

Teachers and Students Dialogue as Springboard for Language Competence

Jawi Mailadanbe¹, Abo Shugaba², Abubakar Isa³ and Bukar Baruwa Mohammed⁴

¹Department of English, Umar Suleiman College of Education Gashua. Email: jawi_mailadanbe@yahoo.com, Phone No: 08032827019.

²Department of English Language, Umar Suleiman College of Education, Gashua. Email: aboshugaba74@gmail.com, Phone No: 07037143509

³School of Preliminary Studies, Umar Suleiman College of Education, Gashua. Email: abubakarisah@gmail.com, Phone No: 08038097800

⁴Department of Primary Education, Umar Suleiman College of education, Gashua. Email: bukarbaruwamohammed@gmail.com, Phone No: 07037693361

Abstract: *This paper analysed institutional conversation using Conversation Analysis (CA), it is a teacher/student conversation; the teacher and the student do not assume the same status in terms of opportunities to speak and to be addressed. The purpose is to determine how the conversation between teacher and student aid in acquiring language competence. The teacher initiates such of the 18 turns giving directives to the student. The data was collected through tape recorder of conversation between the tutor and the student each assumes their institutional roles in managing an institutional task to help the student with her project writing. The tutor leads in the discussion toward achieving the goal of the student academic endeavour (dissertation). The tutor sets the limits and enforces them. The tutor's domination of the talk and the student's consenting all through the data indicate that the tutor has long acquaintance with the text and high epistemic status about the subject. The student on the other hand, maintains the same kind of response because she has read very little and has missed the focus of the work. The study shows and indeed concludes that this kind of conversation indicates the kind of epistemic asymmetry found in dialogue may be described as the tutor rating more and the student rating low on the epistemic gradient.*

Key words: Teachers, Dialogue, Springboard & Language

© 2020. Jawi Mailadanbe, Abo Shugaba, Abubakar Isa and Bukar Baruwa Mohammed. Ogonnaya, Dorcas C. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1.0 Introduction

The Jeffersonian transcript in this conversation is designed to help not only to capture all that was said but *how it* was said by the use of the complex symbols. The transcript highlights

information about the participants' words, spoken sound, uttered inaudible sound, overlapping, speech Stretch, stresses and volume. Etc. Jeff and Smith (1999) observes that many people find conversations difficult to handle not because of the abnormality in such persons, but because they lack some levels of competence that we use and rely on to keep up conversational cooperation.

2.0 Review of Literature on Jefferson transcription in the analysis of the data

This section provides reviews of some related studies on conversation Analysis and the analyses of data were carried out in transcription.

2.1 Deontics and Directivity

In this data, there is an indication of directivity, established as in Chids' (2012) use of 'I want' and 'I need' to construct directives. The construction in line (22) heeds not to the willingness or ability of the recipient to perform the projected task (Craven and Potter, 2010 in Chids 2012). In line (22) the tutor demands the student to observed the deontic obligation on her to look at philosophical things she proposed.

22 >you'd also need to look at <philoso[phical things=

In (line 30) the directivity continues in the tutor's expressions of her deontic authority in asking the student not to orient her project toward practical politics.

30 <I u:m(.) I don't want your project to became too(hh) oriented towards um

31 practical politics>

Advice is a kind of directive on what *should* happen rather than predicting future action (Hepburn and Potter 2011:217) There is a construction expressing contingency encoded in the phrase 'I would like'. In (line 76 and 78), the tutor advises the student in rather a form of contingency that the student is entitled to her opinion but is encouraged by the tutor to consider another opinion.

76 Tutor: but I'd like you

77 even you disagree with it

78 I w'd like you to also recognise

79 the other side of the argument=

18 Tutor: tchuhm
19 so, ye _____s look at bio means political science ar:tics=
20 =but (.) u:: would ar:gue (.) h that you would
21 (.)
22 >you'd also need to look at <philoso[phical thin]gs=
23 Student: [yeah yeah]

2.4 Repair/correction

Jefferson, Schegloff and Sacks (1977). Two types of repairs have been identified in repair/correction organisation. However, their main concern is on self-correction as preferred to other-correction. Their main interest is in repairs such as 'word search' where the right word is not available at the right time for the speaker to use; and the repairs where there are mistakes or faults. They note however that, some hearable mistakes do not necessarily need repairs (Jefferson, Schegloff and Sacks 1977). In this data, there are four repairs all occurring where there are no hearable mistakes. These self-initiated repairs are interestingly well distributed across the data and is not only used for correction. It is used for the purpose of achieving interactional goals. This can be seen as re-arranging thoughts as in lines (46). Example:

46 hhh have you do you understand the major difference between=
47 =philosophical difference between those who say it is ok to have dirty hands in
48 politics
49 =and those who say i i:zn't<

The question on line (46) comes perhaps as a result of the tutor's bit of disappointment because she expects the student at this level to have read and known about the philosophical difference between the two stands on dirty hand in politics.

Another type of repair in this data is the replacing of an error with the correct or right word. In line (6) there is clearly audible replacement of a word. The word 'look' is used to replace probably the word 'reason'.

06 Tutor: >at the end of the day s<(.) you will have to probably resumes look back at(.)

2.5 Epistemics

Epistemic status

The data shows epistemic status of the teacher knowing how much Anita has written about political philosophy in line (57). The student remains silent; showing low epistemic status.

53 Tutor: have you looked at coz what worries: me s upstairs

- 54 If you looked at W alters=_
55 =If you looked at that book 24 n uh philosophy=
56 =hh uh which's got stuff from Steven Dividu;
57 >Anita's written a lot about it<=____
58 =I don know if you uhh
59 (.)
60 >you can find that there are articles from him<

The tutor expects some reading from the student and tries to confirm it by using an interesting low epistemic tone 'I don know if you uhh' in line (58). This could be a kind of professional practice of making enquiry.

2.5 Epistemic Asymmetry

It is evident that the student on the other hand expresses low epistemic stance (Heritage 2012) compared to the teacher. Throughout the data the student keeps consenting. In addition, the pause in line (59) indicates the student's apparent little knowledge about the text of philosophy by Stephen Divijus. In general, the teacher assumes epistemic authority in controlling the discussion. However, this does not confirm the traditional belief that teachers have authority over institutional interaction with their student (Brannon and Knoblauch, 1982 in Park, 2012).

- 57 >Anita's written a lot about it<=____
58 =I don know if you uhh
59 (.)

2.6 Epistemic stance

It can be understood from the data that the student has not read much hence, the tutor could not find the things she was expecting in the work. This student's low epistemic stance is what gives the tutor those worries (Angell and Bolden, 2015).

- 53 Tutor: have you looked at coz what worries: me s upstairs
54 If you looked at Walters=____

2.7 Accounts

In order to negotiate treatment recommendations with patients, Angell and Bolden (2015) observed two kinds of accounts the psychiatrists use to come to agreement. They are 'client

attentive' and the psychiatrist's medical authority. In the 'client-attentive' account the psychiatrists attends to the clients' opinion, expresses concern about their health, and their well-being generally; as well as giving reasons (accounts) that it is on the needs and concerns of the client that these such treatment plans are based. The second kind of the account is the 'psychiatrist's medical authority in which treatment recommendations are justified on the physician's medical knowledge and specialisation. In line (34 and 35) the tutor gives the reason why she likes the student's idea of not orienting the work toward practical politics.

35tutor: >i'm looking at fiction is actually where to avoid it<= 36
=>which is why I quite like your this idea<

2.8 Negotiating understanding and agreement

Bowker (2012) focusses on the supervisor's turns on giving information and advice to the student so as to negotiate and establish understanding on the institutional task. The tutor and the student negotiate on the project not to be more of political science on line(30) to which the tutor suggests 'fiction' (line 35) as the means to do it.

30 <I u:m(.) I don't want your project to become too (hh) oriented towards um

31 practical politics>

32student: ok(h)

33tutor: ok

34Student: yeah

35tutor: >i'm looking at fiction is actually where to avoid it<=

36 =>which is why I quite like your this idea<

37 im, im

38student: ok

39Tutor: ok(h)

40Student: yeah

Limberg (2010:276) identified that there are agreement tokens such as 'yeah', 'mm', 'mhm' etc than partial repeats to show agreement to offer of advice. Limberg's findings corroborate my findings. When the tutor comes to her analogy and exercises her epistemic and deontic stand by asking the student to look at philosophical things in line (22) the student agrees strongly with the token 'yeah, yeah'.

19 so, yes look at bio means political science articles=

20 =but (.) u:: would argue (.) h that you would

21 (.)

22 >you'd also need to look at<philoso[phical thin]gs=

23 Student: [yeah yeah]

2.9 on 'so' as a boundary marker

The marker 'so' is used in discourses to mark a course of action, an interactional project or an upcoming topic. It is sometimes used to introduce what participants may consider a pending agenda in a dialogue (Bolden, 2009). In line (14), the issue of morality in politics is started, then in line (19) it is presented a course of action for the student to also look at political science articles to include morality in politics stuff.

14 >and it's about morality<in politics;.

19 so, yes look at bio means political science ar:ticles=

2.10 Pauses and Gaps

In observing gaps and pauses in individual speech and between two speakers, what is more important is to look at the factors that are responsible for their occurrence (Heldner and Edlund 2010). A tense situation in which information is sought is associated with short gaps (Jaffe and Felstein, 1970 in Heldner and Edlund, 2010). Shorter gaps are found in argument more than in conversation (Trimboli and Walker, 1984 in Heldner and Edlund, 2010). However, new and more complex tasks and conversational barriers are responsible for longer gaps (Bull & Aylett, 1998).

43 Tutor: ok

44 °hh a:m mcht no:

45 mhhh

46 hhh have you do you understand the major difference between=

47 =philosophical difference between those who say it is ok to have dirty hands in

48 politics

49 =>and those who say i i:zn't<

50 (0.8)

51 Student: () mhmm

Initiated in line (44) with the unintelligible sound, the long gap in line (50) is however, produced by the long time the tutor took to go through, possibly pages of some draft. Although it is an audio data but the rustle of papers are clearly audible. It is interesting too to see that in spite of the long gap the tutor is responsible for, the student took the next turn.

Conclusion

This paper has examined how readers will have seen that many of the different dimensions or levels of ‘institutionality’ in the talk are thoroughly interrelated. Lexical choice is part of turn design and is part of sequence organisation and is therefore part of the structural organisation. Turn taking, overlap, asymetrics, pause and gaps, repairs and errors, accounts and so on have been used in this conversation having the major significance effects at many levels of this data. It is important to consider the use of language within this dialogue. Conversational analysis was used to analyse the transcript and to evaluate conversation pattern. The transcript was a clear example of a conversational discourse style with the tutor and student constructing meaning and maintaining tutor –led structured. We can understand how people carry out conversation in the society. The study has thus, contributed to the work of literature in conversational Analysis on Jefferson transcription as it shows how dialogue improved learners language competence.

Reference

- Angell, B. and Bolden, G. (2015) Justifying medication decisions in mental health care: Psychiatrists' accounts for treatment recommendations. *Social science & medicine* [online], 138pp. 44-56.
- Bowker D (2012) Okay? Yeah? Right?: Negotiating understanding and agreement in master's supervision meetings with international students, Doctor of Education, University of Stirling.
- Bolden, G.B. (2009) Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker ‘so’ in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* [online], 41(5), pp. 974-998 . Last checked 15/5/2016.
- Childs, C. (2012). ‘I’m not X, I just want Y’: Formulating ‘wants’ in interaction. *Discourse Studies* [online], 14(2), pp. 181-196. Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Farber, B. and Doolin, E. (2011). Positive regard. *Psychotherapy* 48: 58-64.
- Heritage, (2012a,b) Epistemic status check’ as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* Volume 45, Issue 1, January 2013, [online] Pages 13–28
- Heritage, J. (2013) Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies* [online], 15(5), pp. 551-578 .
- Heldner, M. and Edlund, J. (2010) *Pauses, gaps and overlaps in conversations*. *Journal of Phonetics* [online], 38(4), pp. 555 .
- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2011). Designing the recipient: Some practices that manage advice resistance in institutional settings, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74: 216-241.
- Jefferson, G., Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1977) The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* [online], 53(2), pp. 361 .
- Kolden, G., Klein, M. Wang, C. and Austin, S. (2011). Congruence/ genuineness. *Psychotherapy* 48: 65-71.
- Waring, H.Z. (2007a). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text and Talk*, 27 1: 107-137.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2000) *Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation*. *Language in Society* [online], 29 (1), pp. 1-63 .