

Revised version 26/09/07

Talk about Text during Independent Writing: what teacher-student interaction suggests for how we understand students' competence

Dr Christina Davidson

School of Learning and Innovation

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Education

Central Queensland University

Bruce Highway

Rockhampton

QLD 4702

c.davidson@cqu.edu.au

Dr Christina Davidson is a senior lecturer in the School of Learning and Innovation at Central Queensland University. Christina coordinates undergraduate literacy courses and teaches in the area of early literacy instruction. On-going research interests include young children's social interaction, Conversation Analysis and its application to examining classroom interaction and activity.

Talk about Text during Independent Writing: what teacher-student interaction suggests for how we understand students' competence

Talk between students and their teachers is central to learning at school, yet students' competence is often understood as the outcome of instructional talk rather than essential to successful participation in instructional talk. Curriculum frameworks used to attribute students with levels of competence reflect these understandings. This article employs Conversation Analysis to consider student-teacher interaction during an independent writing lesson. Discussion of their interaction establishes the link between the student's taken-for-granted knowledge of teacher talk and the teacher's instruction. The finding suggests the importance of locating students' competence within the context of instructional talk between teachers and students.

Key words: teacher-student interaction, competence, Conversation Analysis

Introduction

Studies of young children's language use have determined the numerous ways they interact successfully with others to negotiate their social worlds prior to formal schooling (Danby, 2002; Leiminer & Baker, 2000). Not only do very young children employ complex language resources in their interactions, they do so in ways that construct their social identities (Danby, 2002; Goodwin, 1990) in the course of accomplishing their social activity with others (Martello, 2007).

When young children enter formal schooling they bring understandings, knowledge and skills gained through interaction with significant others in their communities and homes (Comber, 2000). Yet their competence is not always recognised or acknowledged by teachers (Danby & Davidson, 2007; Marsh, 2005), nor does it necessarily ensure success at school (Hicks, 2002). Studies have established numerous differences between home and school language use, frequently in order to consider how language use contributes to differential access to instruction (Au, 1993; Heath, 1983). While school talk is different to outside-of-school communication, it more closely resembles the discourse practices (Adger, 2001) of some children who are thus more readily identified as competent language users during classroom interaction with their teachers (Michaels, 1985; Martello, 2004).

The "crediting of literate competence" in the early years can be found in the interchanges between students and their teachers during teacher-led whole-class literacy lessons (Baker and Freebody, 1993, p. 279). Literacy lessons are driven by teachers' questions (Freiberg & Freebody, 1998), and students' answers taken to be evidence of their literacy competence. On-going talk about texts, particularly through questions and answers, provides the literacy lesson, overall, for everybody. Yet, teachers' questions are "difficult to answer" and talk in early literacy lessons is a "highly complicated course of interaction" (Baker & Freebody, 1993, pp. 290 - 291).

The complexity of instructional interaction in the early years is not reflected in current curriculum documents that describe children's levels of oral competence. For example,

Queensland's draft English syllabus for Years 1-10 emphasises simplicity and brevity of oral texts that children interpret and produce at Level 1 (Queensland Studies Authority, 2005). Similarly, the English K-6 syllabus for NSW (2007) uses "brief", "simple" and "short" in descriptions of texts that students produce or respond to orally. Documents such as these attribute a level of competence commensurate with students "being young" and in the earliest stage of schooling; they say little about the competence that complex instructional talk requires *of* students. Thus, interaction between students and teachers - integral to successful learning at school - remains largely taken-for-granted in curriculum frameworks used to describe young students' competencies in classrooms.

This paper addresses competence required by young students to accomplish classroom activity and learning during interaction with the teacher. The paper examines interaction between a student and teacher during an independent writing lesson and provides a turn-by-turn account of their activity. The focus on one-to-one interaction between a student and teacher illustrates that the complexity of instructional talk is not restricted to whole-class teacher-led contexts. Discussion of the young student's interaction highlights the ways his competence made possible the teacher's instructional activity and suggests that understandings of students' competence in curriculum frameworks need to encompass features of instructional talk, especially the ways teachers and students accomplish complex talk about texts

Theoretical perspective

This study was informed by Ethnomethodology (EM), a sociological approach that seeks to understand peoples' situated sense making during their ordinary activity. EM studies focus on how people organise their “naturally occurring ordinary activities” (Cuff, Sharrock & Francis, 1998), and the common-sense understandings and methods by which “ordinary members of society make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves.” (Heritage, 1984, p. 40). A central imperative of EM is that the focus for research directly arises out of the specific orientations of research participants; hence, social activity is best understood through its detailed examination *in situ*. One way to do this is through analysis of social interaction.

Many ethnomethodological studies employ Conversation Analysis (CA), a method of analysing interaction. Conversation analysts are interested in the social organization of people's interaction; the focus for analysis is “language-in-use” (Francis & Hester, 2004, p. 13) or the ways that language is used by people to accomplish their social activity. CA requires fine-grained analysis that begins with recordings of naturally occurring talk. While recordings are considered to be the data, transcripts are necessary to discern the interaction resources that constitute turns at talk. Detailed transcripts are developed using Jefferson notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999). This notation system provides ways to record the finer nuances of talk including even the slightest silences and pauses, changes in intonation and emphases provided through elongation of speech sounds.

CA has provided many key understandings and concepts about social interaction through detailed descriptions of the system for turn-taking, or speech exchange system (Sacks,

Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). For example, some utterances are paired so that the appearance of the first part (such as a question), powerfully requires the provision of a particular second by another (an answer). Other adjacency pairs include directive-compliance and summons-response. Trouble and repair are two other concepts that are central to CA. Trouble is used to refer to problems that occur during interaction. Trouble is an everyday feature of interaction and ranges from trouble at a word and pronunciation “level”, through to trouble related to problems of understanding (Schegloff, 1992, p. 1341) or even hearing (Bilmes, 1992). Repair occurs close to the trouble source and people show a preference for self-correction (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) rather than direct correction of others. So, for example, the use of “pardon” may prompt repetition of an utterance that was misheard or not understood.

One particular arm of conversation analytic work is the study of institutional talk. For some researchers this will involve comparisons with ordinary mundane conversation as a method of explicating the features of talk that are “specialized and respecified in various ways” (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991) within the individual institutionalized setting. Others will seek to show how people orient to particular institutional goals, activities and institutional identities, and how this is accomplished through courses of social interaction. Analysis may focus on the accomplishment of a particular event, not how all such events are accomplished (Hester & Francis, 1995). For example, Hester and Francis analyse a particular story telling lesson to describe the accomplishment of *just that lesson*. In keeping with the intentions of EM/CA, the analytic focus provides highly

detailed descriptions of members' methods, otherwise taken-for-granted in everyday and institutional activity.

EM/CA studies of classrooms show numerous ways that classroom talk presents reductions of ordinary conversation and specialisations of interaction resources (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). That is, talk in classrooms shows differences from ordinary conversation and these can be related to institutional activity that is dominated by teachers during instruction. Teacher-led talk during whole-class instruction is two-party talk although large numbers of potential speakers are present. The teacher takes every second turn at talk and usually nominates who will speak next. Talk forms a three-part sequence of turns (Mehan, 1979; 1985), characterized as question-answer-evaluation turns (Freebody *et al.*, 1995). Macbeth referred to the two-party organisation of the lesson as "our familiar sense of classroom order and instruction" (Macbeth, 2001, p. 61). Certainly, this pattern of interaction is said to characterize teaching activity in classrooms (Cazden, 1988; Edwards & Westgate, 1994) - although research, including from the EM/CA perspective, continues to focus on teacher-led whole class instruction and teacher-led small group activity (Austin, Dwyer & Freebody, 2003).

Overall, CA research in classrooms has established that students need to draw on a "stock of social knowledge" (Mehan, 1985, p. 119) when acquiring academic knowledge.

Central to the "intertwining of the two" is successful classroom interaction with the teacher. An extensive literature demonstrates the ways that students and their teachers accomplish classroom activity during whole-class or small group instruction that is

teacher-led (Austin, Dwyer, & Freebody, 2003). The research that informs this article examined the “stock of social knowledge” used to accomplish the social organisation of independent writing, a time of individual activity in the classroom.

Examining Independent Writing in an Early Years Classroom

The EM/CA examination of independent writing was intended to explicate taken-for-granted knowledge and skills employed during children’s social activity. Data were collected in a Prep/Grade I classroom in Victoria, Australia and consisted of audio and video recordings of ten writing lessons made after two terms of peripheral participation (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004, p. 225) in the classroom. The classroom teacher’s approach to writing instruction was informed by the Early Years Literacy Program (EYLP), an approach to early literacy instruction that is mandated for the state’s primary schools. Within the program, writing instruction requires the implementation of a variety of approaches including independent writing. The program’s description of independent writing emphasises that it is a time when children complete their own writing, or tasks determined by the teacher. During independent writing, the teacher moves around the room talking to individual students about their writing. Conversations provide support where needed, although independent writing is considered to be primarily a time of individual problem-solving by students (Department of Education, Vic., 1998).

Audio and video recordings of one independent writing lesson were selected from the corpus of lesson recordings for detailed analysis. Recordings captured the activity of children seated at one table, and activity that occurred as others, including the teacher,

approached the table. For analytic purposes, the recordings were reviewed many times. The final focus for analysis in the study arose from the orientations of students to others during independent writing: numerous students sought information, help and approval from others. A transcript was developed of the lesson using Jefferson notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999) and detailed analyses of sequences of interaction conducted using CA. Sequences were analysed on a turn-by-turn basis in order to detail the methods employed to accomplish activity during the independent writing lesson.

One activity initiated by some students was to show the teacher completed writing or writing in-progress. Sequences were delineated through repeated viewing of recordings of the independent writing lesson and through examination of transcripts developed from these recordings. The analysis enabled detailed descriptions of interaction, including recurrent features that were identified across sequences, and specific aspects of interaction that occurred during encounters between a particular student and the teacher. The sequence analysed here was selected because it illustrated features of instructional talk that were used by the teacher during all like encounters with students, and it provided a specific account of the way in which the teacher addressed one student's understandings of independent writing. The recurrent feature across encounters was the use of the students' written text to require that students listen to her reading and respond to her talk about it, in order to find their next action in her talk. The specific feature of the encounter was the way the teacher addressed the student's understanding of independent writing, made apparent in his initial utterance to her.

Analysis

During independent writing, Zac (aged five and a half) approached the teacher with his finished work. Since the teacher was seated at a table with other students, Zac had to first gain her attention. The interaction began with a summons-response (1-2) sequence (Schegloff, 1968); Zac said the teacher's name to initiate interaction with her and the teacher responded by turning to face him (1-2). The teacher's acknowledgment of Zac allowed him to take the next turn (4). Zac's spoken turn, together with his passing of the book, announced the "business" and made relevant what was "noteworthy" about his writing; he had written a whole page.

- | | | |
|----|---------|---|
| 1 | Zac | ((walking towards teacher)) Miss Anderson (0.4) |
| 2 | | ((teacher turns to face Zac)) |
| 3 | | (0.2) |
| 4 | Zac | I writ the whole page ((passing his book to the teacher)) |
| 5 | | (1.0) |
| 6 | Teacher | on Saturday I went to Nan |
| 7 | | (1.0) |
| 8 | Zac | [[to sleep up for the night* |
| 9 | Teacher | [[and (Pop's)* (0.4) party and ↑slept |
| 10 | | (1.0) |
| 11 | Zac | over |
| 12 | | (1.2) |

The teacher response was to begin reading the text (6). As she read, the teacher used pauses and intonation to elicit responses from Zac. The teacher stopped reading after the word "Nan" and waited (6-7). Zac eventually responded by telling the teacher what he had done on Saturday (8). Zac's talk overlapped the teacher's voice as she had begun to read again (9). When reading the next section of Zac's writing, the teacher paused briefly

after “Pop’s”, then used rising intonation on ‘slept’ and paused again. After a long pause, Zac responded with the word “over” (11).

Through her reading of the text, the teacher addressed two “problems” in the interaction with Zac. One concerned his claim to have written the whole page. By reading his written text as she did the teacher got Zac to “fill the gap”, or supply words that would fit with what she had read. This provided her with information about what Zac thought was on the page. The teacher also used her talk to bring about Zac’s correct use of “over” rather than the incorrect expression (“sleep up”) he used prior to this. Through her turn design the teacher brought about Zac’s repair of his own talk rather than correcting his talk herself. This way of correcting errors in talk is consistent with previous research that establishes teachers’ preference for withholding correction of student errors in order to bring about their self-repair (McHoul, 1990). While Zac had not corrected his previous speech, he used the correct expression in his response to the teacher.

In the talk that followed her reading of the text, the teacher made relevant (Schegloff, 1991) doing writing “by yourself”. Her question directly required Zac’s confirmation that he had written all of the text *by himself* (13). The design of the teacher's turn (Lerner, 1995) can be "heard" to be in response to Zac's initial utterance and to the interaction that had just occurred during her reading of the text; the inclusion of "by yourself" introduced something new.

- 13 Teacher did you write all this [by yourself?
14 [(Zac nodding ‘yes’)]
15 (0.8)

- 16 Teacher ↓or did Joanne help you? ((joking tone))
 17 ((Zac nodding))
 18 Cathlyn Miss Anderson?, ((puts her hand in the teacher's hand))
 19 (0.4)
 20 Teacher well done! that's great what goes at the end of a sentence
 21 though?
 22 (0.4)
 23 Zac full stop ((turning away))
 24 Teacher full stop that's ↑wonderful ((turns to face Cathlyn))

Zac's response to the teacher's question overlapped her utterance (13-14) at the point where the teacher's words introduced the distinction between writing the whole page and writing it "by yourself". The silence that followed (15) indicated trouble (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977) since Zac's affirmation occasioned an evaluation from the teacher. The teacher did not take an evaluative turn to give what might have been an expected response, such as a comment praising Zac.

In the absence of comment from Zac, which her silence provided for, the teacher asked another question (16). The question, through the use of "or" put it to Zac that Joanne, a parent helper in the classroom and stepmother of Zac, had helped him write his "whole page". This question provided a formulation of how Zac wrote the whole page - with help - and is an information seeking strategy that provides a "candidate" answer (Pomerantz, 1988). Rather than asking if he received help that teacher proposed that Joanne helped him. The teacher's joking tone indicated to Zac her understanding that he was trying to trick her. Zac's answer confirmed that he had been helped (17). Although Zac had, in one sense, provided contradictory responses - he wrote it himself and he was helped to write it - the teacher's questions occasioned his responses. On his terms, he had written the

whole page but according to the teacher's understanding of independent writing, he was helped.

To this point, interaction between Zac and the teacher related to Zac's initial utterance ("I writ the whole page"). The teacher had used the text, through her reading of it and talk that required responses from Zac, to make Zac accountable for his initial comment and for the production of the text itself as independent writing. The teacher's praise and acknowledgement for Zac (20) was given only after he confirmed that he was helped to write the page. Her use of 'well done' finally provided an evaluation of his initial utterance (4) after she had determined how he wrote his sentence: with Joanne's help. The teacher's next words, "that's great" (20) evaluated the written text itself.

The teacher's comment was followed by indication of an error in Zac's writing ("what goes at the end of a sentence though?"). The use of "though" made the point but also down played it so that her question did not detract from her previous acknowledgement of his work. Zac responded to the teacher's question by naming what had been left off the end of his writing (23) and immediately turned away. The teacher's turn accepted the answer and praised Zac again. Although the teacher had not said directly that Zac had to correct his work, the interaction nevertheless makes salient that the teacher is directing that Zac should put a full stop at the end of his sentence.

Discussion

The analysis of interaction between Zac and the teacher provides grist for considering the role of students' competence in the accomplishment of activities central to instruction and learning during independent writing. Discussion considers how interaction between Zac and the teacher shows their orientations to identities and related goals in the institutional setting of the classroom, how instructional activity was mutually accomplished and the interaction resources that Zac needed and used during his interaction with the teacher.

In the course of interaction between Zac and the teacher we see their orientations to identities and related goals. Zac looked to the teacher for approval of his work and at the same time indicated his understanding of what counted as independent writing: he had written the whole page. These actions may be understood in terms of his social orientation to doing “being a student” and to his understanding of the goal of independent writing. Zac brought his work to the teacher for affirmation thus showed his orientation to her social identity and related activity – the teacher approves work. The teacher's response exhibited an instructional goal of independent writing (to have students complete their own writing) and worked to clarify Zac's understanding of it. Hence she made a distinction between writing “by yourself” and writing with help. More broadly, the teacher attempted to bring about learning. She did this through talk that required that Zac name the omission in his writing rather than telling him herself. Thus, she oriented to a particular way of “being the teacher” during independent writing.

The teacher withheld telling and correcting in her responses to Zac and his writing. Rather than directly responding to his initial utterance, she used her reading of his text,

and questions about it, to introduce her own understanding of independent writing. Her correction of his written work was accomplished by asking a question that required that Zac name “full stop” rather than telling him that he had left out a full stop at the end of his sentence. While withholding of information has been identified in previous studies as teachers' modus operandi in literacy lessons (Freebody, Ludwig & Gunn, 1995), the analysis that informed this study shows how withholding of information and correction is mutually accomplished in the classroom.

Although Zac initiated the interaction with the teacher, clearly she took over the "business" of their encounter. Nevertheless, her reading of his text was designed to elicit responses from Zac at particular points. Zac had to hear this in her talk and produce the necessary responses in order for the teacher to continue to withhold information. Most obviously, for the teacher to avoid correcting Zac's written work by telling him that he had omitted a full stop at the end of his writing, Zac had to hear her talk as requiring that he name what had been left off his sentence. Likewise, the teacher was able to determine that Zac had received help because of the mismatch between the responses that Zac supplied during her reading and what he had written in his book.

It is in the “manipulation of culturally available resources to manage the trajectories of interaction” (Hutchby & Moran-Ellis, 1998, p. 16) that Zac's competence during instructional talk may be located. Understandings of the ways that Zac and the teacher accomplished their activity reside in minute details of their talk evinced through the close analyses of their talk. Zac's competence with instructional talk can be considered more

closely in relation to aspects of turn taking or the speech exchange system (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), and features of the teacher's talk. For example, taking turns at talk required hearing silences as invitations to speak (Lerner, 1995), rather than merely pauses in the reading of the text. Zac's provision of answers required understanding subtle changes in intonation that indicated questions by the teacher. Silences and intonation, aspects of talk and interaction, are integral to the social organization of activity, yet are taken-for-granted in institutional talk and ordinary conversation.

Conclusion

While this consideration of a single classroom interaction does not seek to claim that all children's approaches for approval from the teacher will be accomplished in the same way, its EM/CA perspective demonstrates the interaction resources that children and teachers may draw on in the course of their everyday activity in classrooms. Exchanges between Zac and his teacher illustrate how even during one-to-one interaction, teachers ask questions rather than tell, and students must find the points of instructional talk in their provisional answers to teachers' questions. This study affirms this to be the case even during a lesson where students were completing individual activity rather than a whole class lesson.

The analysis of interaction during an independent writing lesson attests to some of the "stock of social knowledge" students require to accomplish instructional interaction.

While current curriculum frameworks address a range of competencies that students need to develop, interaction with the teacher needs to be encompassed within frameworks that

seek to address students' competence in classroom areas such as communication, English and learning in other disciplines of the school curriculum.

Transcription symbols

- [[Utterances that begin at the same time
- [Overlap in speakers' talk
- * Indicates point where simultaneous talk finishes
- = Talk between speakers that latches or follows without a break between
- () Used to indicate length of silences, pauses and gaps e.g. (0.2)
- (.) Indicates micro intervals
- ::: Indicates that a prior sound is prolonged e.g. li::ke
- Word is cut off e.g. ta-
- ? Rising intonation
- ?, Rising intonation that is weaker than ?
- ↑ Marked rising intonation
- ↓ Marked falling intonation
- ! An animated tone
- un Emphasis with capitals indicating greater emphasis e.g. NO
- Emphasis and prolongation indicate pitch change e.g. stra:::p indicates stress on word but no change in pitch; stra::p pitch rise
- CA Upper case indicates loudness
- ° Indicates softness e.g. It's a ° secret °
- .hhh Indicates in-breath
- (it) Indicates that word within parentheses is uncertain
- () Empty parentheses indicate that word/s could not be worked out
- (()) These are used to indicate verbal descriptions e.g. ((sits down))

Notation adapted from Jefferson notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999).

References

- Adger, C. T. (2001) Discourse in Educational Settings, in D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton (Eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA; Oxford; Vic, Aust: Blackwell Publishing.
- Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (1999) Jefferson's Transcript Notation, in A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.) *The Discourse Reader*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Au, K. H. (1993) *Literacy Instruction in Multicultural Settings*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Austin, H., Dwyer, B. & Freebody, P. (2003) *Schooling the Child: the making of students in classrooms*. London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Baker, C. D. & Freebody, P. (1993) The Crediting of Literate Competence in Classroom Talk, *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 16 (4), 279-294.
- Bilmes, J. (1992) Dividing the Rice: a microanalysis of the mediator's role in a Northern Thai negotiation, *Language in Society*, 21(4), 569 – 602.
- Board of Studies New South Wales. (2007) *English K-6*. Sydney: Board of Studies, NSW.

- Cazden, C. (1988) *Classroom Discourse: the language of teaching and learning*.
Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Comber, B. (2000). What Really Counts in Early Literacy Lessons, *Language Arts*, 78
(1), 39 – 49.
- Cuff, E. C., Sharrock, W. & Francis, D. (1998) *Perspectives in Sociology*, 4th edition.
New York: Routledge.
- Danby, S. (2002) The Communicative Competence of Young Children, *Australian
Journal of Early Childhood*, 27 (3), 25-30.
- Danby, S. & Davidson, C. (2007) Young Children Using Language to Negotiate their
Social Worlds, in L. Makin, C. Jones-Diaz & C. McLachlan (Eds.) *Literacies in
Childhood: changing views, challenging practices*, 2nd edition. Port Melbourne,
Vic: Elsevier.
- Department of Education Victoria. (1998) *Teaching Writers in the Classroom: Stage
2 Early Years Literacy Program*. South Melbourne, Vic: Addison Wesley
Longman.
- Edwards, D. & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994) *Investigating Classroom Talk*, 2nd edition.
Sussex: The Falmer Press.

Francis, D. & Hester, S. (2004) *An Invitation to Ethnomethodology: language, society and interaction*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Freebody, P. (2003) *Qualitative Research in Education*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE.

Freebody, P., Ludwig, C. & Gunn, S. (1995) *Everyday Literacy Practices In and Out of Schools in Low Socio-Economic Urban Communities: a summary of a descriptive and interpretive research program*. Canberra: Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Freiberg, J. & Freebody, P. (1998) Analysing Literacy Events in Classrooms and Homes, in P. Freebody, C. Ludwig, T. Forrest, J. Freiberg, S. Gunn & P. Herschell (Eds.) *Talk and Literacy in Schools and Homes*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Goodwin, M. (1990) *He-Said-She-Said: talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983) *Ways with Words: language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Polity Press.

- Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991) On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: the case of news interviews, in D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.) *Talk and Social Structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hester, S. & Francis, D. (1995) Words and Pictures: collaborative storytelling in a primary classroom, *Research in Education*, 53, 65-88.
- Hicks, D. (2002) *Reading Lives: working class children and literacy learning*. Cambridge: Teachers College Press.
- Hutchby, I. & Moran-Ellis, J. (1998) *Children and Social Competence: arenas of action*. London; Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2004) *Handbook of Teacher Research*. Berkshire, Eng: Open University Press.
- Leiminer, M. & Baker, C. D. (2000) A Child's Say in Parent-Teacher Talk at the Pre-School: doing conversation analytic research in early childhood settings, *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 1 (2), 135-152.
- Lerner, G. (1995) Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities, *Discourse Processes*, 19 (1), 111-131.

- Macbeth, D. (2001) On "Reflexivity" in Qualitative Research: two readings, and a Third, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7 (1), 35-68.
- McHoul, A. W. (1978) The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom, *Language in Society*, 7 (2), 183-212.
- McHoul, A. W. (1985) Two Aspects of Classroom Interaction: turn-taking and correction, *Classroom Interaction*, 13, 53-64.
- Marsh, J. (2005) Ritual, Performance and Identity Construction: young children's engagement with popular cultural and media texts, in J. Marsh (Ed.) *Popular Culture, New Media and Digital Literacy in Early Childhood*. Oxon, Eng: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Martello, J. (2004) Precompetence and Trying to Learn: beginning writers talk about spelling, *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4 (3), 271 – 289.
- Martello, J. (2007) Many roads through Many Modes: becoming literate in childhood, in L. Makin, C. Jones-Diaz & Claire McLachlan (Eds.) *Literacies in Childhood*. Marrickville, NSW: Elsevier.
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in*

- Society*, 19, 349-377.
- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons: social organization in the classroom*.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mehan, H. (1985) The Structure of Classroom Discourse, in T. A. van Dijk (Ed.)
Handbook of Discourse Analysis. London: Academic Press.
- Michaels, S. (1985) Hearing the Connections in Children's Oral and Written Discourse,
Journal of Education, 167 (1), 36-56.
- Pomerantz, A. (1988) Offering a Candidate Answer: an information seeking strategy,
Communication Monographs, 55 (4), 360-373.
- Queensland Studies Authority. (2005) *Years 1-10 English Syllabus (Trial)*. Spring Hill,
QLD: QSA.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974) A simplest systematics for the
organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language*, 50 (4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968) Sequencing in Conversational Openings, *American
Anthropologist*, 70 (6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991) Reflections on Talk and Social Structure, in D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.) *Talk and Social Structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992) Repair after Next Turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation, *American Journal of Sociology*, 97 (5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977) The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation, *Language*, 53 (2), 361-382.