point of overlap onset
] point at which overlap stops
= latching (no gap or no overlap between stretches of talk)
(0.5) elapsed time in silence by tenth of seconds
(.) micropause of less than 0.2 seconds
word stress
: lengthening of a sound
. falling terminal contour
, a continuing contour
? rising contour
↑↓ shifts into higher or lower pitch
• • speech noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk
CAPITALS speech noticeably louder than the surrounding talk
> < speech produced noticeably quicker than the surrounding talk
· hh in-breath, the number of ‘h’ indicating the length
hh an out-breath, the number of ‘h’ indicating the length
- a halting, abrupt cutoff
( ) inaudible speech
(why/well) varieties of transcriptionist doubt
(( )) non-verbal activity
-> a pointer to a specific part of an extract discussed in the text


Conventions for transcription of eye-gaze*

↓ Downward eye-gaze
→ Eye-gaze towards the audience
M Eye-gaze towards Miki
L Eye-gaze towards the lecturer
,, Transitional eye-gaze