Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

How Do a Group of Trainee Primary Teachers Collaborate Discursively?

Thesis

oro.open.ac.uk

Desma Sharon Brown

BA (Hons) Organisation Studies, BSc, PGCE Primary, MEd Applied Linguistics

HOW DO A GROUP OF TRAINEE PRIMARY TEACHERS COLLABORATE DISCURSIVELY?

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Education

The Open University

Language and Communication

June 2016

DATE OF SUBMISSION : 28 JANUARY 2016

DATE OF AWARD: 27 JULY 2016

ProQuest Number: 13834607

ProQuest 13834607

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The research took place in a UK context and explores how a group of graduate-level trainee primary-school teachers collaborated discursively on a final year assessment task. It examines how one high-achieving group develop their ideas over time, discursively construct roles within the group and identify themselves as a group through their use of language.

The thesis draws on a case-study using audio/video recording of the group over the course of three meetings. It also includes an initial study of extracts of talk involving five other groups. The talk is transcribed and a discourse-analytical approach is applied to the data. Individual participant evaluations of the case-study group-work are also used to shed further light on the trainees' perspective of their group collaboration.

Several factors emerge as important in the successful operation of the high-achieving group. These include an attention to shared common knowledge, a collective identity as teachers, the use of the first person plural to emphasise collective activity as a group, exploratory talk, the use of humour in promoting teamwork and the adoption of negative politeness strategies to manage relations between speakers (Leech 2014). It appeared from their discourse that participants shared the leadership of the task and also realised some of the other team-roles discussed by Belbin (1993; 2010). An additional team-role emerged through the data as, the Humorist, which acted in maintaining conviviality and building solidarity within the group.

The potential significance of this thesis for education is that it shows how a successful group of trainee-teachers collaborate in their discussion; and how in the process, they produce themselves as a team. It also offers an addition to the management literature in proposing a new metaphor to replace Tuckman (1965) and shows how team-roles based on psychometric testing and self-perception may be realised in authentic discourse.

Tables

Extracts

Contents

xi

Appendices

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Rationale

My teaching role within teacher education and teacher professional development has given

me the opportunity to observe students working together on joint tasks in preparation for

oral presentations. In my work with these students in their group discussions leading to the

presentations, I became interested in how students collaborated within their groups.

Some groups achieved good presentation marks and appeared more effective than others in

developing and linking ideas and I wanted to gain some insight into the complexities of

how groups work together in completing a joint task. My particular concern was that some

groups appeared to engage less well than others in the process of discussing ideas and

verbally planning the task. In some cases students had appeared to assume roles within the

group and this was of interest to me in providing insight into how the group managed the

collaborative process.

1.2 Context

My research took place in a large college in a multicultural area of the north of England.

The college is primarily a Further Education college, which includes programmes of study

for students after the age of sixteen, which are not part of higher education (i.e.

undergraduate and post-graduate degrees). It also has several Higher Education

departments including a Teaching and Professional Development department, where my

research took place. The majority of students come from the local and surrounding areas

to access the two undergraduate primary teacher education courses, which prepare students

to work with children aged from five to eleven. The teacher education courses were at the

time a four year BA Hons QTS (qualified teacher status) programme and a two year top-up

BEd Hons QTS programme for those who are already Foundation Degree graduates. In

both these courses students follow a programme where they consider the theories of

learning including the work of Vygotsky, Bruner and Piaget and also the subject specific knowledge required to teach in the primary classroom. In Primary Education within England and Wales the subjects covered in the National Curriculum (relevant at the time of conducting this research DFS 2004) included English; Mathematics, Science, Information Communications Technology (ICT), Physical Education (PE), Art, History, Geography, Religious Education (RE), Music and PSHCE (Personal Social Health Citizenship Education). Students engage in programmes of work in each subject specific area, where they explore theoretical principles and the practical application of theory to practice in the classroom. In addition to the subject knowledge the students engage in Professional Development and Planning where, for example they have the opportunity to take part in role play interview situations with Head-Teachers from schools who work in partnership with the college. During their teaching placements they are assessed against the teaching standards while teaching within school in order to demonstrate that they can meet the requirements to gain qualified teacher status at the end of their degrees. Tutors from college together with the teacher responsible in school conduct observations of the student teaching. They also have to complete an evidence-based portfolio that documents how they have met each teaching standard and this needs to be signed off by the class teacher responsible. The majority of students are female (approximately 75%) including both mature students and those who come directly from 'A' levels or equivalent at the beginning of their course of study.

In the final year of study the two cohorts of students from both degree courses (BA Hons QTS and BEd Hons QTS) are required to participate in a module, which is a component of their course entitled A Vision for Education. The purpose of this module is to allow the students to reflect on the knowledge acquired during their course and apply this to the task in hand, which involves a creative approach to how education could look in future years. For BEd students the Vision assessment consisted of a presentation (40%) and an

individual personal evaluation of the process (10%) and this formed 50% of their Personal

Development and Planning portfolio. The BA students were assessed on a group

presentation (50%) an evaluation of the process (20%) and a timed essay relating to their

subject specialism and vision (30%) and this was their full Vision for Education module.

My research was conducted during this module where students were required to work in

groups within their degree course of no more than six and formulate their Vision for

Education over the course of six meetings, where each meeting lasted up to one and a half

hours. Students also communicated by e-mail between meetings, as they were required to

complete documentation for the eventual inclusion in a group file which included evidence

of group meetings and research considered in connection with their ideas for the

presentation. The final product of this group collaboration was a presentation to peers,

members of staff and external examiners. This took place in the college lecture theatre,

which had the seating capacity for one-hundred and twenty people, where a total of nine

groups presented for approximately twenty minutes each throughout the allocated day.

The assessment consisted of individual peer and staff evaluations of each group which

were marked according to the grading criteria and guidance notes given to students

(Appendix 1 and 2).

1.3 Relevance of study

Most research in relation to collaborative talk in an educational setting has been conducted

in relation to children, below the age of eleven in compulsory schooling, rather than

students in Higher Education (HE). Some of the research in relation to children can be

applied to different settings including the work on dialogic talk (Alexander 2006) but there

appears be a gap in research concerning group collaboration among HE students and more

particularly trainee teachers. My research focusses on group collaboration among trainee

teachers and explores whether there is any relationship between the nature of the quality of

the collaboration and the marks awarded.

My interest in how groups engaged in exploring their ideas discursively arose from the fact that some groups of trainee teachers were able to engage well in the group process and others appeared to experience difficulty in working collaboratively. This led me to consider how in my professional role I could better support trainee teachers. In my view a development of the skills needed to enable groups to collaborate more effectively was needed, particularly as the establishment of professionally collaborative cultures has been linked with effective schools and the promotion of good teaching and learning (Fullan, 2001). However, it can be argued that the opportunity for pupils to work collaboratively within schools is being eroded by pressures on time in meeting pupil targets and completing schemes of work. Collaboration is an important concept used particularly in discussions on innovations and teacher learning in that it implies that, for example the teachers involved share responsibility and authority for decision- making in relation to their practices. This is not always the case and the word 'collaboration' is often confused with cooperation, where working together is to improve current practices (Merinka et al. 2010:163-164). My study concentrates on collaboration in exploring how one group reached decisions in developing their Vision and what particular features of talk were used in this process. This is particularly important, as item nine in the professional standards associated with teaching in England and Wales, emphasises developing effective professional relationships with colleagues (DFE 2011:13).

Another factor that concerned me, although outside the scope of this thesis, was that the current presentation assessment criteria used by the institution in the study (Appendix 2) does not reflect individual contributions in relation to the discussion process, or the presentation. Inevitably some students do not engage well in the discussion process, but receive the same mark for the presentation as others.

1.4 Research questions

My research approach was concerned with the analysis of discourse from transcriptions of group talk as part of the Vision task. It also draws on short evaluations (1000 words) written individually by students in relation to their experience of working within the group. Initially I conducted my research by identifying discursive features and then focussed on the apparent underlying purposes and processes of the interaction. The research questions that led my research were formulated to primarily reflect how the ideas were brought together to inform the group's Vision, the roles that emerged within the group and the nature of the collaborative process through the language used in the interaction.

Groups had six weekly meetings where they had the opportunity to discuss their Vision and do research in relation to their Vision ideas. They generally stayed within the college setting over the course of their first three meetings, when they were also required to attend key-note lectures. After the first three meetings many groups chose to meet in places more convenient for the group members and the city library was one such place used by one of the groups. The meetings varied in length depending on how the group decided to manage their time. My study involving a case-study group occurred over the course of their first three weekly meetings within the college setting totalling two- hours seven- minutes. This study builds on initial research involving short extracts of talk from six groups.

The research questions in the context of the Vision task were eventually formulated as:

RQ1 How are ideas within the group collaboratively developed over time?

RQ2 To what extent and, in what ways are particular discursive roles constructed within the group?

RQ3 How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group?

RQ1 focussed on the development of the collaboration over the course of the sequential meetings. I approached my analysis with a consideration of the origins of the Vision talk in how the group explored ideas, how they used repetition and how these ideas emerged into the Vision topic. I considered themes that appeared to run through the meetings and particularly noted talk when the vision was mentioned. The formation of the Vision statement was particularly important in my analysis.

RQ2 involved a consideration of the importance of discursive roles in revealing how the group worked together in the completion of the task. It also had the potential to reveal how leadership roles were assumed and how other roles emerged in enabling the task to be completed. In my approach to this question I began to consider whether the team-roles of Belbin (1993; 2010:23) were significant in how the group worked. I also considered whether I could identify specific discourse features that I could associate with those team-roles.

In relation to RQ3 the analysis of the data involved looking for evidence from the transcripts of how the group used language in identifying themselves as a group. I approached my examination of language use through examining the use of first person plural (1stPP) within the group, which builds on findings from my initial study involving short extracts of talk from six groups.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

This thesis has seven chapters, where the present chapter gives a rationale and background to the study. Chapter 2 provides some discussion of team-roles in reference to the work of Belbin (1993; 2010) and the research traditions of relevance to my study including the sociocultural approach and to a lesser extent the systemic functional approach. It also discusses the building of community in a consideration of collaborative talk, problem solving learning and team-work. Chapter 3 discusses my methodological choices,

including: my overall approach in identifying my work as a piece of discourse analysis; my collection and analysis of data; phase one of my study; how I addressed my research questions and considerations relating to validity, reliability and ethics.

Chapters 4-6 discuss the analysis of data in relation to each of the research questions. Chapter 4 relates to RQ1, where I consider how ideas for the Vision are developed over time. Chapter 5 examines RQ2 in identifying how discursive roles are constructed. In Chapter 6, I analyse how the group construe themselves as a group through their discussion.

Chapter 7, concludes the study and brings together some of the key findings from the previous three chapters, as well as considering some of the potential implications of the study for practitioners specifically teacher educators.

Chapter 2 Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

My research involving how a group of trainee teachers collaborate discursively towards a shared 'Vision' of education has its roots within a sociocultural framework, where language is seen as a means of exchanging meanings. In order to consider the nature of this approach I begin by exploring definitions of discourse and the nature of discourse analysis, followed by a discussion related to the sociocultural tradition. I also draw on literature associated with Systemic Functional Linguistics particularly in relation to pronoun usage. My discussion in relation to collaboration explores the forms of talk commonly used in educational contexts and examines research from similar contexts to my own with a particular emphasis on exploratory talk. It discusses the concept of the building of community and the nature of problem solving learning. I also consider the attributes of a successful team, which goes beyond educational contexts in considering literature associated with leadership and management more broadly.

2.2 Discourse analysis

The concept of discourse analysis has been applied widely throughout various disciplines including linguistics, pragmatics and the social sciences. The traditional view of discourse analysis, which was originally devised by Harris (1952), defines discourse analysis as a way of analysing connected speech and writing beyond the level of the sentence in describing connections between sentences in the form of patterns rather than the sentence structure alone. A more developed view of discourse analysis comes from the work of Foucault (1972:49) where language is viewed as social practice and is constructed from a particular perspective, for example in the language of social practice. Discourse analysis thus refers to text, both written and spoken language and can represent communications and meanings within a specific domain, as in the discourse of teaching which is of

9

relevance to my study (Fetzer et al. 2008:5). The importance of social context is highlighted through the relationship between language and the social and cultural context in which it occurs (Paltridge 2012:2). Discourse in specific social contexts is defined as the social construction of some aspect of reality (Van Leeuwen 2005:94), as in the trainee teachers collaborative construction of their educational Vision. There are similarities with the work of Halliday in the tradition of Systemic Functional Linguistics, where specifically text is viewed as a 'sociological event, a semiotic encounter through which the meanings that constitute the social system are exchanged' (Halliday 2002:50). As Halliday states 'Language has evolved as the primary mode of meaning in a social environment' (2002:53). It is a transmitter of culture. Therefore language and culture are intertwined and need to be viewed within the context in which they are used. Drawing on all these traditions, my own approach to the study of discourse therefore views the use of language as being located within its social context.

2.3 Sociocultural tradition

The term 'sociocultural' is used within different traditions. In common across these is a focus on language in use within social contexts. In the sociocultural approach to language and learning there is an emphasis on the relationship between language as a collective cultural tool and individual thought (Lillis and McKinney 2003:39). Vygotsky (1986) (whose theories were developed in the 1920s) is the key theorist in this approach and he saw language as providing the two functions of both a psychological tool and a cultural tool. Language as a psychological tool is viewed in the planning, reasoning and organising of individual thought, referred to by Mercer (2000:116) as reviewing past experience, organisation into narrative and reconstructing identities. Language as a cultural tool is viewed as a communicative process where ideas are jointly shared and knowledge developed. Instead of focussing on the way in which language choices function to convey meaning (as in SFL) sociocultural research considers language as the mechanism

for developing shared knowledge and understanding. It is useful in the examination of the process of teaching and learning and particularly relevant in my research focussing on collaborative talk between trainee teachers.

In relation to the development of shared knowledge and understanding Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) is relevant. It reflects the collaboration between less and more capable peers in the development of knowledge and problem solving (Vygotsky 1986:187-188). This concept has been adapted to a wider use in including work with adults in what has been labelled a zone of 'collaborative facilitation' (Nokes-Malach et al., 2012:39). This involves individuals working towards the same goal. It depends on the previous knowledge of the group, their skills and the specific task, suggesting that interaction enables learning when there is a sufficient distance from the prior knowledge of individuals and experience of the task. Arguably, experience of collaboration with others in similar situations, together with shared knowledge and common experiences, assist in the development of new knowledge within the group. Common experiences and shared knowledge regarding interaction, enabling learning to take place, may depend on context, as understood by Mercer and Edwards, in what speakers know and understand within conversations (1987:63). The experience and background of the listener is important, but the collaboration process and the development of learning will also depend on participants and '…what they think has been said, what they think was meant, what they perceive to be relevant' in conversations (Edwards and Mercer 1987:65). This has relevance to my analysis of the group's collaboration in their building of ideas for their Vision. Drawing on previous background and knowledge may be important, but how the group interact and share a common understanding about how their development of ideas should progress is critical to successful collaboration within the group. For example in problem solving, ideas will be shared and private individual

11

knowledge becomes common knowledge where individuals learn from each other in what Littleton and Mercer refer to as 'appropriation' (Littleton and Mercer 2013:114).

Mercer's (2000:116) particular interest was in group interaction and how knowledge within communities is constructed and shared. He views knowledge as a social entity and draws on the sociocultural approach to learning in suggesting that in communities of practice participants share knowledge and activities, share past experience, create joint understanding, and co-ordinate strategies for dealing with new experiences. The existence of knowledge as a social phenomenon rather than the product of individual thought is central to my research (Mercer 1995:66). The relevance of Mercer's work to my study is in the exploration of how trainee teachers collaborate in the process of coming to a consensus in the construction of their shared Vision. This includes a task which involves them utilising their knowledge of teaching and drawing on their common knowledge in that process of creating their joint construction of ideas. The emphasis on examining strategies that speakers use in bringing together their ideas and constructing their roles within the group are central to my qualitative approach in addressing RQ1 and RQ2. However, it sometimes is necessary to quantify features of talk to compare whether there are any consistent patterns of usage between different groups or individuals (Wray and Bloomer 2013:95). In relation to RQ3 I partly draw on SFL in my analysis of personal pronouns, as I both count and analyse their usage.

2.4 An SFL approach to personal pronouns

A functional approach to language analysis is ' based on the assumption that the language system has evolved (and is constantly evolving)' (Thompson 2004:45). It is concerned with the analysis of both written and spoken texts by using frameworks to categorise and label features of language, for example to interpret how sentences and clauses are organised in expressing a view of the world (ideational metafunction), creating an opinion or expressing an attitude (interpersonal metafunction) and making a coherent message

(textual metafunction). Its overall focus is both on how people use language to make meaning and how they simultaneously use it to go about their everyday activities. A definition used by Halliday to describe systemic theory is:

> Understanding the nature of discourse, and of functional variation in language (register); studying particular types of discourse (classroom, medical, etc.) for practical purposes such as the training of teachers and of specialists in the field …relating language to other semiotic systems and to the ideological patterns of the culture
>
> (Halliday 2003:86).

In relation to register, the three aspects of context of situation (field, tenor and mode) reflect the three metafunctions of language. Together they describe the variety of language which may occur. 'Field' refers to the aspects of a situation which includes, the social activity, or the topic of speech. 'Tenor' refers to the relationship or interaction between the speakers and 'Mode' is the channel of communication and is concerned with the production of a text. The mode of discourse can be dialogic with face to face interaction, or can be monologic (non-interactive) like a political broadcast (Coffin et al. 2009:221).

In relation to RQ3: How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group? I consider the use of first person plural forms (henceforth '1stPP') in all their variants ('we' 'us' 'our' 'ours' 'ourselves' etc). In relation to speech the distribution of pronouns across registers indicates that pronouns in general occur more frequently in conversation than in written text and are used four times more frequently in conversation than in academic prose (O' Halloran and Coffin 2006:51). Research conducted by Scheibman (2002:383) identifies coding categories for pronouns which are related to inclusivity and exclusivity. In the use of 'we' these include: inclusive plural (in relation to

a group) exclusive dual (self and one other) or exclusive plural (referring to self plus

people outside the group). The use of 'we' in spoken discourse has important functions in

expressing group membership and alignment with referents (Scheibman 2002:381). For

example in situations where a speaker has multiple alliances (lawyer and client, lawyer and

court system, lawyer and witness) 'we' may be used inclusively and exclusively. Bearing

in mind that English does not have a 'morphological or lexical inclusive/exclusive

contrast' there is recognition that 'referentially ambiguous uses of 'we' in discourse have

important functions. Expressions of group membership or maintenance of positive and

negative face...' (Scheibman 2002:382). For example Scheibman gives an example from a

legal context, where a lawyer meets with a witness who is also a victim of the crime being

discussed and the words spoken by the lawyer: 'if we get a conviction on just one case

here' reflect the multiple alliances of lawyer client/witness, lawyer and other members of

the legal system (Scheibman 2002:382). The concept of team cohesiveness is also linked

to the interest commitment of the participants and the extent to which they talk in terms of

'we' and 'us'. Low cohesion in a team has been linked to the absence of such words from

the vocabulary used by the team (Adair 2009:20).

Kuo's analysis of scientific texts identifies that the common function of inclusive 'we' is to

indicate a presumption of a shared background knowledge on behalf of the readers (Kuo

1999:132-133). Similarly in written science texts inclusive 'we' is chosen rather than

'you' (which has the effect of distancing the reader) for the purpose of sharing

understandings and goals (Oliveira et al. 2014:106). Inclusive 'we' is used by the writer to

indicate that there is a shared understanding with the reader. In comparison in discourse,

the use of inclusive or exclusive first person prounouns are indicative of the relationship

between the speaker and the addressee (Butt et al. 2001:93). In political discourse the use

of inclusive 'we' is particularly recognised as being essential in presenting a united front

(Moberg and Eriksson 2013:331). Likewise, I considered that inclusive 'we' was of

importance in how the trainee teachers construed themselves as a group. I therefore explored how speakers use inclusive 'we' and other 1stPP in construing themselves as a group. This involved an examination of inclusive 'we' when referring to the speaker and addressee(s) within the group talk.

2.5 The Building of Community Through Discourse

The building of community was of importance in reference to all three of my research questions. How the group discursively construed themselves as a group and to what extent discursive roles were constructed within the three meetings were crucial in determining the nature of collaboration. This had an impact on how ideas were collaboratively developed over time. An example of how discourse can develop over time was given in a event-history analysis incorporating questions and their uptake from both students and teachers, which demonstrated that questions had their origins in previous interactions and current interactions carry implications for future ones (Nystrand et al. 2003:192). Arguably, knowledge building in groups occurs over time through the cumulation of ideas and the social character of learning is important in that process.

2.5.1 Communities of Practice

The social character of learning was captured by Lave and Wenger (1991:64-65) in their concept of community of practice, which suggested that learning is something that evolves and is renewed by people working in groups, who also share practices and 'interact on an on-going basis' (Wenger et al. 2002:4). A community of practice is defined by people who come together in mutual engagement and the practice is in which that membership engages (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet1992:464). This can be likened to an assimilation process, where members gradually embed themselves within communities by negotiating membership and adopting practices commensurate with those communities. This is rather like trainee teachers learning to teach and gradually adopting the persona of a teacher

15

before becoming teaching professionals. A community of practice is defined through three dimensions according to Wenger (1998:73) which include:

acting as a joint enterprise which is continually renegotiated by its participants

functioning by mutual engagement where members form a social entity

the production of shared communal resources that participants develop over time.

A community of practice then is viewed as a specific form of social network, where there are three characteristics of 'mutual engagement, a jointly negotiated enterprise and a shared repertoire' (Meyerhoff 2011:200). The resources can include a shared vocabulary, for example in reference to my own study there was a shared vocabulary relating to schools and teaching. From a discourse perspective communities of practice develop as a result of the activities in which members of a group engage together and use language to construct identities, rather like the trainee teachers using language in identifying themselves as teachers and identifying themselves as a group for their Vision task (Holmes 2001:188-189). The formation of a shared repertoire through discourse may include shared speech practices, or the use of a shared jargon or in-jokes, which enable participants to continue discussion over a period of time without the need to re-orientate towards the topic (Meyerhoff 2011:200). Engagement in shared social practice is also important as a process that enables learning to take place, where a community can take the responsibility for the development and sharing of knowledge (Wenger et al. 2002:29). A preferred condition for a community of learners is that it is collaborative in constructing meanings (Bruner 1971:84).

Communities of practice have also been discussed within professional development (MacPhail et al. 2014), which is also of particular relevance in relation to my study, as these trainee teachers share common learning in terms of their course and have similar experiences in practice within teaching placements. They are working together in a group to develop a shared Vision, which inevitably will enable them to learn from the experience

16

giving them a developmental opportunity before they enter the workplace. It has been suggested that communities of practice act as a specialised form of professional development, where members share a common learning and professional interest where discussion is conducted over time in problem solving and the promotion of professional learning (MacPhail et al. 2014:39-40). In relation to my study, the trainee teachers were faced with the challenge of jointly negotiating a shared Vision for the future of education by mutual engagement. The nature of that mutual engagement was of particular interest to me in determining how they specifically worked together as a group or team.

2.5.2 Teamwork and Belbin

The concept of teamwork or in-groupness is central to my three research questions in a consideration of the ways in which members of the group assume roles, how they identify themselves as a group and work together on their shared task. One definition of what makes a group a team is as follows: '...The special requirements that make a small group a team are that team members must have complementary skills, they must be accountable for their actions, and they will disband when they have achieved their purpose or goal' (Egolf, 2001:4). A team may have been formed for a particular purpose, like the group of trainee teachers in my research, where the life span of their team was limited to the Vision task. The short life span of a team has advantages in that it is shorter than other forms of grouping and arguably offers a more creative approach, as it is does not suffer from 'cognitive rigidity' (Egolf 2001:5). However, from a discourse perspective the notion of creativity is constructed from the language strategies used. For example repetition is seen as a 'central linguistic mean-making strategy' which is viewed as a resource for creativity and interpersonal involvement (Tannen 2007:101). Creativity in discourse also includes the dialogic co-construction of ideas, interactive joking, word play and the re-contextualisation of utterances from other contexts (Maybin and Swann 2007:513). Arguably, the short life-span of a team such as the group of trainee teachers working on their Vision, creates deadlines where the team are required to be highly focussed in order

17

to meet the requirements of the task during the given time. However, these deadlines and tight focus may not be conducive to interpersonal creativity.

The concept of teamwork is not a recent phenomenon and work has taken place on the process of interaction in teamwork involving a categorisation of communication acts (Bales 1950) and the categorisation of the roles participants play within groups (Benne and Sheats 1958). There are many ways of analysing team-roles including the measurement of psychological properties (Swailes and McIntyre-Bhatty 2002) and the association of team-roles with cognitive styles (Aritzeta et al. 2005) and personality traits (Fisher et al., 2001). However, I refer to the work of Belbin (2010) in my consideration of how the group of trainee teachers performed team-roles through the discourse they used within the interaction. The work of Belbin was chosen, because the group had some familiarity with Belbin's team- roles in relation to a lecture they had attended prior to their assignment in groups and because Belbin has been particularly influential.

The term 'team-role' 'refers to a tendency to behave, contribute, and interrelate with others at work in certain ways' (Belbin 2010:24) which arguably reflects the presence of complementary skills. Biech (2001) refers to complementary skills, as having valued diversity. An effective team is defined as a small group of individuals with specific goals who have complementary skills, which 'allow mutual accountability' (Gordon 2002:185). However, team-roles can be different from an individual's assigned functional role, where an individual may have been employed to do a task according to their existing skills (Belbin 2010:25). A variation in the team-role and any assigned functional role may occur due to differences in personality (Belbin 2010:25). Belbin initially defined team-roles in 1981 but after some re-naming (Co-ordinator, rather than Chairman) and the introduction of a ninth role of the Specialist in 1993 the following team-roles were categorised under three headings:

Action-orientated roles:

Shaper - dynamic thrives on pressure, has the drive to overcome obstacles

Completer Finisher - conscientious, anxious, searches out errors, delivers on time

Implementer- disciplined, reliable, turns ideas into practical actions.

People-orientated roles:

Co-ordinator - confident, good chair, clarifies goals, promotes decision-making

Resource Investigator - extrovert, explores opportunities and develops contacts

Team-worker - co-operative, diplomatic, listens, averts friction

Problem solving - orientated roles:

Monitor Evaluator- strategic, discerning, sees all options

Plant - creative, imaginative, unorthodox. Solves difficult problems.

Specialist-single minded, dedicated, provides knowledge and skills in rare supply

Adapted from Belbin 1993; 2010:22.

A criticism of psychometric testing and the Team-Role Self-Perception Inventory (TRSP inventory devised by Belbin) based on assessing how individuals behave in team environments, is that the nine team-roles cannot be clearly differentiated from one another (Aritzeta et al. 2007:105). Belbin's team-role theory makes the claim that a balanced team based on high-scoring individuals in each team-role (TRSP data) is more likely to perform highly, but no statistical data was found to support this (Smith et al. 2012:599). Team performance has been associated with individual differences in approach to problem-solving and decision-making in Adaptation-Innovation Inventory theory (Kirton: 1976). This theory draws on a scale of cognitive styles rather than team roles, where the level of structure of a task affects how an individual engages. It suggests that the effectiveness of a team will be determined by the structure of a task rather than the effectiveness of team-roles (Aritzeta et al. 2005: 429). There are limitations of using Belbin's team-role model,

as it does not take into account whether the task is highly structured, or not and this may influence how team-roles are assumed. I acknowledge that I am using Belbin's team-roles in a way not intended by him, for example by recognising individual roles through observer and respondent ratings. This is a less systematic means of assessing team-roles than the Team-Role Self-Perception Inventory tool and hence raises issues of validity and reliability. However, the team-role model does have positive features in that it is 'useful for measuring preferences towards contributions and interactions with other team members' (Aritzeta et al. 2007:111).

Individual roles are unlikely to remain the same in any team-work situation and context is important in defining how individuals choose to engage, particularly in a consideration of the discourse used in that engagement. Belbin's team-role model recognises that roles develop and change over time. They are defined by factors such as: personality, mental ability, current values and motivation, field constraints, experience and role learning (Aritzeta et al. 2007:99). However, the variation in a team-role explained by each factor is not shown by Belbin (Aritzeta et al. 2007:99).

If teams are formed on the basis of team-role profiles as a result of psychometric testing and TRSP inventory data, then additional work is needed in relation to the discursive nature of how teams work in practice. This is not addressed by Belbin.

The dynamics of how a small team might orientate towards each other are also considered in an influential team-role model proposed in 1965 by Tuckman. This was concerned with the stages of development that are team encounters. These have been labelled forming, storming, norming and performing. This model accepts that there will be conflict (storming) to some degree among team members before a shared practice is adopted, where the team functions effectively (norming) and is therefore able to perform (Tuckman 1965:396). I offer a criticism of this model is that it ignores the impact of outside influences and pressures on the team, which potentially could create conflict at any given

moment within the process. It perhaps is more reflective of the initial formation of a team, particularly where team members may not be familiar with each other and have yet to establish relationships within the team.

In relation to my research the discursive nature of teams is of particular importance in defining how Belbin's team-roles are assumed within the group. Tuckman's model can offer some insight in relation to the stages of development within the process of the task, where individual ideas are brought together in the presentation of a group Vision. However, there are limitations in using Belbin and Tuckman's frameworks within the Vision context, as they do not take into consideration the structure of the task and how this might influence engagement. The research also (due to circumstances outside the researcher's control) focuses on the first three meetings of the case-study group. An analysis of the entire process was not available, which potentially could reveal further changes in Belbin team-roles among the group. Likewise, this may have had implications for the application of Tuckman's framework over a longer period of time, where further stages may have occurred in the Vision task.

2.5.3 Humour

In the process of working as a team a 'shared repertoire' is often developed which can include speech styles, shared ways of pronouncing words or shared jokes (Meyerhoff 2006:200) . This is often referred to as relational talk, which can include small talk, teasing and humour (Norrick et al. 2013:286). Humorous talk is associated with a form of play which is collaborative, as it is jointly constructed and often occurs spontaneously through the shared knowledge of a group or team (Coates 2007:29-31). Humour serves a variety of functions within social interaction. These can be positive in increasing the well- being of others, reducing conflict situations and potentially raising the morale of group members in order to enhance the group cohesiveness (Markey 2014:51-52). Humour can be used to 'strengthen collegiality, soften an instruction, and release tension or defuse anger. It can be

used as a strategy to mitigate the effects of instructions in order to appear less authoritative (Baxter 2010:108). It also may construct and enact different types of relationships in the workplace including 'friendly leader, office joker...' (Holmes 2007:520). In terms of leadership of a team, humour is a valuable resource in releasing tension and providing breaks from what may be a serious discussion (Baxter 2010:152). Humour is a distinctive aspect of someone's style of talk and this can include: sarcasm, which sometimes can appear hostile, irony, or the telling of jokes (Tannen 2005:163). There are negative uses of humour, in attempts to enable oneself to look good at the expense of others. In research involving a humour styles questionnaire, humour was classified into two categories, as benign and benevolent (enhancing the self and enhancing relationships with others) or potentially aggressive and detrimental (enhance the self at the expense of others) (Martin et al. 2003:52-53). Subversive humour in the form of quips, jocular abuse and role-play may also be used negatively to undermine the power status of an individual (Holmes and Marra 2002:72). Humour can stimulate a creative response in a task-based situation in the way ideas are generated (Holmes 2007:529) and this is of particular relevance to my research in the way the trainee teachers use humour generated by mime in exploring ideas. It can be used creatively in maintaining relational goals but also in enabling creative thinking in the fulfilment of workplace objectives (Holmes 2007:533).

2.5.4 Politeness

Another method of managing and maintaining relationships is through the use of Linguistic Politeness, which mitigates the force of speech acts (Lam 2011:361). It is important when we examine interaction within groups, as in my research, where there is a shared task and participants are careful to maintain 'face' within the group. An original definition of what is meant by face-work comes from Goffman (1967:7): 'The term face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact' . The term 'to lose face' means to be shamed and the term 'to save one's face' refers to sustaining an impression, so that to others 'face' has

not been lost (Goffman 1967:7). In interpersonal interaction 'saving face' is of importance, for example if the receiver of a message is under the impression that the language used by the speaker implies a relationship that is not equal, where the speaker appears to be exhibiting power which he/she does not have, then the listener can view the message as a threat to face. The response to such a message can be defensive (Brown and Levison 1978; 1987). Conversely, politeness can be used in the process of requesting: *Would you lend me a pound?* This is in comparison to a blunt request, as in: '*Give me a pound* (Coates 2004:158).

There is a distinction made between positive politeness and negative politeness, which were terms originally used by Goffman (1956:227) and later adopted by Brown and Levinson (1978). Leech (2014:11-13) reviews the concept of positive and negative politeness (which he refers to as neg-politeness/ pos-politeness) as he believes there is a lack of 'correspondence' between Brown and Levison's' (1978) positive and negative face. He considers that their concept of positive politeness is 'too broadly defined' to include many 'solidarity-building strategies'. Leech (2014:11) views neg-politenss as being the more important of the two, as its function is to mitigate, or lessen any causes of offence. For example in the contrast between an imperative such as, *say that again* and a request in the form of a question in *could you say that again*? The question gives the hearer the opportunity to comply with what has been asked or to refuse. The use of the modal auxillary of *can* or *could* indicates ability rather than willingness in relation to the hearer, which also gives the hearer the opportunity to refuse without offending the speaker in his/her inability to do what was being asked (Leech 2014:13). There is a suggestion that using the past tense 'could' instead of 'can' distances the request from 'the here and now' (Leech 2014:14) .

Another form of politeness prominent in talk are hedges and according to Leech (2014:11) are a form of negative politeness in mitigating causes of offence. Hedges are also

described as being linguistic forms 'such as *I think*, *I'm sure*, *you know*, *sort of* and *perhaps* which express the speaker's certainty or uncertainty about the proposition under discussion' (Coates 2004:88).

There have been many studies involving discourse analysis and conversational analysis in relation to politeness in leadership (Lam 2011:360). These have focussed on how politeness is used by leaders to interact with others in their group/team. This aspect is particularly relevant in relation to my RQ2, which examined the extent of the construction of roles within the group. Politeness is a strategy used to maintain smooth interaction, but also has the ability to re-shape social relationships in the way it can convey messages (Kallia 2004:146).

2.6 Sharing Knowledge

Sharing of knowledge is of relevance to all three of my research questions. Their shared experiences in training to be teachers and their individual experiences in the classroom express a commonality in terms of a community of practice. This commonality or collective identity of being a teacher underpins their approach to how they construct their Vision and how they interact within that process.

2.6.1 Common knowledge

The concept of shared knowledge that is developed over the course of the three meetings, through a joint construction of the Vision task is relevant. In establishing a shared understanding and building the foundation of a shared or common knowledge there are certain basic elements that consist of: 'offering of new information; reference to past existing experience; requests for information and tests or 'checks' on the validity of interpretations of information offered' (Edwards and Mercer 1987:6). Mercer (2000:49-50) discusses three kinds of common knowledge including:

> common experience in creating a shared frame of reference,

24

collective remembering

past joint activity.

Mercer's concept of 'collective remembering' is similar to where a reference to shared events and memories is demonstrated in the form of 'do you remember' which acts in establishing common ground among participants (Hie-Jung You 2015:1). The concept of knowledge being derived from prior experience in the form of 'collective remembering' is of particular relevance in my research, as the group build their Vision ideas, engage in interaction and perform roles in the process. There are also similarities between Mercer's work and Lee's (2001:27) concept of common ground as shared knowledge is defined as three categories, which include:

the establishment of shared beliefs and shared knowledge (established common ground)

background common knowledge and beliefs (assumed common ground)

and new beliefs or knowledge (as though common ground).

This had relevance to my study, as the group had a shared knowledge of teaching, which was established common ground, but the background common knowledge (assumed common ground) was often identified through individual experience. A socio-cognitive approach to common ground that encompasses both pragmatic and cognitive aspects including a core common ground and an emergent common ground appears relatable to my study:

The core common ground refers to common knowledge in a community that derives from the result of prior experience and prior interaction within that community.

The emergent common ground refers to private knowledge that belongs to the individual created during the course of that communication process.

(Kecskes and Zhang 2009:347)

2.6.2 Repetition in the sharing of ideas

Repetition is prominent in spoken discourse through fixed expressions like idioms or phrases that are repeated in group interaction by more than one speaker. In the social production of language repetition is important in the understanding of discourse and in the production of cohesion (Hellerman 2003:81). Tannen divides repetition into four categories, as production, comprehension, interaction and coherence/connection (Tannen 1987:581; 2007:58-62). Repetition produces language in the efficient use of words which allows the speaker to think of what to say next. It allows for comprehension of the speech, as the discourse is less complicated by the inclusion of the repetition of words. In relation to interaction repetition helps in the management of the conversation in the linking of ideas, acquiring or keeping the conversational floor, demonstrating listening and showing humour. This is particularly relevant in reference to my RQ1, where the group were forming their Vision ideas, where it allowed links to be made between parts of discourse, in the repeating of words or phrases of other speakers, so allowing talk to continue. It is therefore an interpersonal device demonstrating coherence and involvement in the way it shows acceptance of the utterances of others (Tannen 1987:58; Tannen 2007:61). Repetition enables speakers to produce language more efficiently and more fluently: 'Repetition allows a speaker to set up a paradigm and slot in new information- where the frame for the new information stands ready, rather than having to be newly formulated' (Tannen 2007:58). In this way it acts as a a bridging device in conversation (Johnson 1994:6).

The different forms of repetition include self-repetition and the repetition of others (allo repetition) (Tannen 2007:63). The functions of self-repetition in spoken discourse include ensuring the correct uptake of what is being said, keeping the talk relevant, holding the conversational floor and building interaction (Norrick 1987:257). Arguably, these

functions can be associated with group leadership. Within interactional talk, speakers rarely repeat exactly the original words of others using the same prosody and in choosing to do so or not, may show affiliation or disaffiliation with previous talk (Hellerman 2003:82). The many functions of repetition in discourse include stalling, expanding, the creation of humour, demonstrating participatory listenership, ratifying listenership and shadowing (Tannen 2007:68-92). However, much repetition in conversation is automatic where speakers repeat and rephrase, use echo and shadow the words of others' without thinking (Tannen 2007:94).

2.6.3 Collective identity as teachers

The group are trainee teachers and this is relevant in my consideration of how they discursively construe themselves as a group. Exchanges that occur in talk, which have been traditionally associated with educational contexts (schools) involve a three- part structure. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) in their work referred to an initiation by the teacher, a pupil response and then feedback by the teacher (= the so-called IRF exchange). Mehan (1979) refers to this three- part structure as initiation response and evaluation (= IRE) where a series of initiations and responses may occur with the third move withheld until the teacher provides evaluation, acknowledging all previous moves. That evaluation can be positive or negative and can provide different sequences of classroom talk. In a positive evaluation by the teacher of a student's response the sequence is complete, but if the response is evaluated negatively the sequence continues and prompts further interaction. The offering of positive evaluation by group members is important in defining in-groupness in the form of encouragement often used by teachers. However, a differentiation between what is meant by positive praise, for example 'well done' and positive reinforcement or evaluation is important. Prusak et al., defines positive reinforcement as being 'a specific skill used in a specific time and for a specific purpose' (Prusak et al. 2005:21). Teachers often use this to offer some specific evaluation in, for example *your work on thinking of questions we could ask about our topic, was really useful for our final piece of work.* Positive evaluation and

positive praise are of interest particularly in my consideration of how the group discursively construed themselves as a group.

Other features of techniques used by teachers in the classroom include:

Recaps – brief review of previous joint experience used to set the scene for current work

Reformulations – paraphrasing a response in a slightly different form, often with a view to aid understanding

Elicitations – ususally in the form of a question and designed to obtain information gained in past class activity

Repetitions – acceptance of student's answers by repeating in an affirming way

Exhortations – emphasis on value of past experience 'think or remember' for the success of the current learning activities.

(adapted from Mercer 2000:52-54).

In relation to repetitions, prosodic cues used with teacher repetitions in IRF exchanges, function to provide positive assessment of student responses or to identify student responses as incomplete (Hellerman 2003:83). The features above are important in the building of a shared understanding in relation to the Vision task, as the group refer to common knowledge and jointly formulate their Vision statement.

2.7 Problem-Solving Learning

2.7.1 Forms of talk

Mercer and Wegerif (1997) argue that in relation to a shared task there are three kinds of talk associated with language use in the creation of knowledge. Mercer and Wegerif (1997) refer to these as being types of dialogic talk. These are, disputational talk, cumulative talk and exploratory talk. In disputational talk speakers tend to defend their positions and

28

express disagreement. In contrast in cumulative talk speakers support each other and build on contributions to talk. Both these types of talk in terms of SFL are related to interpersonal meaning (Halliday, 1994) in that they express the attitude or relationship that exists between participants. However, there are ideational and textual functions also associated with cumulative talk. Mercer defines cumulative talk as when, '…speakers build on each other's contributions, add information of their own and in a mutually supportive, uncritical way construct shared knowledge and understanding'. (Mercer 2000:30).

2.7.2 Exploratory talk

The term 'exploratory' was initially introduced by Barnes in relation to problem solving in an 'intimate group' and the characteristics that were associated with the term exploratory included, '…hesitations and changes of direction; tentativeness shown in intonation; assertions and questions in the hypothetical modality, inviting modification and surmise; self- monitoring and reflexivity' (Barnes and Todd 1977:3).

Exploratory talk is related to critical and constructive engagement with the ideas of others, where reasons are given for disagreement. Mercer et al. define it as where:

all relevant information is shared

all members of the group are invited to contribute to the discussion;

opinions and ideas are respected and considered;

challenges and alternatives are made explicit and are negotiated;

the group seeks to reach agreement before taking a decision of acting.

(adapted from Mercer et al. 2004:362).

In regard to my research these definitions form a linear structure in relation to the process of the Vision task in forming the Vision statement. The sharing of information which informs the possibilities for the Vision begins the process. A discussion follows where all

members of the group contribute their ideas which are then considered. A specific idea proposed and the group challenge and negotiate the content of the Vision before reaching agreement on the exact Vision statement to be used in defining their Vision concept.

In a piece of research by Sutherland (2006) involving undergraduate students (trainee English secondary teachers, as part of an intervention programme) exploratory talk was used to improve higher order thinking skills, where challenging tasks were planned and ground rules for exploratory talk investigated. The research aimed to develop trainee skills in promoting and sustaining effective group talk by using teacher discourse strategies in a secondary school context (11-12 year old pupils). The programme proved effective in improving both the skills of trainee teachers and the thinking skills of pupils. The importance of establishing ground rules for exploratory talk was previously recognised by Mercer (2000:154). He commented on this in relation to when a teacher asks pupils to take part in a discussion:

> But one other clear finding of classroom research, including my own, is that teachers rarely make such expectations clear and explicit. That is, the ground rules which are used for generating particular functional ways of using language - spoken or written - are rarely taught. In all levels of education, from primary school to university, students usually seem to be expected to work out the ground rules for themselves.
>
> Mercer (2000:154).

However, there has been criticism of the use of guidelines for exploratory talk, as Swann (2007:345) suggests that there is a tension as they imply 'a particular set of social relations, broadly egalitarian, with an emphasis on encouraging others to speak and repeating what they have to say'. Swann (2007:348) recognised more of a collaborative way of talking among children in her study, as children did not draw evenly on all aspects

of exploratory talk and she identifies interpersonal constraints on an adoption of strategies for talk (p.356). The establishment of very specific rules cannot take into account how discussion may need to work in particular contexts. The guidelines-for-talk approach, whilst effective in encouraging children to communicate in a learning centred fashion, does not take into consideration individual differences between speakers and the roles they adopt within the group collaboration process.

One study by Foster (2009), with much in common with my own research, focusses on understanding interaction as Higher Education students talk in groups to review, interpret and organise information as part of a learning task. The similarity was in relation to students working together on a pre-defined task, although the emphasis of Foster's research was on how information was organised and the functions and forms of talk that occur as this information is sought. Four categories of functional talk were identified which were structuring, eliciting, informing and summarising. Parallels can be drawn here with some of the techniques used by teachers. Mercer (1995:34) identifies that teachers use direct and cued elicitations in eliciting knowledge from learners and an analysis of the way questions are used in the group talk will determine if information is sought in this way and who is seeking information.

The importance of shared knowledge is recognised and Foster comments on a sequence of talk being structurally divided into a nuclear exchange and a dependent exchange (Foster 2009:94). Once a speaker initiates a new sequence there are two possible discourse patterns which may involve either a follow up by the speaker who initiated the sequence (extension-self) or a follow up by one or more of the other speakers (extension-other). It was concluded from the data collected by Foster that the ratio of extension-self to extension-other exchanges was significant, as effective collaborative educational talk was linked to the dominance of extension-other exchanges (Foster 2009:94). A factor to consider is that speakers may not always conform to one particular pattern of exchange.

Foster's (2009:88) analysis of exchanges also included reference to three types of dialogic talk and the conclusions of Foster's study indicated that exploratory talk was the most frequently occurring, and from an educational perspective, the most valued form of collaborative talk (Foster 2009:102).

2.7.3 Collaboration

The concept of exploratory talk relates to collaboration within groups in the building and sharing of common understandings in the construction of knowledge. Alexander's seven powerful arguments to justify giving talk the central place in education encompass a sociocultural approach to learning:

> *Communicative*: talk is humankind's principal means of communication, especially in an era when children are becoming more familiar with visual images than the written word.
>
> *Social*: talk builds relationships, confidence and a sense of self.
>
> *Cultural*: talk creates and sustains individual and collective identities.
>
> *Neuroscientific*: language, and especially spoken language, builds connections in the brain; during the early and pre-adolescent years pre-eminently so.
>
> *Psychological*: language and the development of thought are inseparable. Learning is a social process, and high-quality talk helps to scaffold the pupil's understanding from what is currently known to what has yet to be known.
>
> *Pedagogical*: process and process-product research show that cognitively enriching talk engages pupils' attention and motivation, increases time on task and produces measurable learning gains.
>
> *Political*: democracies need citizens who can argue, reason, challenge, question, present cases and evaluate them. Democracies decline when citizens listen rather than talk, and when they comply rather than debate.
>
> Alexander (2006:37)

In relation to my own research with adults I can see that the concepts above are relevant in small group working, where relationships are maintained, a collective identity emerges, and talk within the group is scaffolded by reference to common knowledge in the development of new ideas.

The term collaboration in relation to collaborative success has been documented in association with both problem solving and learning experiences. For example Nokes-Malach et al. (2012:53) define collaborative success in problem solving activities as a 'complex interaction of the prior knowledge and experience of the individuals working together, and the relation of their combined knowledge to task'. The process of successful collaboration is also viewed as one requiring the maintenance of a mutual understanding of the task, together with a consensus on strategies and basic concepts (Gijlers et al. 2009:253). It is therefore clear that a process of negotiation in the building of ideas is important in developing successful collaboration, together with individual prior knowledge, shared experiences and mutual understanding about what is needed for the task. However, the benefits of a collaborative task are not only success but also the learning that is achieved, as participants learn from each other and acquire transferable skills in the process which 'empowers' them as learners (Wells and Chang-Wells 1992:58).

2.8 Summary of Chapter 2

My research aims to offer an insight into the discursive nature of collaboration in a small group of trainee teachers, as they work towards a given task. I refer to the sociocultural character of learning, in my examination of how members of the group use language in reviewing past experiences and constructing ideas in the creation of a joint understanding (Mercer 2000:116) of their Vision for Education. I consider how repetition functions in the building of shared ideas. I also discuss forms of talk associated with the creation of knowledge. The concept of building a community is relevant in my consideration of how the trainee teachers discursively construed themselves as a group and the strategies they

used to maintain their interaction through the use of politeness and humour. I also draw on the literature associated with leadership and management in the building of community in relation to Belbin's team-roles (1993;2010) as I examine the discursive strategies used in defining team-roles within the group. My reference to SFL considers the use of 1stPP in my analysis of the discursive strategies used in construing the group.

In Chapter 3 I discuss my methods of data collection.

Chapter 3 Data Collection and Analysis

3.1 Introduction

The overall aim of my research was to determine how a group of trainee teachers collaborate discursively towards a shared Vision of education. The three research questions in the context of the Vision task were initially formulated as:

RQ1   How do students share and build on understandings?

RQ2   Does an analysis of interpersonal tenor reveal roles within the group?

RQ3   How do students use textual cohesion in their group talk?

There was a clear shift in these initial research questions from the pilot study to the final case-study moving from an SFL framework to a sociocultural frame. This occurred because my analysis of transcripts revealed that there was evidence to better support a sociocultural frame, where linguistic features were central to the construction of identity and roles within the group. My research questions were subsequently developed and appear in Section 3.5.

This chapter gives details of my methodological choices including the choice of a discourse analysis approach and the decisions that I made in relation to my transcription notation format. I consider validity, reliability and ethics in relation to the research process. My collection of data is discussed and I explain how I will present the analysis of my data in the following three chapters.

3.1.2 Context

The research took place in the Teacher Education department of a large college in the North of England. The undergraduate trainee teachers were in their final year of study and were engaged in a module entitled Vision for Education, which was designed to bring together and review the learning experienced across their teacher education programmes.

During this module they were required to work in groups (six members) in formulating their Vision for Education for the future. The assessment guidelines for this appear in Appendix 1 and 2. The trainee teachers were asked to consider current issues within education and to underpin their ideas with reference to theory and current research in formulating their Vision. In addition they were asked to write a 1000 word evaluation of their group working and were advised within this to include theory related to working in teams. The groups were expected to keep a group file in which notes, research and the minutes of meetings would be filed (Appendix 3). A template was supplied to help in outlining their presentation (Appendix 4) and they were also given a template to aid the writing of the minutes and were told to take turns in writing the minutes from each meeting (Appendix 5). The end result of this group collaboration was a presentation to their peers, tutors and external examiners in the lecture theatre within the institution. These guidelines and the advice given had the potential to influence the trainee interactions, particularly as the trainees knew they would reflect on their group working in a written task at a later stage and they were also sharing the minute taking of each meeting, which potentially could have an influence on group dynamics.

Before any research commenced a letter was given to all students taking part in the Vision for Education module inviting them to take part in my research. The letter described the research in broad terms (without revealing details that might compromise my findings) and made it clear that participation would not affect final assessment marks in any way (Appendix 6). In this I was following the guidelines of the British Educational Research Association (2011:5) which advise that voluntary informed consent to participation in research is necessary prior to the research taking place. After an opportunity had been given to the trainee teachers to ask questions about my research and signed consent had been obtained the tutors who were responsible for supervising the Vision module randomly allocated trainees into groups of six.

Data was captured through a combination of audio and video recording of these six groups of six participants, in the process of working towards the task of forming their Vision for education. The audio and video material was then transcribed and analysed.

In addition, I referred to the available 1000-word evaluations produced by the trainees of how they had worked in their group towards the Vision task. These evaluations were used in helping to provide an alternative lens on the audio and video data.

I begin with a discussion relating to my methodology.

3.2 Methodology

My research began with an analysis of short extracts of talk involving six groups of trainee teachers from the BEd and BA Course, who had achieved a range of final presentation marks from 55 (C grade) to 72 (A grade). These were also drawn upon in a comparative analysis. The reason for choosing this approach was to ascertain whether there were any key differences in how the groups used language to work together and if there were commonalities between the groups that had produced successful presentations in terms of high grades. However, this did not enable me to examine how the ideas of the groups emerged over a period of time, nor did it allow me to consider the nature of the collaborative process in these groups. A group from the BEd course, who had produced a presentation which was given the high mark of 72% (A) was therefore chosen as a case-study group. I had audio/video footage of the first three meetings of this group and used this, as the focus of my research. This enabled me to examine the nature of the collaborative process in terms of how their ideas emerged over the three meetings. Ideally data from all six meetings, would have enabled me to analyse the evolution of the group more easily. Unfortunately this was not available, due to a number of factors including a shortage of quiet recording space, the group choosing to meet in other places outside the

institution after meeting three and my availability as researcher during my responsibility as leader for the Vision module.

3.2.1 Qualitative and quantitative approaches

Qualitative and quantitative research paradigms offer very distinct approaches, broadly described by the two generic terms of interpretive and normative/positivist. The normative/positivist paradigm views the nature of reality as being rule-governed and investigated according to the rules of natural science, with an aim of generating theory where data is collected (Cohen et al. 2007:21-22). The interpretive paradigm in contrast is concerned with human experience in terms of understanding the views and opinions of people and its aim is to generate meaning which gives some insight into behaviour. The aim of scientific investigation in relation to an interpretive piece of research is to provide understanding in relation to events during one place and at one time and make comparisons with other places at different times. Meanings are then generated which give some insight into the behaviour of people (Cohen et al. 2007:22).

Brannen (2005:175) comments that there are more overlaps than differences between qualitative and quantitative research. For example, claims based on the assumption that qualitative research focusses on meanings and quantitative research focuses on behaviour are not fully supported, as both forms of research can take into account the views and actions of people.

I considered that my research was positioned primarily within an interpretive (qualitative) paradigm, and specifically as a case-study. However, there were minor elements of my research that involved a more quantitative approach, in counting particular features of speech and in assessing outcomes. Generalisation was not an aim of this research, as each particular group of trainee students would present different characteristics. The term 'relatability' may be more appropriate, as Bassey comments: '...an important criterion for judging the merit of a case-study is the extent to which the details are sufficient and

38

appropriate for a teacher working in a similar situation to relate his decision- making to that described in the case-study. The relatability of a case is more important than its generalizability' (Bassey 1981:83)

My research is a case-study in terms of the main focus being the behaviour of one group of trainee teachers, who are interacting in a particular setting in the process of completing a task. As Opie (2004:74) states: '… [the] focus of a case-study is on a real situation, with real people in an environment often familiar to the researcher'. The environment was familiar to me as a researcher and the study aimed to give some insight into how this case-study group interacted during the task of producing their Vision for Education. In a study of this nature it is common practice to share the data retrospectively with the participants to gain a fuller insight into how they perceived the interaction. I did not have the opportunity to do this, as this module was a final module conducted at the end of the academic year and students were not attending college after this. However, I did have access to the student evaluations of their interaction within the group and used these to offer insight into the collaboration within the group.

3.2.2 Discourse analysis
As discussed more fully in Chapter 2, the analysis of discourse reveals how discursive strategies are used in the construction of social phenomena.

Fairclough's approach to discourse analysis is based on 'the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life (2003:2). The collective term 'discourse analysis' does not refer to a particular method of research, but instead refers to the study of language practices as they occur in any context (Tannen 2010:5). It '…designates many different research approaches that are concerned with the analysis of 'natural' communication processes in different contexts, and from linguistic, sociolinguistic, ethnomethodological - conversation-analysis, sociological and psychological perspectives' (Keller 2013:13).

Discourse analysis within sociolinguistics has been associated with the analysis of audio-visual data, where transcriptions are made from recorded speech and then examined.

It can be argued that a study of the discourse alone eliminates other features that may be important in conveying the message including body language and intonation. Although my study was not focussed on intonation, or body language I made notes in relation to any features I felt were important in enabling the discourse to be better understood.

3.2.3 Transcription

I faced choices in transcription framework design, in that group spoken interaction needed to be captured, together with any relevant action which may be significant in documenting shared understanding between participants. In particular, I needed to consider how much information to treat as relevant.

The act of transcription is extremely time-consuming and involves interpretation on the part of the researcher. Ochs (1979:44) discusses the features used in the representation of spoken interaction and describes transcriptions as a selective process in the choice of page lay-outs, page biases in reading from left to right and the symbols used to represent non-verbal features.

What is included in a transcript will be dependent on the focus of the research (Graddol et al. 2001:183) and the type of transcription framework I considered suitable to reflect the interaction taking place in this research was a column transcript. 'Ideally a transcription would record the speech of each participant, and relevant non-linguistic gestures, objects referred to etc., in separate columns on the page' (Schofield 1994:46). A column transcript makes it easier to document different speaker's contributions and to track an individual's participation, as each speaker is assigned a separate column. There is also a column for notes to record any particular action/ contextual feature relevant to the discourse. I decided to include notes on the transcript of action that was relevant to my analysis, for example in

relation to humour I noted the instances of mime. Swann makes the observation that 'column transcripts do not make the assumption about sequencing and connecting between turns' as in a standard transcription layout where one turn follows on from another (2007:169). This is relevant as in group talk participants often overlap speech. Graddol et al. (2001:46) point out that the allocation of columns to speakers may not be a totally neutral decision, as due to the left-hand orientation and page layout in European transcripts priority may be given to information on the left-hand side. They also note that the speaker given this position may appear to be the main initiator in conversation. This may be something that has to be considered when producing the transcripts, particularly if there is a dominant speaker within the group.

In transcribing the discourse I considered using voice recognition software, but had concerns about its ability to recognise particular voices and produce group talk with any overlap that might occur. I therefore decided to manually transcribe the discourse. The transcription notation used by Swann (2007:166) was used as a starting point with slight modifications from the notation used by Stockwell (2008:76) in the use of square brackets to indicate speaker overlap (see Appendix 7 for a list of transcription conventions). I chose not to punctuate or use upper case in my transcriptions, but used transcription conventions to indicate when words were uttered with added emphasis and when there were short or long pauses in the discourse. In the initial organisation of data from these transcripts colour coding and bold text were used to highlight particular instances of interest in my research (see Appendix 7). In presenting extracts from my transcripts I encountered a challenge in aligning the data vertically and used tables to help me to do this. I also added a time code which appears below the title of each extract to indicate its length. I attach a sample transcript in Appendix 8.

There are issues in assuming that any data, for example transcripts, can be analysed in isolation from the context of situation, as the text carries many levels of meaning (Cohen et

al. 2008:495). According to Hammersley (2006:759) transcripts could be considered as constructions, as they are far removed from the recordings. I was particularly concerned with the question of interpretation and like Tannen (2005:48-49) grappled with the question of how do I know what is going on. I decided after trial and error to focus on recurring patterns within the discussion and so focussed on features of discourse that occurred and recurred, while recognising that my interpretation was potentially one of many (Tannen 2005:43).

3.3 Ethical principles

3.3.1 Validity and reliability

Interpretation is one concern in relation to the consideration of validity, as the role of the researcher in the phenomenon being studied can have the effect of altering the way that the language used by participants is represented. This can be due to direct involvement, as a participant or indirectly through the use of recording equipment, particularly if participants are asked to position themselves in an unnatural position in view of the camera. In either situation there can be an impact on the research. Factors such as the awareness of participants in the recording process and the extent to which the observational process has been structured need to be considered carefully. There can be no such thing as a neutral interpretation of events due to the individual perspective of the person doing the interpretation and any influences on that perspective.

In Phase 1 of my research I initially acted as a non-participant observer, as my role was simply to use the video recording in capturing the interaction which took place within the group. According to Cohen et al., 'both complete participation and complete detachment minimize reactivity…' The concept of reliability in qualitative research according to Cohen et al., differs from that in quantitative research in that: 'In qualitative methodologies reliability includes fidelity to real life, context-and situation-specificity, authenticity,

comprehensiveness, detail, honesty, depth of response and meaningfulness to the respondents' (Cohen et al., 2007:149).

On the other hand, reliability in a quantitative research context assumes that replication can take place and if the same methods and sample were used then the results should be very similar (Bassey 1981:85).

3.3.2 Ethics

My research was underpinned by the BERA guidelines (2011:7), which discuss the fact that anonymous treatment of participants' data is considered the norm for the conduct of the research. Note that my consent letter in Appendix 6 showed the BERA 2004 guidelines, as I started my research before the 2011 guidelines came into practice. Coffey et al. (2006:26) noted that the digitisation of qualitative data and the issue of wider access to that data create particular ethical concerns involving consent and anonymity. In this research there were two stages for consideration. The first stage involved the group interaction in preparation for the presentations, where the main data gathering took place. This required group meetings to be audio /visually recorded in order to study the process of how students interacted. The data collected was solely for my own use as researcher in that transcripts could be produced for analysis. The participants were not asked to do any additional tasks to what they were required to do as part of the module and any personal data especially from transcripts was given a code to identify the source of data. Initially this coding consisted of labelling groups with a colour which was used as part of the administration of the module, so I ensured eventually that the groups who participated in this research were given a separate colour label by me together with a pseudonym to protect their identity. At the point of obtaining permissions trainees were asked for contact details (email addresses) which were stored separately to the AV material on different computers. The presentation stage was where each group performed their Vision for Education in final presentations, as a result of their group collaboration. These

presentations were performed to a large audience of peers, staff and external examiners and have been traditionally video-recorded as part of the assessment process, so that performances can be reviewed and absent external examiners can access them.

BERA makes the comment that: 'Researchers engaged in action research must consider the extent to which their own reflective research impinges on others, for example in the case of the dual role of teacher and researcher and the impact on students and colleagues'. (BERA 2011:5). This is particularly relevant in consideration of my role as a member of staff jointly organising this module and I was also the course leader for one of the undergraduate degrees (BEd QTS) when the research commenced (Phase One of the study) but not at the time of the collection of data in this research.

I was very conscious of my role in relation to assessment of this module. The assessment for this particular group's presentation element (group-mark 72%) was part of the module Personal Development and Planning (PDP) in the BEd programme. It constituted 40% of the mark towards PDP. The final presentations are marked by peers, members of staff and external examiners/visitors, as a mark sheet is provided together with marking criteria where each group is graded. Due to the fact that there may be concerns about my involvement with the presentation marking process, I decided to withdraw from that stage of marking.

Another area for consideration in relation to ethics is how much information is divulged to students regarding the precise nature of the research. So as not to actively mislead participants, I decided to reveal the general purpose of the research without giving specific details (BAAL 2000). On the other hand, deliberate deception is seen as unacceptable, as it constitutes a violation of the principles of informed consent and the right to privacy. However, it is recognised that in some research contexts there are methodological reasons for participants not being fully aware about the precise nature of the objectives of the research. Particular circumstances may include research on phonological variation or

particular features of 'talk'. In this research there were reasons for withholding the precise nature of the research due to the fact that revealing this might influence the nature of talk. Representing the research as a study of group interaction with a particular focus on use of language was a compromise between honesty and full disclosure.

3.3.3 Phase 1 of my study

Before embarking on my main research I conducted a pilot study involving six groups of trainee teachers, where I recorded short extracts of talk (ten minutes) during the first thirty minutes of their first meeting within college. I examined these short extracts of talk to determine whether I could identify any features that were prominent within that first meeting of the six groups. I noticed that in the four higher scoring groups (according to their final assessment marks) there was a frequent use of the first person plural pronoun 'we' used during their discussions about their Vision for Education. I discuss this in Chapter 6, where I consider how the group is discursively construed. It was also apparent that the groups in these short extracts of talk referred to common knowledge, either in the form of an individual's previous experience, shared knowledge relating to teaching, or shared experiences and this is particularly relevant to my RQ1 and RQ3 involving the development of ideas over time and how the group was construed. Table 3.1 gives details of the six groups including ethnicity and age according to college records, where students had self-selected their ethnic categories and each student was also given a pseudonym.

Table 3.1 Groups in Phase 1 of my study.

Group & Grade	Speaker	Ethnicity	Age
Titanium	Tess	white British	27
72	Talisha	British Pakistani	36
	Tom	white British	38
	Tim	white British	48
	Tina	white British	38
	Tazmin	British Pakistani	30
		Average age	36
Aluminium	Alan	white British	44
72	Adele	white British	30
	Adam	white British	23
	Amy	white British	23
	Ann	white British	22
	Angus	white British	30
		Average Age	28
Nickel	Nicola	white British	30
65	Norma	mixed heritage Caribbean	22
	Noreen	white British	31
	Narif	British Pakistani	35
	Naila	British Pakistani	24
		Average Age	28
Copper	Chandi	British Pakistani	22
62	Chloe	white British	23
	Cora	white British	22
	Carol	white British	24
	Cala	British Pakistani	25
	Cindy	white British	22
		Average Age	23
Zinc	Zara	white British	24
58	Zelda	white British	29
	Zen	white British	27
	Zach	white British	39
	Zia	Black African	42
	Zoe	white British	30
		Average Age	31
Lead	Leah	white British	22
55	Lois	white British	22
	Leanne	white British	24
	Leila	British Pakistani	22
	Lakshmi	British Indian	23
	Lubna	British Indian	24
		Average Age	22

For Phase 2, I decided to focus on Titanium group. To some extent the group represented a convenience sample in that, unlike other groups, I had recorded material from their first three meetings totalling 2 hours 7 minutes of talk, but they were also selected on the basis that they were one of two groups who had achieved a high mark in their presentation of 72%. The group were hence chosen on their potential ability to offer insights into how a group who achieved high marks collaborated in the discussion process towards the task of formulating their Vision of Education. I also wondered how important those first three meetings would be in how they discursively construed themselves as a group. The group consisted of four females and two males and as in other groups, I gave them pseudonyms to protect their identity. The group was labelled Titanium and the group members were given names beginning with T:

Table 3.2 The case-study group.

Name- Titanium	Age	Gender	Ethnicity
Tess	27	F	white British
Talisha	36	F	British Pakistani
Tina	38	F	white British
Tim	48	M	white British
Tom	38	M	white British
Tazmin	30	F	British Pakistani

3.4 Data Analysis

3.4.1 Data Collection

The main method of collecting data for this project was through audio and video recording of participants and there were various challenges to consider in the arrangement of equipment in this process. For example, I considered that in an audio recording alone it may only be possible to hear one person speaking at any time and contributors to 'talk' may not be heard clearly. Utterances may be spoken simultaneously which would make it difficult to hear the full extent of the discussion. Audio recordings alone lose contextual information which could have an effect on the validity of the study. I also considered that it may not be possible to judge the engagement of the participants, particularly in a group situation as there may be group members who do not make any contribution. Another factor I was aware of was that I did not personally know all of the students taking part in this module, so that it may be more difficult to distinguish voices when transcribing from audio recordings. Flewitt (2006:29) in her research with young children also recognised that focusing exclusively on audio recordings can be a limitation in demonstrating the communication processes that are taking place. Flewitt comments:

> The choice of visual media reflected the researcher's belief that focusing exclusively on audio recordings...fails to portray how children and adults combine communicative modes and how personal and institutional factors impact upon individuals' choice of modes.

(Flewitt 2006:2)

In relation to my research this raises awareness of the importance of being able to identify speakers and clarify transcriptions through the use of video as well as audio material. A study of discourse alone, particularly when transcribing from audio recordings can be problematic. I decided to combine audio with video modes in my collection of data.

48

Combining audio and video modes to record interaction still presented challenges. For example, there were limitations in using cameras, particularly in the effect a camera presence can have on participant behaviour. Deciding where to angle a camera, so that the lens can capture the extent of the interaction had to also be considered. One solution to this issue may have been to use more than one camera, which would enable recordings from a different angle to capture a more comprehensive view of the interaction. These different viewing angles can give a more indepth image of the interaction taking place within any given context. However, the central concern I had was in the effect a camera presence may have on the interaction.

During Phase 1 of my study, where I recorded participants using a digital audio recorder and a digital video camera, I realised that the digital video recorder was more than adequate at recording audio and video material. One difficulty was that the camera had to be positioned to capture all participants, which was awkward when using only one camera. I was reluctant to move participants, as I wanted them to be as comfortable and natural as possible in their group interaction and so I moved the hand-held camera to capture interaction. I suspect that my presence in the pilot study may have encouraged some groups of students to focus more on the task, as some informal feedback from students after the pilot study suggested that they felt the recording process was useful in keeping them focussed on their discussions. In my final study I secured the camera in a position that would capture the group interaction and allowed the camera to record in my absence for each of the three meetings, which were part of my study. This removed my presence from the recording process. However, it may still have had the effect of keeping the group focussed on the task knowing that I would be viewing their efforts at a later date.

My second method of collecting data for my focus group was through the information that was given by the trainee teachers in meeting the requirements of the Vision for Education module. This included their individual evaluations of the group work. Five of the six

members of the group submitted their written work for this module and this data was used to help provide an additional perspective on my findings.

3.4.2 Data analysis in relation to my research questions

My research questions were progressively reformulated to more effectively capture the nature of collaboration and these eventually appeared as:

RQ1 How are ideas within the group collaboratively developed over time?

RQ2 To what extent and in what ways are particular discursive roles constructed within the group?

RQ3 How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group?

In relation to RQ1, I began my analysis of how the group explored ideas and built on those ideas by noting when the Vision was mentioned within their discussion. This involved a consideration of how the group used their individual and shared knowledge in bringing together those ideas, allowing me to trace the origins of the Vision topic and how the Vision statement was formulated.

In relation to RQ2, I decided to use Belbin's team-roles (2010:22) in my analysis of the construction of discursive roles, as I was interested in whether the group members adopted roles similar to those of Belbin, particularly as the group were familiar with the work of Belbin. I considered organisation of the Vision task and the seeking of concensus in my examination of discursive roles, together with the use of humour within the group in an attempt to identify where there was leadership of the group and what other roles emerged.

In relation to RQ3, I began my analysis referring to my findings in Phase 1 of my study regarding the use of first person plural forms (henceforth '1stPP'). The rationale for using 1stPP 'the first person plural' was to avoid the issue of whether I'm always talking about pronouns. Arguably, 'our' (like my/ your/ his/ her/) is a possessive determiner rather than

50

a pronoun, and the pronoun in 'let's' is buried in the verb. I then examined the three meetings from my case-study group in relation to the use of 1stPP. My research involved small amounts of data so it appeared counter-productive to buy, learn how to use and apply specialised concordancing software. I instead made use of the 'find' function on the Microsoft 2010 toolbar, which despite some disadvantages was sufficient in allowing me to identify where 1stPP occurred within the transcripts. In relation to the use of 'we' I was particularly interested in where 'we' had been used inclusively among the group members, where one member of the group may refer to another or others in their use of 'we'. This was in contrast to when it was used to denote a member of the group and another or others outside the group. In order to differentiate the use of inclusive 'we' I highlighted 'we' on the transcript and typed it in bold text, so that it could be clearly seen in context. My analysis of the use of 'we' 'us' and 'our' 'ours' and 'ourselves' within the context of the group discussion began with a quantitative approach and and then moved on to a qualitative approach in order to analyse the data in more depth.

3.5 Summary of Chapter 3

The research took place in the Teacher Education department of a large college in the North of England. The undergraduate trainee teachers were in their final year of study and were engaged in a module entitled Vision for Education, which was designed to bring together and review the learning experienced across their teacher education programmes. The research was positioned mainly in an interpretive (qualitative) paradigm, although a quantitative analysis was used in the counting of particular features of speech.

Phase 1 of my research included six groups who had achieved a variation in final presentation marks from 55 to 72%, in the task of forming their Vision for Education. These groups were used in a comparative analysis. My main focus was a case-study of a group of trainee teachers from the BEd Course who had scored 72% in their assessment and involved an analysis of their first three meetings within college.

Data was captured through a combination of audio and video recording of six trainee teacher groups, each consisting of six participants. The recordings were then transcribed and analysed. In addition, the trainee teachers as part of their assessment produced short (1000) word evaluations of how they had worked in their group. These evaluations were used in helping to provide an alternative lens on the audio and video data.

A discourse analysis approach was taken, which had many challenges. Producing and interpreting transcripts was a challenge for me, as this was a lengthy process, particularly as I had made the decision not to use voice recognition software. I eventually adopted the use of a column transcript, where I included colour coding and bold text used to highlight particular features. The use of columns made it easier to document different speakers' contributions' and add any notes that were relevant to the interaction.

Determining any patterns that emerged through the group discussion that were relevant in addressing my three research questions proved complex. Knowing what was relevant in constructing an effective argument in presenting my case was a particular challenge for me. When relevant evidence had been identified further challenges for me emerged in the effective presentation, length and alignment of extracts in addressing the points made.

My research questions were re-formulated to effectively capture the nature of collaboration and these eventually appeared as:

RQ1   How are ideas within the group collaboratively developed over time?

RQ2   To what extent and in what ways are particular discursive roles constructed within the group?

RQ3   How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group?

RQ1 informed my first data chapter (Chapter 4), RQ2 my second data chapter (Chapter 5) and RQ3 my final data chapter (Chapter 6).

Chapter 4 The development of ideas over time

4.1 Introduction

This chapter refers to my first research question: How are ideas within the group collaboratively developed over time?

The development of ideas over time is of importance, as there is a great deal of research which has explored the development of ideas within particular interaction (Mercer 2000; Holmes 2001; Littleton and Mercer 2013), but there is less evidence of the development of ideas over successive interactions. The work of Victoria (2012) is significant in that is one example of a study that examined interactions over a succession of classes in terms of the formation of the group as a group.

Recordings of my case-study group (Titanium group) over three successive meetings allowed me to explore this temporal dimension. This was important to my study as students were tasked with developing a creative Vision for Education as part of their assessment, where they gave a presentation to their peers, tutors and external examiners in the college lecture theatre. It was valuable to be able to look at the development of the Vision from its inception through to to its final agreed form.

The Vision that Titanium developed over the course of this task was based on an ICT (information and communications technology) four-dimensional approach to teaching and learning, where virtual reality was identified as a tool which enabled children to access experiences that were not immediately available within the classroom. These included access to various environments and sensory experiences, including visiting other countries and periods in history to promote a greater understanding of the National Curriculum (DFS England, 2004). Their final Vision statement was formulated as:

To create a 22nd century vision for the future of education which will deliver an immersive, multi-sensory, exploratory, virtual learning experience which is inclusive to all.

I approached my analysis of how the Vision idea was developed by noting initially when 'Vision' was mentioned in the group discussion. I then considered how the Vision idea developed from ICT learning to a creative four-dimentional approach over the course of the first three group meetings. It was possible to identify particular stages in the temporal development of the group's Vision. In Chapter 2 I discussed Tuckman's stages of group formation (1965:396) but there were shortcomings in the application of this framework to my own data. In the following sections 4.2- 4.4 I chart the development of the Vision through three stages and used the metaphor of building a house in my discussion of how the ideas were developed and argue that this better reflects how the Vision was constructed.

In section 4.2 examples are given to illustrate how the group initiate their ideas for their Vision in the 'Drawing of the plans'. This is extended in 4.3 with 'Digging the foundations' , as the group outline their ideas and start to form the foundations of their Vision, rather like the building of the foundations of a house. In section 4.4 (Building the Vision) the group are building their Vision, like the walls of a house beginning to grow.

4.2 Drawing the plans

Extracts 4.1- 4.6 below show how the ideas about the use of ICT in the group's Vision are initiated and then developed collaboratively between speakers in the group. Extract 4.1 occurs about a minute into the first meeting. The group has been discussing the organisation of their task and how they might record minutes of their discussion. Talisha has attempted to initiate a new topic which is a discussion of the Vision itself ('right (.) Vision'). This is uttered quietly and does not appear to be taken up by other participants.

At the beginning of Extract 4.1, a few seconds later, Talisha again attempts to shift the topic and this time is successful.

Extract 4.1 'My actual vision' (Meeting 1)

[01.00 – 02.07]

1	TAL	yeah think it will just be easier
2	TOM	yeah okay it's a good idea
3	TAL	we can just e-mail each other off there anyway it's not a problem at all right (.) vision
4	TESS	could be better to actually take off the notes to actually write them down yeah
5	TOM	we need to take notes
6	TAL	if we take turns one every week we'll pop on to a stick and just type it up (.) easier right- anybody got any (.) ideas (.) I'll give you mine
7	TIM	=yeah I've got some ideas [we'll brainstorm I'll give you what I did
8	TAL	[shall I start
9	TIM	I'm still writing things down
10	TAL	that's why I'll start (.) mine was the use of ICT and how it should be used with the children so a more practical way of using ICT (teaching children) my actual vision was something like having being at home for the children to be able to access resources from home like they are doing now but it was more like a shared experience you know like you have the PlayStation games things like that well having something like that more like that but on an educational basis

In turn 6 Talisha asks if anyone has any ideas about the group's Vision for education. Following a brief pause in which no one responds, Talisha offers to give her ideas. Tim then responds to Talisha's question (turn 7) but Talisha overlaps his speech with 'shall I start' (turn 8). Tim is engaged in writing notes at the time (turn 9) and Talisha takes this as a reason why she should start (turn 10). What is of interest here is that Talisha is claiming speaking rights over Tim and this allows her to propose the use of ICT for the group's Vision. This is significant as it is the first time ICT is mentioned in the discussion. Talisha's role in managing the group discussion is discussed further in Chapter 5. Talisha progressively refines her proposal for the use of ICT, specifying initially that this is a 'more practical way of using ICT' (turn 10) to teach children, then narrowing this in noting

that her 'actual Vision' relates to children accessing resources from home as a shared experience. She appeals to the common knowledge of the group In ('you know like you have the PlayStation games things like that'). In her later evaluation of the group work Talisha suggests that her proposal for ICT was motivated by personal experience which was in the form of some research she had carried out previously:

Our initial meeting enabled the group to highlight their specific skills. I suggested we link the vision to ICT and 4D learning as this was an area I had recently researched through my dissertation and I felt it could be a focus area for our vision.

Talisha's idea of using ICT is initially developed by Tina and then by Tess illustrated in Extract 4.2.

Extract 4.2 'Like social network' (Meeting 1)

[2.07 – 02.45]

11	TINA	so they can all like a social network not like a social network that's wrong where they can all interlink
12	TAL	yeah
13	TINA	and interact with each other
14	TAL	yeah
15	TINA	so people around the world or people they know or
16	TAL	yeah (.) yeah all over I don't know it's just it's really broad it's something to link all these
17	TESS	it's a starting point
18	TAL	It is (.) it is something to link ICT and learning
19	TESS	The thing is though (.) our vision can incorporate everything in there
20	TAL	in there
21	TESS	look at your (.) er that Headmaster's talk today he had so many
22	TAL	amazing
23	TESS	different strands

Tina (turn 11) builds on Talisha's reference (in turn 10 Extract 4) to the potential of shared experience like PlayStation games. She adds two further points: the possibility of a social network, corrected to the idea that pupils can 'interlink' and 'interact with each other', and the fact that this can involve 'people around the world or people they know'. These points

56

are supported by Talisha (turns 12, 14 and 16). Talisha then hedges her proposal 'I don't know it's just really broad' adding that it is a way of linking ICT and learning (turns 16, 18). Tess supports Talisha here (turn 17) where she notes 'it's a starting point' and refers to the broad remit of the vision (it 'can incorporate everything....').These points are developed in close collaboration with Talisha, seen through Talisha's repetition of Tess's 'in there' (turns 19/20) and the joint construction ('...so many/ amazing/ different strands'). This collaborative process is characteristic of the group's general development of their Vision, where speakers support each other in the building and developing of each other's ideas.

The talk returns to ICT [03.46] after a brief discussion about the Headmaster's talk and comments from Tom about the Vision needing to maintain a focus. Within Extract 4.3 below Tina considers the use of ICT in changing the pattern of school hours.

Extract 4.3 'I really like that ICT idea' (Meeting 1)

[03.46 – 04.44]

1	TESS	each child reaches their full potential but there was a key phrase
2	TAL	key phrase
3	TINA	right I really like that ICT idea I was thinking something which ICT would play a major part in along the lines of providing erm education er in a more tailored fashion so schools doesn't start at 9 and finish at 3 where you start at 7 and finish at 5 er at 12 and you can fit around child-care you can drop in and out of lessons [03.59]............[04.41] but how would would it work (.) how would you do that (.)
4	TAL	we could think about that brilliant and we could incorporate [the ICT
5	TINA	[learning from home as well
6	TAL	if the child's actually missed a day off school they can access it

The importance of this extract is that there is a marked shift back to the topic of ICT, where Tina (turn 3) uses what is referred to as a topical transition marker (Schiffrin 1987) in her use of 'right' (turn 3) where she makes a positive evaluation. Tina (turn 3) expresses

some ideas about using ICT in education outside school hours in introducing flexibility in education. She expresses some caution here with 'but how would it work (.) how would you do that (.)'. Talisha in turn 4 responds to Tina's comments positively in supporting her ideas, even though she does not offer an immediate solution to how it would work. The use of 'we' by Talisha might suggest an attempt here to build the group identity and make the ICT idea a collective matter, in moving away from Tina's (turn 3) use of 'I' in proposing her ideas to 'we' in bringing it within the remit of the group.

The conversation continues [05.25- 06.46] along the lines of child-led learning based on the interest of the child with some talk about enrichment and creativity. There is another topic shift (shown in the extract below) when the talk returns to an ICT Vison when Talisha asks Tom what he thinks:

Extract 4.4 'It has to be based on IT' (Meeting 1)

[06.42-07.17]

1	TAL	Tom what do you think
2	TOM	(taking minutes) yeah yeah just building on what you said really - just taking IT don't think I would ignore IT really actually you talk about vision for education it has to be based in some way on IT
3	TAL	my last dissertation was based on ICT based on IT I've just done so much reading on it right now
4	TOM	that's brilliant
5	TAL	it'd all be there so that's why I was kind of thinking about this
6	TOM	that's brilliant (.) I agree with the personalised learning a lot but also think I'm really interested in bringing in more er developing more the social interpersonal skills for children- I think obviously it was touched on last week in that Ken Robinson video -education is very test SATs and exam focussed but it doesn't develop the whole child

Tom in turn 2 is promoting IT as a focus of the Vision. Talisha in turns 3 and 5 mentions her own work and suggests that this would be a resource. Tom endorses this repeating 'that's brilliant' and adds a focus to think about the 'social interpersonal skills for children'. He refers to a common shared experience of the group in a keynote lecture and

expresses concern over the development of the child. This discussion continues around life skills and individual learning until vision is mentioned again.

Extract 4.5 below appears to be a turning point in facilitating the creative thinking that follows.

Extract 4.5 That's something completely different (Meeting 1)

[08.52- 09.02]

1   TESS   yeah think about it what our vision has to be it's something that's not even there it's something whether it works we can't say but it's got to be something where they can say that's completely different that's not been thought about like the boy and his underwater schools
(joint laughter throughout the group)

Tess suggests that it's not practical concerns that matter 'whether it works we can't say' but the uniqueness of the Vision 'something...' . 'The boy and his underwater schools' refers back to a keynote lecture, which was attended by the group members. The reference revives this common knowledge and is responded to by laughter. This seems to serve as a catalyst in inviting more creative ideas and a focus on those ideas being different without the pre-occupation with practicalities.

Within Extract 4.6 the idea of 4D learning is mentioned by Talisha for the first time and it is important in that all six members of the group contribute to a discussion related to 4D learning and the use of holograms.

Extract 4.6 '4D learning would look really good' (Meeting 1)

[09.26- 10.08]

1	TAZ	we could have a school in a ship as well can dive under water
2	TAL	something like 4D learning [like 4D rather than 3D
3	TINA	[oo 4D learning so it's taking out=
4	TOM	=you're talking about holograms teaching holograms and stuff aren't you I'll write that down
5	TAL	I wanna do my hologram idea was based on=
6	TIM	=4D learning would look really good on ( ) wouldn't it
7	TAL	I know shall we have that
8	TESS	that's a really good idea
9	TINA	and then it would bring in your VAK [visual auditory kinaesthetic] the kinaesthetic perhaps having a hologram as the teacher in the room with you
10	TAL	that's what I said
11	TINA	but (.) 4D would then mean that you would have to do a practical cutting the feeling the smelling that would lead to individual learning

Here we see the group collaboratively building on the idea of a 4D Vision. Tazmin (turn 1) introduces the idea of 'a school in a ship' which is reformulated by Talisha in ('something like 4D learning'). This is taken up by Tina in 'oo 4D learning' indicating her enthusiasm for the idea and her engagement in the talk through her repetition of '4D learning'. In turn 4 Tom uses a tag question in seeking confirmation from others that what is being discussed is related to holograms. Talisha responds to this in beginning to discuss what her hologram idea was based on (turn 5) with Tim (turn 6) latching on to her comment and adding support. Talisha makes a proposal to the group 'I know shall we have that' (turn 7) which arguably is a response to the general discussion related to 4D learning. Tess indicates support with 'that's a really good idea' and Tina adds further comments about how it might be used (turn 9). The term VAC here refers to different forms of learning which are visual, auditory and kinaesthetic and this is within the common knowledge of the group as trainee teachers. Talisha indicates agreement (turn 10) and Tina continues to explore the idea of 4D. There are many such examples of repetition

and the echoing of ideas within this extract as the group build their Vision. These ideas about 4D learning continued to be discussed and proved influential in eventually forming the final Vision.

4.3 Digging the foundations

Section 4.3 moves away from the initiation of the Vision idea and the immediate development of the group's ideas and considers the structure of the foundation of those ideas, giving examples of how the ideas were further developed in a consideration of the practicalities involved in representing teaching and learning in a 4D Vision. This was the start of what I termed 'digging the foundations'.

Extract 4.7 below (approximately 16 minutes after Extract 4.6) the group concern themselves with the practicalities of producing a 4D Vision. The group are aware that they will need to justify their Vision ideas through the questioning that will take place at the end of their group presentation and attempt to prepare themselves for the likely questions that may be asked in relation to teaching and learning (Appendix 2). Within this extract they consider the role of the teacher in relation to the delivery of numeracy and literacy, which are core subjects in the primary national curriculum for England (DES 2004:3). This generates a discussion in relation to skills, particularly related to numeracy skills, instigated by Talisha's comments regarding calculators and exams:

Extract 4.7 'Having the skills' (Meeting 1)

[26.27-28.08]

1	TESS	the role of the teacher in like numeracy and literacy
2	TAL	doesn't have to be how it's taught now in a lesson
3	TINA	could be the hidden curriculum numeracy and literacy may be the part that's in it encompassing everything else
4	TIM	so children don't necessarily know they're being directed
5	TINA	yeah that would be the limitation
6	TAZ	but it's not directed a teacher just standing there and giving instruction and children
7	TAL	it's not my children it gets to exams and they've got a non calculator paper a non calculator paper I just don't see the point because they say when we go out we're using a calculator so what is why
8	TINA	what is the reason is if you're stuck and you don't have a calculator and you don't have the skills then to do it=
9	TAL	=would you have the skills
10	TIM	that's not the only answer what it something's wrong with it
11	TINA	yes but having the skills to check it
12	TAL	but that's the kind of thing they need to say we will get questions like that
13	TIM	yeah you could have your 4D programme in a jungle and a polar bear turns up somebody has to know that that shouldn't be there
14	TINA	that's where I see vision going wrong
15	TESS	it's not just about in the real world you have a calculator it's about fostering skills that you will need in life you know
16	TINA	when you go to Top-Shop 20% student discount you need to know [joint laughter]
17	TESS	you do (-) so basically our role as a teacher in this is a facilitator we're providing opportunities to learn
18	TINA	and the knowledge to develop
19	TESS	yes

Here there are examples of references to the group's common knowledge of teaching. For example, in turn 1 Tess makes reference to 'the role of the teacher in like numeracy and literacy'. The 'hidden curriculum' is mentioned by Tina (turn 3) and trainee teachers will know that this is defined as not being part of the formal school curriculum, but is acquired as part of the experience of learning, as in social behaviour in school. It appears that Tina

is suggesting that numeracy and literacy 'could be the hidden curriculum numeracy and literacy may be the part that's in it encompassing everything else' Tim's response to this (turn 4) suggests that he has interpreted Tina's statement to mean that children are not told what to learn. There is some discussion about directed learning, as Tina recognises that children not knowing they are being directed could be a limitation of the Vision (Turn 4). Tazmin appears to argue that 'it's not directed' and Talisha ' it's not' in the following turn. The repeated 'it' here appears to refer to the Vision. The discussion shifts in turn 7 when Talisha refers to her children's experience of a non calculator paper. This leads to a discussion in relation to skills. There is an echoing of the word 'skills' introduced by Tina in turn 8 and echoed by Talisha in turn 9 as she queries Tina's point about not having the skills. Tim intervens in offering another viewpoint which leads to Tina acknowledging Tim, but again re-iterating skills in 'yes but having the skills to check it' . Talisha (turn 12) refers to the questions which are directed at the group by staff and peers at the end of their Vision presentation and refers to the common knowledge held by the group about the assessment process of the Vision module. Tim makes a jocular reference in pointing out a potential weakness in using 4D learning '…in a jungle and a polar bear turns up…'. Tina's response (turn 14) indicates that this could be a potential weakness of the Vision. Tess (turn 15) makes an attempt to recap on the discussion by initially referring back to the comments about calculators. Tina (turn 16) makes a humourous response to this, which generates laughter among the group, in supporting Tess's comment 'when you go to Top-Shop 20% discount you need to know' . There is agreement from Tess 'you do' before Tess reformulates the discussion referring back to the role of the teacher (turn 17). Tina gives support to Tess's comment in building on the utterance (turn 19) with 'and the knowledge to develop'.

Throughout this extract the group are exploring the role of the teacher and the concept of skills. This is important, as the group will face rigorous questioning from tutors and peers

after the presentation of their Vision, which forms part of the assessment (Appendix 2). They inevitably will be asked questions about the role of the teacher and the development of skills in learning and need to be able to justify their Vision in terms of a strong rationale as to why they have chosen a particular approach. The extract above considers some of the potential weaknesses of the 4D Vision idea and considers the role of the teacher as facilitator.

In the talk leading up to Extract 4.8 below, Tom has been recalling the experience of his partner who has recently attended a course on teaching children in a virtual world involving PlayStation type games. This generates some discussion about objectives and differentiation related to a virtual Vision:

Extract 4.8 'The objectives of the lesson' (Meeting 1)

[29.19-30.29]

1	TOM	all the time the teacher is thinking about the objectives of the lesson and what she wants to get out of the kids when they've got this engagement when they've got this done this exploration it gives a link to write about then so she spends 20 minutes engaging them and they go exploring this world and then they all add a couple of sentences according to the objectives of what she wanted them to do and that was the whole lesson really
2	TIM	you could take that a step forward couldn't you like you said she places what she wants them to discover but you have interaction with the teacher and that can be changed so if the kids are getting it you know as too easy you know the subject knowledge becomes apparent you already know that she can change that bit and maybe even for different groups
3	TINA	it can be self-differentiated then a child can get as much out of it as they are willing to do [you know
4	TOM	[hmm she didn't have any differentiation I think that is interesting
5	TINA	cos they can keep extending there's no end so as far as the children are going and the more they are learning the further they were getting and the more they were getting so your really gifted children it's really hard to pitch at the right level they're self
6	TIM	motivating
7	TINA	motivating self led

This is an example where the group as a community of trainee primary school teachers, use the language associated with teaching, in their references to lesson objectives, self-differentiation and gifted and talented children. Arguably, they are drawing on their common knowledge of teaching in their discussion. The discussion is concerned with the learning objectives of the lesson and how these might be differentiated to accommodate the needs of the children. The consideration of these practicalities are important in providing justification that within their Vision, children will be given opportunities to learn to the best of their ability. The group will be questioned on their Vision at the end of their presentation and are likely to encounter questions relating to the organisation of learning for children. The extract begins when Tom presents some information about the virtual reality learning course in relation to learning objectives. This is taken up by Tim as he suggests a way of introducing differentiation (turn 2). Tim is concerned about providing enough challenge in the children's learning. The reference to 'she' is referring back to the teacher originally mentioned by Tom in turn 1. Note that Tim also reintroduces the word teacher and appears to be referring to 'the teacher' in general in '...but you have interaction with the teacher and that can be changed...' A suggestion is made by Tina (turn 3) in reference to the learning in that 'it can be self-differentiated'. This is picked up by Tom (turn 4) as he recalls that the teacher (in the course attended by his partner) '...didn't have any differentiation'. Tina (turn 5) appears to be considering the extension of learning and the idea that gifted and talented children are self motivating. There is a joint construction of 'self motivating' as Tim (turn 6) completes Tina's 'self' with 'motivating'and then Tina repeats 'motivating' in confirming the phrase and adds 'self led' in offering a reformulation of the phrase. This is an example of how the group collaborate in jointly developing their ideas.

The discussion in relation to learning continues in Extract 4.9 below as the group discuss the idea of being creative without losing sight of the learning that needs to take place:

65

Extract 4.9 'It's not a flaky idea' (Meeting 1)

[31.36 – 32.51]

1	TOM	David Murphy said it's important it's not a flaky idea he said you've got to make it creative but not in a contrived way
2	TESS	I think it's really important what you said there the need to keep the objective in your mind cos basically the objective you want the children to learn and the headteacher today was saying you know go and do creative things gives them you know
3	TAL	stimulus
4	TESS	stimulus for the writing you know what you said there about the to get the experiences and then to go and write about it let's face it you know you still have to you end up ( )
5	TAL	one year in a Y2 class they had a SATS paper and it was writing about the beach or something (.)
6	TINA	they'd never been
7	TAL	they'd never been and (.) poor things they were just sat there (.) they just didn't know how to start how do we (.)
8	TESS	a piece of writing in this case would be brilliant if done on the beach cos that's accessible for us so we need take the advantage if it's in the classroom in an inaccessible environment like a tropical rainforest is this what we agree on

There are many instances of repetition in the supporting of each other's comments within this extract as the group consider how the learning can be made creative. In turn 1 Tom raises the concern about creativity not being contrived. Tess (turn 2) builds on this and shows support in echoing 'important'. After a pause by Tess, Talisha completes Tess's sentence (turn 3) with 'stimulus' which is echoed by Tess and then expanded upon, as she relates 'stimulus' to 'writing' (turn 4). There follows a recall of personal experience from Talisha (turn 5) which builds on the idea of writing and refers to writing about the beach. Tina completes Talisha's sentence (turn 6) in 'they'd never been' referring to the fact that the children mentioned by Talisha had never been to the beach. This is echoed by Talisha (turn 7). Talisha ends her turn with 'how do we' followed by a pause in opening further

discussion about 'stimulus' and 'writing'. Tess then attempts to draw together the discussion (turn 8) in checking what the group's thoughts were in relation to the use of environment as a stimulus for writing. This extract demonstrates how the group use repetition and joint turn construction in a highly collaborative development of ideas.

The following 10 minutes of Meeting 1 involves talk around personal experiences of ICT. Talisha discusses her experience of collecting information for her ICT dissertation; Tina and Tim recount their past experience of ICT involving tapes and long playing records and Tazmin discusses her daughter's experience of using i-pads.

Extract 4.10 below occurs just over 2 minutes into Meeting 2, where the group continue to consider the practicalities of representing a 21st century Vision idea.

Extract 4.10 'What was it we are actually going to do?' (Meeting 2)

[02.22- 03.28]

1	TAL	...what was it that we are actually going to do
2	TESS	that's why I was (.............) not sure whether I was doing the right thing what was one of your questions Talisha for that and how do we erm integrate this in the curriculum in the different subjects so I thought this is what I thought we were supposed to do anyway I'm kind of not really sure (.)
3	TAL	yeah
4	TIM	the basic question is are we going with the 21st century vision with the immersive avatar type environment or are we coming back from that and doing something [less than that
5	TAL	[I understood It from this e-mail that Tess sent that's what we talk about the immersive environment in the classroom but then it was just like how do we show it that's what I'm kind of worried about more than anything cos we were saying about the holograms and things like that weren't we
6	TOM	I've got my if we want to pursue it I've got my animator friend on board and he'll be willing to do some images and some scoring er I think we need to put our own dialogue in (.)
7	TAL	yeah
8	TOM	to score it ourselves
9	TAL	right

Here the group question what they are doing. Talisha expresses some uncertainty of what the group were going to do; Tess expands on this point where she raises the issue of the curriculum and the different subjects (turn 2). Again there is uncertainty in Tess's comments: 'I thought this is what I thought we were supposed to do… I'm kind of not really sure'. Tim raises a question based on earlier discussion related to a 4D Vision then acts in asking an exploratory question designed to recap on what had been spoken about previously: '…are we going with the 21st century vision with the immersive avatar type environment or are we coming back from that'. Talisha (turn 5) seems not to want to dismiss this idea, but is concerned about how they can represent their ideas. Tom seems to offer some solution to the problem in referring to an animator (a friend) he knows who can help with producing images (turn 6).

This extract seems to be a point where the group question their Vision in relation to the practicalities of visually representing their ideas. This is resolved with a practical solution offered by Tom.

In the following five minutes the group have a general conversation about 4D technology which begins with Tim discussing the set. This quickly moves to a focus on the content of the Vision and Talisha recounts her experience of discussing 4D with her children. There are references to the StormBreaker film and the associated technology, as the group consider how 4D might be used with children

Extract 4.11 '4D Learning was definitely what we're doing' (Meeting 2)

[08.56- 09.46]

1	TAL	I think 4D learning was definitely what we're doing my worry was just we were thinking about ideas that were just too far-fetched
2	TINA	just bring it in and do the 4D there is enough information out there it will be for a decent presentation but it depends on how deep we want to go into it
3	TIM	I thought if you dressed the set we can do 100 years in the future and say in today's teaching methods=

| 4 | TESS | =that's what my e-mail was trying to |
| 5 | TOM | we do 4D learning in an immersive space 4D learning in virtual immersive space in both scenarios we need to address the things we need to address so might as well push the boat out |

Here is another example of the group having an element of doubt about what they are doing. The extract begins with Talisha (turn 1) expressing some doubt about the 4D Vision idea. Tina affirms that they are doing the right thing (turn 2). Tim offers some suggestion about the set (turn 3) which is not picked up on. Tom (turn 5) seems to resolve the concerns in reformulating the group's discussion and presenting a summary to the group 'we do 4D learning in an immersive space 4D learning in virtual immersive space...'.

Towards the end of Meeting 2 the group continue to address the practical considerations of how they might visually represent their Vision. They review the StormBreaker video clip they had previously seen and consider how they might do something similar in presenting their Vision.

Extract 4.12 'We can actually use something like that can't we?' (Meeting 2)
[16.26-17.26]

1	TIM	I'll just brainstorm what I thought we'd be asked I don't necessarily know the answers but that's something we can work =
2	TAZ	work on that
3	TAL	questions yeah you found that clip storm-breaker I absolutely loved that clip I thought wow that is just something
4	TOM	very good
5	TAL	so we can actually use something like that can't we
6	TOM	yeah
7	TAL	into how we'd actually have it
8	TOM	definitely we can take the idea and I can get some animation done or clips and we can put our own dialogue 2 mins of dialogue and pick 1 topic 1 example of a child learning in 1 environment that we choose
9	TAL	yeah
10	TOM	and we pick the right dialogue that really explains it and shows it
11	TIM	like the Star Trek next generation when we had the hologram

12	TOM	exactly (.)
13	TAL	[so we're doing
14	TIM	[so all we're doing is delivering a presentation like all the other groups but we just do in a more visualistic way
15	TOM	or just saying just saying how it would be delivered in a more interesting way in a 100 years we're just saying we=

The extract begins as Tim is considering possible questions the group could be asked as part of their final presentation assessment. The talk is then diverted by Talisha in relation to a video clip (turn 3) 'Stormbreaker', where she uses a tag question to make a suggestion to the group 'so we can actually use something like that can't we'. Talisha pursues this line of questioning in exploring how the clip might be included in the presentation and Tom develops the idea further (turn 8). Tim relates his past experience of Star-Trek Next Generation with the mention of holograms (turn 11) which is affirmed by Tom 'exactly' (turn 12). Talisha ' so we're doing' (turn 13) and Tim ' so all we're doing' (turn 14) begin to speak at the same time and Tim (turn 14) appears to take control of the talk in providing a reformulation of the discussion 'so all we're doing is delivering a presentation like all the other groups but we just do in a more visualistic way'. Tom echoes this with a slight change of 'or just saying how it would be delivered in a more interesting way....'

The group were very aware that they needed to justify their Vision idea through questioning that would take place at the end of their presentations as part of their assessment. Questions from tutors and peers were likely to focus on the teaching and learning element of the Vision. Within this section 'Digging the foundations' the group focussed on the development of the structure of the Vision in a consideration of the practicalities involved. The role of the teacher and the nature of learning in relation to skills, objectives for learning and differentiation to ensure learning were discussed (Extracts 4.7 & 4.8). There were concerns over being creative without losing sight of the learning (Extract 4.9) and how they might represent a 4D Vision (Extract 4.10). There were doubts about what is was they were going to do (Extracts 4.10 & 4.11) but this seems

to be resolved and Extract 4.12 addresses the practical element of how they might visually represent their 4D Vision as Tom offers some direction on animation.

4.4 Building the Vision

During Meeting 3 the group form their Vision statement, which is required to give an overview of what their Vision is about. They draw together their ideas in producing a statement that captures the 4D nature of their Vision.

The meeting begins with Tess reporting to the group about a '4D creative' website she has discovered. This seems to be an important point in the Vision ideas, especially in the promotion of creativity related to 4D learning.

Extract 4.13 ' It's called 4D creative' (Meeting 3)

[00.34- 01.40]

1	TESS	...it's called 4D creative and that's why I said e-mailed everyone and said guys check this out it's awesome the e-mail address is [...] have you got that the thing was what I'm supposed to be looking into is what is what do we mean by 4D so it was right about my definitions of 4D erm do you want me to go through what I've found now or does someone else
2	TOM	yeah
3	TAL	yeah
4	TAZ	my niece goes there
5	TESS	really
6	TAL	I've researched this on the website
7	TOM	what the 4D creative one
8	TAL	yeah
9	TOM	right
10	TESS	basically I just found that 4D really means 4 dimensional which I think we already knew already it's often used in shows em and so 3D everything is 3D where scenes or objects appear to pop out but then the principle of 4D is that you actually you feel a 4th dimension to it smell you feel your feet shaking and vibrating under your seat that's it touch sensory that kind of thing and looked at this website erm 4D creative

The extracts highlights the moment when Tess reveals her research regarding 4D learning, particularly in relation to the 4th dimension (turn 10). This is the first time that the idea of 4D involving the senses has been discussed. There is also evidence here to suggest that thoughts about the Vision and research done by individuals was shared by e-mail, as Tess mentions this (turn 1). Tom confirms this in his group evaluation:

The group communicated through group email and this was very effective.

Arguably, Extract 4.13 sets the scene for what happens approximately five minutes later when the concepts of 'Immersive' and 'multi-sensory' are discussed in the formulation of the Vision statement. The extract begins amid two conversations, where Tom and Tina are trying to remember a theorist, who was mentioned as part of the key note lectures and when Tom remembers Tina repeats the name (Carl Rogers) although this does not seem to be developed:

Extract 4.14 '4D immersive learning environment' (Meeting 3)

[07.25- 07.47]

1	TAL	so to educate children through immersive
2	TOM	Carl Rogers
3	TINA	Carl Rogers
4	TOM	yeah
5	TESS	think it might be too much
6	TAL	to educate children in a 4D immersive learning environment
7	TESS	oh my god
8	TAL	that's really a good statement isn't it
9	TESS	to educate children through a 4D
10	TAL	immersive learning environment yep the 4D aspect makes it hopefully unique
11	TINA	immersive tells you've everything and it's whole (.)
12	TAL	exactly
13	TESS	do we need to get multi-sensory in there
14	TINA	immersive is covered by multi-sensory
15	TAL	( ) immersive is multi-sensory

This extract outlines a pivotal moment when there was extensive echoing of phrases which were part of the final Vision statement. Talisha uses the term 'to educate children through immersive' (turn 1) which is commented on by Tess 'oh my god'. There is evidence of personal positive evaluation (turn 8) when Talisha comments on her previous statement. Hedging is used within this comment and the statement is repeated by Tess (turn 9) giving confirmation that the statement was taken up in the group discussion. Tess (turn 9) echoes the previous statement made by Talisha (turn 6) with a slight change of wording in the use of 'through'. Talisha (turn 10) repeats 'immersive learning environment' in completing the sentence started by Tess 'to educate children through a 4D'. Immersive is repeated throughout the exchanges on four occasions by Talisha and once by Tina (turn 11 and 14). 'Multi-sensory' is used by Tess (turn 13) in the form of an exploratory question 'do we need to get multi-sensory in there'. Her question is responded to by Tina (turn 14) and Talisha (turn 15) who repeat 'multi-sensory' in linking 'immersive' and 'multi-sensory'. Tazmin comments in her evaluation of the group:

We as a group had built our concept from 4D learning to a Virtual. Immersive Environment (VIE), which is a multisensory environment....

Later in Meeting 3 (Extract 4.15) Tess is trying to formulate the group's Vision statement from their discussion, where the theme of 4D is still part of the Vision, together with the term 'holistic' and 'development of the child'. Within this extract the four speakers are considering the terms 'holistic' and 'development of the child' in relation to how they might include them in their Vision statement:

Extract 4.15 'Holistic' (Meeting 3)

[26.35– 27.20]

1	TESS	I'm sort of getting there I don't know whether I've got everything to deliver a curriculum where children are educated and empowered through a personalised 4D multi-sensory immersive extraordinary environment where development of the holistic child blah blah blah I don't know
2	TOM	holistic development of the child yeah
3	TESS	the development of the holistic the holistic being the whole child life skills and all that
4	TINA	that's holistic paramount and (.)
5	TESS	yeah holistic I want to get in rich somewhere
6	TIM	the holistic development of the child the most important thing the erm the erm how did we describe it the interest based

Tess (turn 1) begins the extract by reading from her notes revisiting some of the ideas previously discussed as a group, where she is trying to formulate the Vision statement. She uses hedging to explore the Vision statement and we can see this with her use of 'I'm sort of getting there' and 'I don't know whether I've got everything'. She also includes 'bla bla bla I don't know'. This has the effect of generating discussion relating to the Vision statement particularly related to 'holistic'. She refers to 'development of the holisti child' and this is repeated throughout this extract beginning with Tom (turn 2) where he plays with holistic in changing Tess's 'development of the holistic child' to 'holistic development of the child'. Tess (turn 3) repeats her original words in an attempt to explain her thinking about 'holistic'. Tina then picks up on this (turn 4) provides some support of Tess's comments, 'that's holistic paramount and'. There is some affirmation c Tina's comments by Tess (turn 5). Tess expresses a wish to try to integrate 'rich' in the Vision statement and at this point Tim (turn 6) echoes Tom's statement in turn 2 giving support. The four members of the group within this extract were working closely togeth in building the Vision statement. The term 'holistic' and 'development of the child' were not included as part of the final Vision statement, although the group did explore how th might integrate them within their Vision idea.

4.5 Summary and conclusion of Chapter 4

'Drawing the plans' where ideas were introduced and discussed, began with the original proposal for an ICT Vision from Talisha (Extract 4.1). This original proposal was developed collaboratively with others and this appeared to happen without resistance and quickly becomes the property of the group, but is developed further over time. The first mention of a 4D Vision occurs approximately ten minutes into Meeting 1 (Extract 4.6) where all six members of the group contribute to a discussion related to 4D learning and the use of holograms.

At approximately twenty-seven minutes into Meeting 1 there was evidence that the group were engaging in the practicalities of producing their Vision and this was the start of 'Digging the foundations' . The practicalities of teaching and learning were discussed in relation to the role of the teacher, learning objectives and differentiation. Then approximately two minutes into Meeting 2 there seemed to be some doubt over what it was they were going to do, where the group members expressed uncertainty about their ideas and specifically about how they might present these ideas in their final presentation to others. This was resolved shortly after this when Tom offered (Extract 4.12) to get some animation clips done. Throughout 'digging the foundations' the group tried to provide a firm base for their Vision in relation to how teaching and learning would be facilitated and how they would visually represent a 4D Vision for the purposes of their presentation. The discussion was collaborative and the group considered weaknesses in their ideas collectively (Extract 4.7). Tom seems to offer the knowledge and contacts needed to facilitate the visual representation of the Vision idea.

Within Meeting 3 'building the Vision' was concerned with the actual building of the statement that informed the content of the Vision. Towards the beginning of Meeting 3 there were two extracts that represented pivotal moments. Extract 4.13 considered the promotion of creativity related to 4D learning and Extract 4.14 (7 minutes later) the group

75

considered the concept of an immersive learning environment and discussed the meaning of multi-sensory. These terms were included as part of the final Vision statement, which informed their philosophy of how they would deliver a 4D Vision for Education. Further talk in relation to the forming of a Vision statement occurred (12 minutes later) where the terms 'holistic' and 'development of the child' were discussed.

The whole process of developing ideas was highly collaborative. The Vision was a joint construction while one person may have initiated it, the Vision was developed in collaborative discussion by the group. In carrying out this collaborative activity the group was attentive to interpersonal relations in maintaining consensus. This seems to be consistent with the task of developing a group Vision on which they would need to agree. I have drawn on politeness theory, and particularly the concept of 'hedging', to discuss how the group displayed regard for others, opened up opportunities for others to contribute ideas and avoided direct challenges. References to common knowledge were also used within the extracts, particularly in relation to key note lectures that the group had attended as part of their Vision module. These references to the shared experiences of the group allowed points to be made quickly, as the group were able to recall their joint experience. Ideas were collaboratively developed between the three meetings and there were many examples of phrases, or words being repeated by more than one speaker, particularly in relation to ideas related to 4D immersive learning in building the Vision statement. It seems that repetition is used as a device here in allowing a speaker to 'set up a paradigm and slot in new information' as the group were building on each others contributions (Tannen 2007:58).

The Vision statement was a crucial part of that collaboration and during Meeting 3 they had reached a stage where the Vision statement had been very nearly formulated. Group dynamics were significant in the development of the group's Vision and I address this

issue further in Chapter 5 where I focus on the construction of discursive roles within the group to determine how the group managed the Vision task.

Chapter 5 The Construction of Discursive Roles

5.1 Introduction

This chapter relates to my second research question: To what extent and what ways are particular discursive roles constructed within the group?

In my consideration of the development of ideas over time, discussed in Chapter 4, it became apparent that group relations were important in the collaborative development of ideas and the joint construction of knowledge. It also became apparent in my analysis that there were differences between speakers in the ways they contributed to this collaborative discussion: speakers seemed to adopt different roles, although these were not fixed and varied within and between meetings. I noticed that each meeting was opened by a different speaker; Tess in Meeting 1, Tim in Meeting 2 and Tom in Meeting 3. There was evidence that Talisha often adopted strategies to co-ordinate discussion within the first meeting and I wondered what significance this had in relation to the group. I considered that an examination of discursive roles would offer an insight into how the team worked together in the completion of the task. This also had the potential to reveal how leadership skills were assumed in enabling a successful piece of work to be completed.

I decided to draw on Belbin's concept of team-roles (2010:22) in my analysis of the construction of roles. This was prominent in the leadership and management literature and the trainee teachers were also familiar with the work of Belbin. This had been presented as a positive team-role model within college sessions and it was therefore a possible influence on how the group organised their discussion. My analytical starting point was the extent to which the group adopted Belbin's team-roles (2010:22) and how such roles could be identified through their talk. This was of interest as the group participants were randomly assigned to the group within their degree programme and not as a result of any psychometric testing to test personality traits associated with team-roles, as in Belbin's

experimental work at Henley (2010:20); nor did the allocation of participants to groups involve the result of a Belbin self-perception survey inventory, which could potentially identify a person's tendency towards a particular role dependent on answers to a set of questions designed to reveal personality/ behavioural tendencies. My interest, which differed from Belbin's focus on behaviour, was in how roles discursively emerge and develop over a short period of time. Over long periods of time individuals learn how to negotiate roles in their knowledge of the behaviour of other people within their work environments (Belbin 2010:25) but for teams working together for a short period of time that knowledge is not necessarily available. Individuals may have a propensity towards certain roles, but by exploring how speakers engaged in discussion it was possible to see how roles emerge, or change in discussion, in this case in the development of the group's Vision. I wondered what the value of Belbin's system of roles was within this context and whether particular individuals take on particular roles, as in Belbin's work. I also wondered, given my earlier analysis of collaborative activity, whether the roles were shared within the group. In line with Mujis and Harris (2007), I define the term 'shared leadership' as a specific form of distributed leadership common to teachers 'teacher leadership' and involves the sharing of values and aims in a collective commitment to success (Muijs and Harris, 2007: 118-119). This form of distributed leadership is fluid and emergent rather than fixed (Gronn, 2000:324).

5.2 Beginnings and endings

During my examination of transcripts from the three meetings I became aware that the person opening each meeting was in Belbin's terms acting as a Co-ordinator. The talk at the beginning and towards the end of all three meetings was primarily concerned with the process of organising the Vision task, where communication involving e-mail; resources; the arrangement of future meetings, the allocation of work and the presentation were discussed. My first extract comes from the beginning of the first meeting of the group

80

within college, but I turn to a later point in the discussion in my second extract. Extract 5.1 starts a few seconds into the talk when Tess is referring to an e-mail address in her use of 'yours' in turn 1. Although there has been no formal allocation of roles Talisha appears to be taking responsibility for acting as Co-ordinator. A Co-ordinator according to Belbin (2010:22) is someone who clarifies goals, promotes decision-making, delegates well and is a good chairperson.

Extract 5.1 Beginning - Communication and Process (Meeting 1)

[00.00- 01.27]

1	TESS	yours is on this and=
2	TAL	= ( ) Tess I don't have yours have you changed your number
3	TESS	no it's the same
4	TAL	but like I said just in case
5	TINA	everybody's got the whole group
6	TAL	yeah
7	TESS	I'll write the numbers like just in case like you know something happens
8	TAL	yeah that's fine can I just very quickly erm if somebody does the minutes of this meeting say designate a person
9	TOM	yeah I'll do it
10	TAL	it's just our first meeting and I think we've got to keep a record of each week cos if you remember at the beginning shall we all we do have=
11	TOM	=we've got a shared area at the university
12	TAL	we've got the computer there get a stick in [and then we'll type as we go along
13	TOM	[hmm
14	TESS	where somebody has a (...)
15	TAL	yeah think it will just be easier=
16	TOM	=yeah okay it's a good idea
17	TAL	we can just e-mail each other off there anyway it's not a problem at all right (.) Vision
18	TESS	could be better to actually take off the notes to actually write them
19	TOM	we need to take notes
20	TAL	if we take turns one every week we'll pop that on to a stick and just type it up (.) easier right anybody got any (.) ideas I'll give you mine
21	TIM	=yeah I've got some ideas...

The first 01.27 minutes were used in sorting out the practicalities of keeping records for the college assessment file in ensuring that contact details were recorded (turn 8). There had

been some agreement on who was going to write the minutes and how they were going to be documented (turns 8-20).

Talisha's (turns 8 and 10) adoption of the role of Co-ordinator (Belbin 2010:22) within this first meeting was through acting as Chair and clarifiying what needed to be done. She also provided feedback in the judging of a proposal from Tess, 'Yeah that's fine' (turn 8) and ascertained agreement from Tom about typing the minutes (turn 16). The linguistic devices she used included the application of politeness incorporating the use of hedging . For example, she makes use of the modals of permission 'can I just very quickly' (turn 8) in changing the direction of the talk in order to discuss the minutes Biber et al. (2002:178) and also in turn 8 uses an indirect rather than direct request she uses: 'if somebody does the minutes of this meeting'. In turn 10 Talisha reminds the group of the requirements of each meeting. She is referring here to the first lecture attended by the trainees her use of 'if you remember at the beginning', which occurred before they were placed in groups where they were given input on the module including the requirement to keep records. Talisha follows (turn 10) with 'shall we all we do have' which has the effect of Tom (turn 11) making a comment: 'we've got a shared area at the university', which is not taken up by Talisha. Talisha makes use of a topical transition marker from the organisation of the minutes to the topic of Vision with her use of 'right (.) vision' (turn 17). Talisha speaks quietly here and either is not heard by Tess, or Tess (turn 18) is concerned with the organisation of the minutes. Tess uses hedging in her suggestion, regarding the notes from the meeting, that it 'could be better to actually take off the notes to actually write them' (turn 18). Tess here seems to be questioning Talisha but then is over-ruled. Talisha a few turns later changes her approach and uses hedging with the use of   'if we take turns' (turn 20) where there is an emphasis on the use of 'we' and on the group having a collective responsibility for the minutes. Talisha avoids any direct request for someone to do the task. There is a contrast

here between Tess's suggestion and Talisha's use of hedging in directing what needs to be done in a Co-ordinator like fashion.

Talisha's evaluation of how she contributed to roles within the group was:

I feel my roles were generally as co-ordinator, monitor evaluator and implementer.

Belbin's description of the Monitor Evaluator suggests a sober strategic approach, where all options are seen and accurate judgement is made (2010:22). The role of Implementer according to Belbin suggests a disciplined efficient approach in turning ideas into practical actions (2010:22). There was little in the interaction from a discursive analysis that suggested Talisha was adopting the roles of Monitor Evaluator or Implementer within this extract. Evidence in the example above demonstrates her acting fairly consistently as a Co-ordinator, but this does not account for the fact that people can assign themselves particular roles and shift between those roles. Others in the group, particularly Tim demonstrated stronger Monitor Evaluator tendencies, as he tended to be more evaluative in the group's reasoning in his exploration of ideas (see Extract 5.9). There was a slight difference in Talisha's perspective and my analysis of the discourse. This has possible implications for my overall analysis of roles, which raises the question of the gap between the participants' own perceptions of their playing a particular role and the examination of discursive features that define a role. In other words do participants set out to play a role, but then through their language seem to adopt a different role.

Approximately five and a half minutes before the end of Meeting 1 the group were considering when they could arrange to meet outside of the allocated class time.

Extract 5.2 'Whoever is in charge of the file' (towards the end of Meeting 1)

[50.30-51.46]

The discussion towards the end of the meeting is about looking after the group file, which is a requirement of the module assessment. Within this extract there is some agreement as to the person who will have responsibility for keeping the group file (Tom). We also see two speakers (Talisha and Tina) using strategies associated with a Co-ordinator role.

1	TOM	if we do it on this basis of 1 meeting a week needing a room (.) we shouldn't need to meet so often
2	TINA	we've got to have a focus
3	TAL	we've not got a lot of time to do this
4	TOM	think the key is action we need to set goals and set targets and go away and act out
5	TINA	whoever is in charge of the file make sure that the file is up to date and on top of everything=
6	TAL	= can I just really quickly say =
7	TINA	= so Tom can do the file he's got the minutes
8	TAL	Tom do you want to do the file we'll tweak it
9	TOM	I'll take it home
10	TINA	is that okay
11	TOM	yeah I'll take it home and bring it back each week

The extract begins with some discussion about the management of the Vision task (turns 1-4) as Tom, Tina and Talisha set out priorites for the task in a co-ordinator like fashion. There appears to be a dual co-ordination between Talisha and Tina (turns 5-10): She uses an imperative here ('make sure') but the target of this is left open ('whoever is in charge of the file..'). Talisha's attempts to take the conversational floor in introducing another point (turn 6) but this utterance is not completed and Tina continues her previous turn in allocating Tom the task of keeping the file up to date (turn 7). She uses the third person here: 'Tom' and 'he's' rather than asking Tom directly to take on the task. Talisha reframes Tina's statement as a question: 'Tom do you want to do the file' (turn 8) and

84

offers the group's help in this: 'we'll tweak it' (turn 8). Talisha is arguably mitigating the force of Tina's imperative by appearing to seek Tom's agreement to do the file this is a move by Talisha in retaining control in acting as Co-ordinator within the group (Belbin 2010:22). Tina in turn 10 echoes this question structure. Talisha in particular in turn 6 using 'can I just very quickly say' and Tina in turn 10 'is that okay' are both using politeness in carrying out the role of coordinator.

Tina's evaluation of how she thought the group worked at the beginning of the process was: ...*nobody seemed to take a lead role at the start of the process; the group's meetings were always unled.*

This evaluation appears to be inconsistent with Talisha's evaluation of the group:

Positive group dynamics and structures such as a rotating chair person and a different member to minute the meetings provided equal opportunities for all members to contribute, whilst not pressurising the group.

However, Tom's comments are consistent with Talisha's in:

We identified early in the process that a rotating chair-person and note-taker would help to maintain a focus on objectives, keep discussion relevant and record key targets.

It is likely that it was after the first few meetings that this was firmly decided, even though a different person opened each meeting, as there was no evidence to suggest that an explicit decision had been taken during those first three meetings.

Tim opened the second meeting (below) by checking that the camera was recording (turn 1).

Extract 5.3 'About the e-mails' beginning of (Meeting 2)

[00.00-1.05]

1	TIM	right are we recording I think this confusion with the e-mails what we need to do is have a quick discussion and [then what direction we go (.)
2	TAL	[shall I do minutes
3	TIM	we need to what we've got we've still an hour and a bit
4	TAL	let's really look at the time (......)
5	TIM	shall I start and go around the table maybe
6	TAL	yeah do that then
7	TIM	I brought some fabric (.) in there about a metre squared of that that sort of stuff star fish colours we've got a roll of that which we can use as a backdrop em these are mixed
8	TESS	textures
9	TIM	we've got an entire roll of that which we can use as backdrop but I think she'll want it back for work afterwards brought that in for today to see what you think (.) about the e-mails

This extract shows some jostling for co-ordination where Tim opens the meeting, but.

Talisha interrupts Tim's initial opening with: 'shall I do the minutes' and Tim's

continuation (turn 3) is responded to by Talisha (turn 4) with: 'let's really look at the time'

Note that Talisha is adopting politeness a politeness formulation in her the use of 'let's'

and this seems to be an attempt to maintain co-ordination of the group. Tim's use of 'shall

I start and go around the table maybe' (turn 5) is structured as a question although it is not

a request, arguably it is being used as a form of politeness. Talisha appears to treat it as a

request for permission in turn 6: 'yeah do that then' in an attempt to maintain her Co-

ordination role. There is also a shift in the topic back to the e-mails in turn 9 when Tim

moves from discussing the fabric to a short pause and then resumes his discussion related

to the e-mails. '... see what you think (.) about the e-mails'. These first few exchanges

were dominated by Tim and Talisha who were both attempting to maintain a role in co-

ordinating the discussion.

Extract 5.4 which occurs towards the end of Meeting 2 discusses the presentation of the Vision, where the group are working closely together in considering how it should be put together. Tom's demonstration of his ICT knowledge in relation to animation (turn 4) may be associated with Belbin's Specialist role (Belbin 2010:22)..

Extract 5.4 'A few weeks to spare' (towards the end of Meeting 2)

[16.33-17.50]

1	TAL	so we can actually use something like that can't we
2	TOM	yeah
3	TAL	into how we'd actually have it
4	TOM	definitely we can take the idea and I can get some animation done or clips and we can put in our own dialogue 2 minutes of dialogue and pick one topic one example of a child learning in one environment that we choose
5	TAL	yeah
6	TOM	and we pick the right dialogue that really explains it and shows it
7	TIM	like the next generation when we had the hologram
8	TOM	exactly (.) like that
9	TAL	[so we're doing
10	TIM	[so all we're doing is delivering a presentation like all the other groups but we just do in a more visualistic way
11	TOM	or just saying how it would be delivered in a more interesting way in a hundred years we're just saying we=
12	TIM	=if we can do all this with a few weeks to spare we can spend the last few weeks dressing the set
13	TOM	yeah
14	TIM	and getting the lines together
15	TAL	yeah you see that's what
16	TOM	shall we divide it up and we all take a section
17	TAL	yeah
18	TAZ	yeah that's fine
19	TIM	and get the areas of specialism that they'll be able to do best
20	TAL	let's think about what the sections are that we need to talk about first
21	TIM	yeah
22	TAL	obviously assessment yeah

Tom's own view on his role within his evaluation was:

I saw myself as an evaluator and co-ordinator; often allowing other more creative members of the group time to speak and work to their strengths...

Tom did not identify himself as a Specialist in relation to Belbin's team-roles: 'Single-minded, self-starting, dedicated. Provides knowledge and skills in rare supply' (Belbin 2010:22). Again, there is a difference in a participant's perception of their team-role and my analysis. Context is important in defining how participants choose to engage and although a team-role model may be useful for measuring a preference towards certain contributions in a team, the discursive nature of team-work affects the nature of participants' actual contributions (Aritzete et al. 2007:111). Team-roles may be shared and an individual participant may be playing more than one role within the discourse. Within this extract Tom, Tim and Talisha seem to be jointly co-ordinating what is needed and I argue that Tom is adopting two roles here. In turn 16 Tom uses negative politeness (shall we) in mitigating his request in the form of a question (Leech 2014:11), which is responded to by Talisha and Tazmin with 'yeah'. Talisha (turn 20) similarly in her use of 'let's think about the sections' attempts to reframe what needs to be done with her request in a move to take control of the conversation and resume co-ordination of the group. Tim (turn 10) appears to clarify what they are doing: 'so all we're doing is delivering a presentation like all the other groups but we just do in a more visualistic way'.

The role of Co-ordinator is seen at the beginning of the extract below, together with an example of Tina assuming the role of Teamworker and Tess acting as a Resource Investigator.

Extract 5.5 'Hang on let's start' (beginning of Meeting 3)

[00.00-01.16]

1	TESS	I think that's kind of going back in time [okay]
2	TOM	I do [I think] we're further down I think Tess's suggestion you won't have seen it
3	TAL	I haven't seen it either
4	TOM	hang on let's start who's been getting my e-mails did everybody get my e-mails
5	TESS	[yes
6	TAL	[yes
7	TAZ	[yes
8	TESS	brilliant yeah
9	TOM	did everyone get Tim's or Tess's
10	TIM	I've got Tess on facebook
11	TESS	honestly I sent
12	TINA	do you know what the website is and I'll log in
13	TESS	yeah I did it through face-book cos erm er cos they have a page you can like one of those things with face-book where you can like this page it's called 4D creative and that's why I said e-mailed everyone and said guys check this out it's awesome the e-mail address is [..............] have you got that the thing was what I'm supposed to be looking into is what is that do we mean by 4D so that was ( ) definitions of 4D in comparison to 3D and what this website 4D creative erm do you want me to to go through what I've found or does someone else
14	TOM	yeah
15	TAL	yeah

The extract appears to begin with pre-meeting chat related to concerns linked to an e-mail (turns 1-3). There is also a distinct start to the meeting in turn 3, where Tom acts in a Co-ordination role as he announces 'hang on let's start- who's been getting my e-mails did everybody get my e-mails'. Tina appears to act as Teamworker in averting any friction and calming the waters (Belbin 2010:22) in offering to find the website in turn 12 and this arguably focusses the group on the content of the website as Tess discusses what she has found out. Tess relates her findings in relation to a website called 4D creative and her account of this is consistent with Belbin's tole of Resource Investigator (Belbin 2010:22). Belbin describes this role as: 'Extrovert, enthusiastic, communicative. Explores opportunities. Develops contacts' (2010:23).

89

In the extract below there is additional evidence of the role of Resource Investigator, in this case adopted by Tom and later Tess as the group consider their ideas on 4D towards the end of Meeting 3. Tom has been doing some research and refers to Summerhill School which is a co-educational boarding school in Suffolk England founded by A.S. Neill in 1921. The school is based on democratic values in identifying the rights of the child and the group had been discussing a more creative form of learning, where students were allowed to select learning based on their personal interests and were considering this in relation to their 4D Vision.

Extract 5.6 'I've got in touch with the AV guys' (towards the end of Meeting 3)
[43.16- 44.58]

1	TINA	that gives an argument for still needing stuff and yeah this 4D curriculum is fantastic sometimes you just need hands on to play glockenspiel or to learn a recorder there's no 4D way of doing it
2	TOM	what about a holographic image ( ) a full orchestra 23 kids You know a brass section
3	TAL	we can add to that
4	TOM	the examples probably do exist they're just not there we need to use our imagination
5	TIM	that's why we need to (explain)
6	TOM	(need to) just quickly I er have got in touch with the AV guys but not had time to discuss at length so I've just concentrated more on the theory behind it I've looked at the Summerhill school and looked at this guy and I'd have no problem developing that and also I'd no problem trying to present a couple of minutes at the start as a rationale and theory
7	TAL	cos we'll need=
8	TOM	=and it was actually Sue who put us on to this me and Tim had a discussion with Sue and she thought it would link in really well I'd have no problem staying on that obviously you are welcome to come in and contribute and support on the day or whatever but just offering my (.)
9	TESS	can I just double check where people would be if this 4D creative team e-mail me back and say they have a 4D learning open day in a nearby city would everyone be up for going down

There are two shifts in the topic within this extract. One involves Tom (turn 6) where he changes the direction of the talk in reference to his contact with the 'AV guys' (some ICT

specialists) and his contribution to the presentation. Arguably this is an instance of co-ordination, particularly as Tom he opened the meeting. He also refers to some of the research he had done on Summerhill School and in this case also appears to be adopting the role of Resource Investigator in Belbin's terms. The other topic shift occurs in turn 9 when Tess is appears to be adopting a Co-ordinator role in organising the group meetings (also see Extract 5.2) where she is trying to organise a meeting 'can I just double check where people would be'. The 'can I just' is used to take the conversational floor, which is not dissimilar to a strategy adopted by Talisha in acting as a Co-ordinator in Extract 5.2. Tess's reference to her contact with the 4D creative team (turn 9, see also Extract 5.5 above) is also consistent with the role of Resource Investigator.

In relation to the beginning and ending of meetings the role that emerges prominently within the discourse is the Co-ordinator role, as the group were concerning themselves with the process of organising the Vision task, arranging meetings and allocating work in relation to the presentation. However, other roles overlapped with this.

5.3 The main discussion

I continued my examination of roles within the group in my consideration of the group's discussion of ideas in relation to their Vision task. The extracts below show examples of the assumption of roles during the main discussion, as the group put together ideas for their Vision.

Extract 5.7a 'Right' (Meeting 2)

[01.36-03.26]

1	TAL	yeah check that [ ]
2	TINA	[...].co.uk
3	TAL	no keeps saying failed
4	TESS	send it to the other one I've been sending it to
5	TINA	I'll give you an alternative then
6	TAL	right - what it was on that first Monday I was just thinking about things and I realised that we'd actually had no focus what so ever but we left on that Tuesday we all said yes 'we'll do this we'll do that' that's it nobody, no concrete ideas as to where we were going it was just for me to get where we were
7	TIM	right
8	TAL	we've got all week rather than wasting the week if everybody does get time we can look up on the internet things like that that's all what it was that we are actually going to do=
9	TESS	=that's why I was (....) not sure whether I was doing the right thing what was one of your questions for that and how do we erm show this in the curriculum in the different subjects so I thought this is what I thought we were supposed to be do anyway I'm not kind of, not really sure (.)
10	TAL	yeah
11	TIM	the basic question is are we going with the 21st century vision with the immersive avatar type environment or are we coming back from that and doing something [less than that
12	TAL	[I understood it from that e-mail that Tess sent that's what we talk about the immersive environment in the classroom but then it was just like how do we show it - that's what I'm kind of worried about more than anything -cos we were saying about the holograms and things like that weren't we
13	TOM	I've got my if we want- I've got my animator friend on board and he'll be willing to do some images and some scoring er I think we need to put our own dialogue in (.) to score it ours

In turn 6 Talisha uses a marked topic shift ('right') in taking the floor in a Co-ordinator

like move. Talisha then expresses concern about the Vision ideas (turn 6), which is

supported by Tess (turn 9). Arguably, Talisha is acting in a Monitor Evaluator role in

questioning the nature of the Vision. Tim makes a response to the concern expressed in

using an either/or question in turn 11: '...are we going with the 21st century vision with

the immersive avatar environment or are we coming back from that and doing something

[less than that]'. This move functions as a recapitulation of the group's main ideas in that shared discussion during the first meeting. It could be argued that this was a goal-directed move on Tim's part to ascertain an answer from the group, particularly as Tim opened the meeting and was acting in an informal role of Co-ordinator in trying to move the discussion forward, but the either/ or question appeared difficult to answer. This could also be viewed in an attempt to reach a decision quickly and therefore an example of the emergence of the role of Completer Finisher, which Belbin describes as 'painstaking, conscientious, anxious, searches out errors and omissions and delivers on time' (Belbin 2010:22). The question posed by Tim was responded to by Talisha in her reference to an email sent by Tess (turn 12) 'I understood it from that e-mail that Tess sent that's what we talk about the immersive environment in the classroom but then it was just like how do we show it that's what I'm kind of worried about more than anything cos we were saying about holograms and things like that weren't we' . Note that Talisha does not provide an answer to the question, but appears to continue with her concerns about the Vision and makes use of a tag question ('weren't we') as a means to explore the ideas further, where she checks that the group did intend to look at holograms in their Vision. This question is not taken up, as Tom takes the floor in offering some solution to how they might represent holograms/images within the Vision: 'I've got my if we want I've got my animator friend on board (turn 13). Tom's specialist knowledge was beginning to emerge in relation to animation, which appeared to address part of Belbin's definition of the role of Specialist as: 'Provides knowledge in short supply' (2010:23).

The extract below continues from the extract 5.7a above, where the group continue to consider various ideas to use within their presentation.

93

Extract 5.7b Dressing the set (Meeting 2)

[03.26- 04.48]

14	TAL	what do you mean scoring
15	TOM	to put some dialogue in and to play over the top of the images think he can make us some images moving, or still and we can put a child's play script or dialogue over the top of it
16	TAL	aww right
17	TOM	to demonstrate
18	TIM	yeah
19	TOM	visually the thing [that we want to demonstrate
20	TIM	[The way I imagined if we dressed the set as an underwater scene and if you want to make some costumes like mermaid costumes or something like mermaid ( ) whatever you think is appropriate the costumes ( ) I could do some sound effects bubbles and things like that water ( ) and basically that's our set we just present [then what's it about
21	TINA	[that's the set and then we need to find the content to put in there
22	TIM	yes
23	TAL	that's more like I was thinking
24	TESS	content and visual (.) [em
25	TIM	[Obviously we are not creating an immersive just simulate [environment
26	TOM	[so describe it with the kids learning
27	TAL	yeah that's it
28	TIM	yeah what the advantages are and what the disadvantages are and (.)
29	TOM	just going back to e-mail when I sent you an e-mail you said you'd spoke to your children about it
30	TAL	oh yeah it was just erm when we talked cos I was watching Attica with them

Extract 5.7b begins with a discussion about scoring (turns 14-19) where Tom (turn 15) further acts in the role of Specialist in demonstrating his knowledge of the terminology used in animation. Tim adds to Tom's comments about the set as he shares his views on how the set might appear for the Vision (turn 20). Arguably, Tim is exhibiting his creative tendencies and thinking about the visual element of the presentation and this can also be seen in Extract 5.3 in relation to his thoughts on fabric. Belbin describes the team-role of

Plant as: 'Creative, imaginative, unorthodox. Solves difficult problems' (2010:23) and there are elements of the creative and imaginative emerging in Tim's team-role, although during this extract this is cut short by Tina. The discussion is diverted as Tina re-focusses the direction of the talk from the planning of the set to discussing the content (turn 21). Tina overlapped Tim's talk, as she reminded the group about the importance of the content of the Vision '[That's the set and then]' and then continued with 'we need to find the content to put in there'. This appears to be Tina's attempt to prevent the conversation from focussing on the contents of the set at the expense of the content of the Vision in a Co-ordinator like move in maintaining a focus on the Vision ideas. There appeared to be some agreement in relation to this (Talisha- turn 23) 'That's more like I was thinking'.

The following extract (5.8) is an example where Tina is adopting Monitor Evaluator (Belbin 2010:22) tendencies in her intervention. It can also be seen during this extract that Tess is exhibiting a Co-ordination role in exploring the content of the Vision and Tim a Completer Finisher role in eliciting decisions regarding the nature of the Vision.

Extract 5.8 Virtual Vision? (Meeting 2)

[10.52- 11.42]

1	TESS	so is it still a vision for the future or are we pulling that back a bit do you know
2	TINA	I understand what you are saying
3	TIM	shall we have a show of hands who thinks it should be for our vision for 100 years time
4	TESS	sorry can you say that again as Tina's talking to me
5	TIM	vision for set in a 100 years' time when in a virtual world who's for that
6	TESS	I really don't know
7	TAL	I just know it's fine
8	TIM	I think it's got to be grounded in=
9	TINA	= let's talk about how it would get there and how it would progress to that point
10	TIM	[yeah
11	TAL	[yeah
12	TINA	I think we said all the basics are gonna be the same and all the work we're gonna put into it it's gonna be out there but we're gonna put the reasoning

```
                    and [the way it gets there]
13    TOM        [that's the key
14    TINA    and I think that [will make it
15    TIM                       [yeah
16    TINA    we haven't looked at that
```

Tess initiates an exploratory question in determining the essence of the Vision (turn 1) 'so is it still a vision for the future or are we pulling that back a bit do you know'. This is not the first occasion when Tess has acted in soliciting some consensus from the group in clarifying the situation, as this also occurred in relation to the organisation of meetings. The clarification of goals in particular and the promotion of decision-making are particularly associated with the role of the Co-ordinator (Belbin 2010:22). There is evidence here which suggests that Tim (turn 3) is keen to elicit a decision from the group in response to the question posed by Tess (turn 1). Tim's approach within this extract suggests that he has some attributes of Belbin's Completer Finisher role (Belbin 2010:22) where there is a propensity to seek out omissions and deliver on time in his use of questioning to elicit agreement. However, there are tentative responses from Tess (turn 6) 'I really don't know'and Talisha (turn 7) 'I just know it's fine' in her use of hedging, which encourages Tim's response (turn 8) 'I think it's got to be grounded in'. Tina acts in intervening to suggest (turn 9) with her use of 'let's' that they consider the progression of the Vision therefore re-focussing the direction of the talk. Tina's approach here invites the group to think about the progression of the Vision ideas, whereas Tim is eager to reach some agreement on the nature of the Vision. It could also be argued here that Tina is adopting Belbin's team-role of Monitor Evaluator (2010:22) in her wish to consider the Vision progression in her use of 'how' in: 'Let's talk about it how it would get there and how it would progress to that point' (turn 9). This is met with agreement from Tim (turn 10) and Talisha (turn 11) indicating that the group are working closely together to reach a consensus.

5.4 Building consensus

Following from my analysis in Chapter 4 Extract 4.1 we see the group working closely together to formulate their Vision statement, by building on the contributions of each other and coming to some consensus on what that statement should be. Littleton and Mercer (2013:21-22) suggest that Cumulative and Exploratory Talk are aimed at the reaching of consensus.

Extracts 5.9 and 5.10 below give examples of Tess explicitly seeking agreement from the group related to how children would be taught in their Vision.

Extract 5.9 below shows an example of exploratory talk being used as a result of Tess's question where there is an element of challenge in the presentation of the ideas. This is a notable extract as further discussion is generated as a result.

Extract 5.9 'Is this what we agree on?' (Meeting 1)

[32.36-33.30]

1	TESS	a piece of writing in this would be brilliant if done on a beach cos that's accessible for them- so we need take the environment if it's in a classroom an inaccessible environment like a rainforest- is this what we agree on
2	TIM	you could do it the other way round you could ask the children earlier where they've been what they've done then paint those environments
3	TOM	yes based on their interests
4	TAL	yeah
5	TINA	perhaps for those who have holidays through school time perhaps to being back facts about say the pyramids use a special holographic camera to record you need to go and film a pyramid and find out lots more information and then bring it back and then your task because you've been on holiday and you've missed part of your schooling and catching up on learning that they've missed is then to deliver to the rest of the children on how pyramids were built or what they did

Tess provides a summary of the discussion relating to writing and environment. She seeks agreement in her use of : 'so we need take the environment, if it's in a classroom an

inaccessible environment like a rainforest Is this what we agree on'(turn 1) in arguably a Co-ordinator like fashion. Tim offers an alternative possibility in his exploration of the idea (turn 2) and in viewing alternative options is exhibiting a Monitor Evaluator role (Belbin 2010:22). Within this extract we also see one example of the emergence of Tina (turn 5) in the role of a Specialist (Belbin 2010:22) who appears to be using her knowledge about school to offer possibilities, as she explores the idea of children bringing information back into to school from holidays. She slips into the role of a teacher with the use of 'you' in explaining the task as an example of how it would operate. Debate is generated within this short extract through the use of Tess's question, where Tim and Tina explore possibilities and there is evidence of an element of challenge to Tess's proposal by Tim (turn 2) creating exploratory talk in the discussion relating to the education of children within the Vision.

Extract 5.10 below shows other examples of 'so' being used at the beginning of exploratory questions to elicit agreement. Tim uses it three times within this extract in exploring the role of the teacher. This extract is also a rare example of all six of the group members taking part in the discussion. The reason for this may rest in the subject matter o the discussion, particularly as the group were trainee teachers and had recently been on teaching practice in their respective schools. Tazmin had made the least contribution to discussion within the group throughout the three meetings, but offered her thoughts to the group here which were taken up within the discussion.

Extract 5.10 'So what is the teacher's role?' (Meeting 1)

[25.17-26.47]

1	TIM	okay so can I ask you a question (directed at Tina) so what is the teacher's role
2	TINA	to give them opportunities and develop their knowledge
3	TIM	so does the teacher also set the theme=
4	TESS	=but it's child led
5	TIM	yeah, but obviously if it's totally child led they might just go off
6	TAL	we can
7	TINA	we can it's our vision if we wanted to do it's our vision
8	TOM	[I know what you mean child going off and doing his own thing
9	TIM	[..of education the learning yeah
10	TOM	and it's the job of the teacher to get it back on pushing them towards
11	TAZ	this is what we want from children to learn and explore
12	TIM	but during that exploration there's certain things that we want them to learn on the way and to learn to read and write
13	TINA	we have limitations, cos when we've done it there will be limitations the limitations perhaps [would be still some structure
14	TIM	[that's what I mean and a whole rounded curriculum to make the rounded child
15	TESS	the role of the teacher in like numeracy and literacy
16	TAL	doesn't have to be how it's taught in a lesson
17	TINA	could be the hidden curriculum numeracy and literacy maybe the part that's in it encompassing everything else
18	TIM	so children don't necessarily know they're being directed
19	TINA	yeah, that would be the limitation

Tim (turn 1) appears to be trying to co-ordinate (Belbin 2010:22) the group in eliciting some decision-making based on what the role of the teacher is within the group's Vision. However, there are also tendencies exhibited by Tim of the role of a Monitor Evaluator (Belbin 2010:22) where he sees the options in clarifying what the role actually entails (turn 18). There is some debate about this point in the Vision being 'child led' where Tess (turn 4) Talisha (turn 6) and Tina (turn 7) appear to misunderstand Tim's concern. Tom adopts the role of Teamworker (Belbin 2010:22) in attempting to avert any potential friction by acknowledging that he understood Tim's concern (turn 8). Further concern is expressed by Tim in his response to Talisha (turn 12): 'but during that exploration there's certain things

that we want them to learn on the way and to learn to read and write'. Tim's attempts at trying to reach some agreement on the role of the teacher generate a discussion about that role, where the group explore possibilities (turn 13 onwards). The extract provides an example of exploratory talk being used, where discussion is generated within the group in debating the issues of a child-led approach to learning.

The final example chosen in my discussion about the building of consensus again comes from Tim.

Extract 5.11 Set Vision or step Vision? (Meeting 1)

[11.48-12.12]   ]

| 1 | TIM | well how are we going to do a set vision at a set point in time or are we gonna have like a step vision saying well maybe in ten years' time we could be here and in fifty years' time we're expected to be here and have the progression or are we gonna just fix on one |
| 2 | TINA | step vision I like the idea of where it might go initially and where it would lead off it might branch off so in ten years we'll be here in fifty years we'll be here here here here or possibly here |

The significance of this extract is that it followed a pattern in the asking of exploratory questions in seeking agreement. Tim uses this question to explore the Vision in his use of 'how are we' (turn 1) and also with the use of 'are we'. Again Tim is showing tendencies of the Co-ordinator role (Belbin 2010:22) in attempting to promote decision-making within the group related to the content of the Vision. Tina (turn 2) is providing support for the idea of a step Vision in response to Tim's exploratory questions.

5.5 Role of humour

In addition to the roles which emerged within the discussion, there was evidence to suggest that humour was adopted in maintaining conviviality within the group, building solidarity and creating possibilities and I wanted to explore this further. Humour as a concept is difficult to define without considering its many applications which may include

maintaining relationships within the group and enabling creative thinking (Holmes 2007:533). The identification of humour in my examination of the three meeting transcripts was based on when the group members exhibited laughter in response to words or actions.. Humour appeared to be constructed by Tina, who was responsible for instigating humour visually through her use of mime. However, humour within the group was also collaboratively constructed through teasing (Extract 5.14) and social commentary (Extract 5.15). I therefore propose that there is an additional role to those of Belbin's team-roles in identifying humour as a means to maintain conviviality and build solidarity within a group.

Here is an example the first instance of humour being generated by Tina in her use of mime within that first meeting.

Extract 5.12 'Sheets and fish' (Meeting 1)

[12.50-13.21]

1   TAZ   =it doesn't have to be in the classroom we could go out somewhere
            exciting and just [explore explore
2   TINA   [if we go out for the delivery I really love the idea of 4D
            learning we really need to explore this week and come back with ideas to
            see if we can build on that but then if you think of the presentation in
            doing that we could do role play someone could be the hologram we
            could dress the hall underwater with sheets and fish (*joint laughter
            throughout the group, as Tina mimes the actions*)

The humour emerges from Tina's comments regarding the 4D learning idea, as we can see in turn 2 with the use of positive evaluation: 'I really love the idea of 4D learning' and 'we really need to explore this week and come back with ideas'. Tina generates laughter among the group in her use of: 'we could dress the hall underwater with sheets and fish', where her enthusiastic waving of arms mimics the actions of the fish. Arguably, humour is used here in the consideration of creative possibilities, which we can see through her use

101

of '...we could do role play someone could be the hologram we could dress the hall underwater with sheets and fish'.

Within this second extract in relation to humour it can be seen that a pattern is emerging in relation to Tina, who appears to be adopting a role within the group in generating humour.

Extract 5.13 'Sometimes it just starts to rain' (Meeting 1)

[14.48-15.46]

1	TESS	I just think in a presentation I always remember like being told it' s really good if you can to involve the audience like audience participation so at some point you know like (.) do you remember, I know this is different but do you know that in my maths presentation the way M and I got you up to =
2	TOM	=yeah
3	TESS	just something like that you know D said give the audience stuff to do
4	TOM	yeah yeah yeah
5	TINA	thinking forward our thinking of senses if you've you were to do like a tropical rain-forest you've got the rain-forest you've got the sound going in the background somebody being the projecting team and sometimes it just starts to rain and someone with a water gun (*joint laughter as Tina mimes throwing water over the audience*) will you get that
6	TESS	that's awesome I love that
7	TINA	then we [could actually bring
8	TIM	[everyone will hate us if we do that just soak them
9	TAL	no they won't

Laughter was more prominent in the first meeting. The majority of laughter within the firs meeting was generated by Tina, who often mimed actions to explore possibilities. During the first example in Extract 5.11 she waves her arms about like a fish and in the second example here, Extract 5.12 she mimes throwing water over the audience. Both examples are related to a discussion about 4D learning. Note Tim's resistance to this idea (turn 8) He appeared to take this seriously, although Tess (turn 6) and Talisha (turn 9) are playing along with the humour. Tim arguably is acting in a Monitor Evaluator role of exhibiting a

'Sober, strategic...' approach (Belbin 2010:22). The laughter again is generated by Tina's enthusiasm and miming of the actions.

The example below demonstrates humour used by Tina in a different way to the previous two extracts.

Extract 5.14 'Is there anybody you don't know' (Meeting1)

[51.53-52.18]

1	TESS	does anyone actually do this like ICT does anyone actually do this, like ICT
2	TOM	I know someone who writes computer software
3	TINA	is there anybody you don't know (*joint muffled laughter*)
4	TESS	okay just erm (.)
5	TOM	sorry there's a possibility I don't want to they're busy people that's the thing he's a good friend and he'll do something that took an hour but it's when you're asking people to spend more

Tina in Extract 5.13 above (turn 3) 'is there anybody you don't know', uses humour in a subversive way in the form of a sarcastic quip directed at Tom possibly in an attempt to undermine him (Holmes and Marra 2002:72). There is muffled laughter among the group and Tom's response suggests that he is aware that he may be beginning to annoy others, due to his tendency to suggest that he knows someone when there is a mention of computer software and this can be seen by his use of 'sorry there's a possibility' (turn 5). This instance appears to demonstrate how humour is used in bringing a member of the group in line who may be becoming annoying to others. There were no other instances of this within the first three meetings.

Extract 5.15 below shows a slightly different example of humour being used within the group and is instigated by Tim.

Extract 5.15 A tease (Meeting 2)

[15.06-15.25]   ]

1	TIM	are you alright is your head hurting
2	TINA	I'm just a bit tired *(Tess rubs Tina's arm with a grin on her face)*
3	TESS	jet lag *(Tina smiles and some muffled laughter)*
4	TIM	the wages of sin *(some muffled laughter)* we won't go any further with the camera on okay
5	TOM	this is really good Tim with this we can pre-empt most questions

Tim expresses concern about Tina (turn 1). Tess appears to generate some muffled laughter from members of the group with her use of 'jet lag' (turn 3) as she rubs Tina's arm with a grin on her face, which implies that it is not jet lag and Tina smiles. There is also some brief muffled laughter from the other members of the group, as Tim makes a quip directed at Tina (turn 3) in implying that Tina has been drinking and he was aware that the camera was recording the meeting. Tina appeared unconcerned and pre-occupied in reading Terry's outline which she had found on an e-mail and the humour is lost, as there is no uptake by Tina on the comment. Tom acts as in the role of Teamworker (Belbin 2010:22) in diplomatically re-focusing the discussion on the e-mail Tim sent to the group (turn 4) with a positive evaluation of Tim's efforts: 'this is really good Tim'. This is an example of collaborative humour as Tim and Tess engage in teasing Tina.

Extract 5.16 below shows an example of humour used in a similar way at the expense of others:

Extract 5.16 Social commentary (Meeting 3)

[30.52-31.40]

1	TIM	were kids getting good results were they
2	TOM	I don't know
3	TINA	it's well they come from affluent backgrounds cos it's private boarding school so the thing is if you want your child to go there it's £12000 a year you've got to earn in excess and some to give your child more (.)
4	TAL	so you're making your child go
5	TINA	well no I think the child needs to want to go I'll show you the video the child has to want to go but they're not coming from free school meal backgrounds so the children achieve cos they're gonna achieve cos they've got really good and it's a secondary school so they've got a really good
6	TAL	aw right
7	TINA	input (.) I've got let me just see (*Tina was trying to find the video*)
8	TIM	you could almost argue that it doesn't matter that they don't achieve cos they're all from wealthy backgrounds (*joint laughter*)
9	TOM	they're all go on to be (…) types and business managers you know artists and
10	TINA	you know they do
11	TOM	and that kind of thing

In Meeting 3 Tim (turn 8) creates joint laughter in making a social commentary on children from wealthy backgrounds creating solidarity in the group's discussion about Summerhill School: 'you could almost argue that it doesn't matter that they don't achieve cos they're all from wealthy backgrounds'. Note the use of 'you' here in making the statement impersonal. There appears to be some agreement on this point as Tom makes a comment along the same lines (turn 9) ' they'll all go on to be (…) types and business managers you know artists and' . This is responded to by Tina with 'you know they do' (turn 10). Tim Tina and Tom appear to agree on this point.

The use of mime in generating humour within a group working towards a task was perhaps slightly unusual. A possible reason why this occurred was due to the content of the proposed Vision, which involved 4D images. Initially, I considered use of The Joker to give a label to the creation of an additional Belbin role in the recognition of the importance

of maintaining conviviality within a group. However, this was not the sole use of humour within the group and there was a collaborative construction of humour among the group as shown in the extracts above.

5.6 The application of Belbin team-roles

In seeking to apply Belbin's team roles to group discussion, the team-role that was the easiest to identify was that of the Coordinator, particularly as this was a leadership role. The features of this role, as identified in the discourse involved a consideration of the following:

Requirements (of the Vision task – references to documentation) Extract 5.2

Clarification (of what needs to be done- particularly in the beginning and towards the end of meetings) Extracts 5.1/ 5.3 /5.6a

Focus (on the Vision task) Extracts 5.4/ 5.5/ 5.6a/ 5.6b/

Consensus (on the ideas to inform the Vision task) Extracts 5.7/ 5.8/ 5.9/ 5.10

Belbin's description of the Co-ordinator is 'Mature, confident, a good chairperson. Clarifies goals, promotes decision-making delegates well' (2010:22). The clarification of goals was particularly prominent at the beginning and towards the end of meetings, where the group were setting out what needed to be done. It also occurred when the group were expressing uncertainty about their Vision ideas as in Extract 5.7a. The promotion of decision-making in reaching a consensus on the Vision ideas appeared either in the form o an exploratory question (Extract 5.7a) or as a direct request (Extract 5.8). Some examples of the specific language features identified within this role appear below:

Politeness in maintaining control of the discussion 'can I just' (Extracts 5.1/5.6)

Avoidance of direct requests 'if somebody does the minutes' (Extract 5.1)

Reformulations disguised as questions 'Tom do you want to do the minutes' (Extract 5.2)

Marked topic shift 'Right' (Extract 5.6a)

106

Encouraging further discussion and maintaining focus 'let's think about it' 'that's the set and then we need to find the content to put in there' (Extracts 5.4/5.6b)

Providing feedback 'yeah that's fine' (Extract 5.1)

Use of exploratory questions in seeking consensus 'so what is the role of the teacher' (Extracts 5.7/ 5.9)

In comparison the phrases and slogans identified by Belbin as projecting the team-role of Co-ordinator are:

Let's keep the main objective in sight

Has anyone else got anything to add to this?

We like to reach a consensus before we move forward.

Never assume that silence means approval.

I think we should give someone else a chance.

Good delegation is an art.

Management is the art of getting other people to do all the work.

(Belbin 2010:89).

The underlying principles of some of the phrases/slogans above were present within the discourse studied, namely keeping the objective in sight (5) and the reaching of consensus on ideas before moving forward (7). Belbin's phrases/slogans above appear indicative of what might take place within a business meeting where there are defined roles. However, these phrases/slogans look like idealised statements rather than what might be said in natural discourse. My study involves the emergence of the Co-ordinator role within an educational context, where roles were not allocated or defined at the outset.

My findings suggest that the role of the Co-ordinator was not settled and most members of the group, with the exception of Tazmin, appeared to assume the role at some stage. Each meeting was opened by a different member of the group (Meeting 1 Talisha, Meeting 2

Tim and Meeting 3 Tom) and the person opening the meeting also appeared to be attempting to co-ordinate the group. There was the occasional tussle over the role, for example in Extract 5.2 where Tina and Talisha are both attempting to co-ordinate the process of writing the minutes. Although, there is evidence to suggest that Talisha appeared to assume a Co-ordinator role throughout the three meetings and adopted a polite form of language in avoiding direct requests (2 above). Tess appeared to be the member of the group during the beginning and towards the end of meetings who had taken responsibility for the organisation of meetings Extract 5.2 and who also appeared to promote decision-making through the posing of questions in 5.8 -5.9, which suggests that she adopted the Co-ordinator role during these occasions. It appears that the group were operating a shared leadership of the process of the Vision task, typical of a form of distributed leadership associated with teachers, where there is a collective commitment (Muijs and Harris, 2007, 118-119); although there was no apparent overt evidence of the group making the decision to act in this way within the first three meetings. They did communicate via e-mail between meetings and this may have been a factor in how they chose to organise themselves. However, Tom in his evaluation makes the comment:

...we did not have a leader- important decisions were made by a 'majority view' ...

Tim also agrees with the fact that the group worked democratically:

...we operated largely democratically, with important decisions being taken by concensus or, it necessary, majority vote.

Talisha's group evaluation made a comment on the team-roles, which suggested that the roles were not fixed:

...I feel team members took on several of these roles at different times. I feel my roles were generally as Coordinator, Monitor Evaluator and Implementer.

Tazmin comments that:

We shared our roles fairly and appreciated and respected individual's ideas. I found Talisha as a strong and an expert leader who was structured and directed us to do the tasks.

These comments from Tazmin appear to be contradictory in her reference to Talisha as a leader while also suggesting that roles were shared. However, they do confirm Talisha's frequent assumption of the co-ordinator role (a role also occasionally claimed by Tom).

It appears from Tom's evaluation that the group did decide on the allocation of functional roles after the focus of the Vision had been decided:

After an initial bout of creative energy where all contributed their creative visions and decided exactly what the focus would be, we agreed that we should divide roles. We assigned 'functional roles' which Belbin (1996:24) describes as what each individual would actually do, according to our individual strength.

This did not occur in the meetings I analysed and it is not clear when this was decided. It has to be considered that the evaluation was written at the end of the Vision task and this was a view of the entire process. Belbin (2010:24) defines a functional role as 'job demands that a person has been engaged to meet by supplying the requisite skills and operational knowledge' (see Chapter 2: 2.5.2).

Another role that emerged during the meetings was that of the Monitor Evaluator where both Tim and Tina and to a lesser extent Talisha, exhibited tendencies of being 'sober', 'strategic' and 'discerning'where 'options' were considered (Belbin 2010:22). For example, Tim's role in the first meeting suggested that he acted in critically evaluating the group's ideas in relation to the role of the teacher (Extract 5.10). Tina also exhibited Monitor Evaluator tendencies in her consideration of the progression of the Vision ideas (Extract 5.8) where she used the strategy of encouraging the group to review the progress

of their Vision ideas in 'let's talk about how it would get there and how it would progress to that point'.

There were elements of the role of Completer Finisher (Belbin 2010:22) which emerged through Tim's use of an exploratory question (Extract 5.7a) 'the basic question is are we going with the 21st century Vision with the immersive avatar environment of are we coming back from that and doing something less than that', in an attempt to elicit agreement from the group. It could be argued that seeking agreement is a characteristic of the role of Co-ordinator, but in this case Tim appeared to be also exhibiting a desire to make decisions quickly, which was not achieved as the discussion continued. Belbin identifies the characteristics of the Completer Finisher as 'painstaking, conscientious, anxious, searches out errors and omissions and delivers on time' (Belbin 2010:22). This particular example demonstrates the difficulty in the identification of team-roles through discourse, as it examines language as it emerges in context, rather than language used as a result of a pre-determined role.

There was also evidence towards the end of Meeting 3 that Tom had adopted the role of Specialist (Belbin 2010:22) in relation to ICT. Tina also appeared to be acting as a Specialist in her discussion of child-learning, but does not acknowledge any self-identification with team-roles in her evaluation. Tim and Tom both identify themselves with the role of Monitor Evaluator within their evaluations of the Vision process. Tim felt that his role was:

50% Completer Finisher

40% Monitor Evaluator

10% Specialist

Tom's evaluation revealed that:

I saw myself as an Evaluator and Coordinator.

Interestingly, Tim did not recognise himself in the Co-ordinator role and Tom did not identify himself as a Specialist. This is a further demonstration of the gap between perceptions of enacting a role and actually interacting within a group where the complexities of peer collaboration can alter the dynamics of team-roles.

Tazmin was the only member of the group who identified with the role of Teamworker:

My role within the team was as a team worker....

However, there was evidence in the transcripts of specific occasions when Tom (Extract 5.9) and Tina (Extract 5.5) acted in either providing support (Tom) or averting friction (Tina) during the discourse in a Teamworker-like fashion.

I considered the use of humour in maintaining conviviality within the group. There appeared to be a sense of fun in that first meeting, particularly in the use of mime by Tina, which was prominent in the generation of laughter and in acting as encouragement to other members of the group to express their ideas and explore possibilities for their Vision. Tina was responsible for the mime aspect of the humour, but was was not alone in instigating other instances of humour among the group. Subversive humour was also used, especially in the form of quips. Holmes and Marra (2002:72) suggest that there is more of a dominance of quips of short witty and often ironic comments in business meetings, than in talk among friends. In the case of my data the group knew each other as fellow students, but were not necessarily friends. Arguably, humour is creative and Belbin's team-role of the Plant, who Belbin describes as: 'Creative, imaginative, unorthodox. Solves difficult problems' (Belbin 2010:22) perhaps is the team-role that comes closest to the identification of creativity. Humour also serves to perform a function that goes beyond creativity in maintaining conviviality within a team.

5.7 Summary and conclusion of Chapter 5

Belbin's team-roles may have some value in offering some indication of an individual's preferred style of working. However, through the analysis of discourse these roles are often not as clearly demarcated as might be expected; are often shared, as in the Co-ordinator role and individuals may also adopt more than one role at the same time. There was also often a gap between participants' perceptions of enacting a role in individual written evaluations and the actual roles adopted within group discussion. The role of Co-ordinator as a leadership role was the easiest to identify and in my analysis negative politeness (Leech 2014) seemed to be a feature of leadership within the group, where individuals were careful to mitigate requests. Arguably, this is a form of relationship work, which enables the group to work collaboratively (see also Chapter 4). Humour also had an important part to play in helping to maintain a convivial atmosphere among the group. However, humour was also equally important in developing the group as a team in its collaborative construction (5.14, 5.15) and for this reason performed a function which I argue should be classified as an additional role within team-work. Belbin's team-role framework does not account adequately for the range of positions participants may adopt. I have drawn importance to participants' use of humour which is not accounted for in Belbin's framework (Belbin 2010:22) as there is no role of 'humorist'. Arguably, in my group, there should be such a role and I therefore propose that the role of The Humorist is added to Belbin's team-roles, which goes beyond the role of the Teamworker, in reflecting the importance of the social aspect of working as a team (Belbin 2010:22).

The next chapter examines how the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group.

Chapter 6 Construing the group

6.1 Introduction

Within this chapter I consider evidence in relation to my third research question where I examined: How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group?

This builds on my analysis within Chapter 5, where I examined the team-roles that were beginning to emerge within the group case-study. I drew on Belbin's work (1993; 2010) on team-roles in my consideration of how the group constructed roles discursively in the process of building the task. I was particularly interested in how leadership roles were adopted and how other team members contributed to the task and this gave me an indication of how the group worked together. However, my analysis of roles did not totally reveal how the group identified or construed themselves as a group and I was curious to examine how they demonstrated this through their use of discourse.

In relation to how the group discursively construed themselves as a group I initially began my analysis of the group meeting transcripts after my reading of the literature associated with the use of first person plural forms (henceforth '1stPP') particularly the pronoun 'we'. 'We' has been linked to expressions of group membership (Scheibmann 2002:382) and the absence of such words linked to low cohesion in a team (Adair 2009:20). This was further motivated by my reading SFL literature on personal reference (Halliday and Hasan 1976) and work in discourse analysis, which aligned the use of 1stPP to the concept of ingroupness or outgroupness. These were important factors in inspiring me to explore particularly how the 1stPP were used in ingroupness: 'Both 'we' and 'they' can be skillfully managed in discourse in order to construct, redistribute or change the social values of ingroupness and outgroupness' (Duszak 2002:6). I wondered how the group made use of 1stPP and whether this was one of the factors that contributed to how they construed themselves as a group. I started manually counting instances of 1stPP within the

transcripts and represented these per thousand words (Mayor 2006:110) so I could make comparisons between meetings. While this initial approach afforded me the opportunity to explore particular features that were prevalent in the transcripts, a quantitative approach to isolate features did not allow me to explore stretches of talk, or to track the impact of certain features. Therefore I considered my observations of interaction during the process of the Vision task and I noticed that there were instances when the group co-ordinated actions needed for their Vision task, used common shared experiences to build their ideas and engaged jointly in agreeing the principles of their Vision. I wondered how they used 1stPP throughout these instances and I decided to explore these aspects further in a qualitative analysis of the transcripts from the three meetings in how they discursively construed themselves as a group during the process of building their Vision concept. As they were trainee teachers the extent to which they demonstrated talk typical of teachers was another factor that was worthy of attention in how the group discursively aligned themselves.

6.2 The pilot study and the use of 1stPP

The initial data examined in my pilot study shown in Table 6.1 and Table 6.2 was based on ten minutes of talk obtained from recordings taken during the first meeting of each group which occurred within college (some groups chose to hold later meetings outside college). Each recording did not start at beginning of each meeting with the exception of Titanium group (my case-study group). Therefore, the ten minutes in relation to the other five groups represented a snap-shot of the talk during the first thirty minutes of talk in the initial first meeting. The reason for selecting the first meeting was to examine the groups' initial interaction, as I wondered about the importance of that first meeting in determining how groups organised themselves in relation to the Vision task. In my discussion of the use of 1stPP, I refer to my pilot study mentioned in Chapter 3 (Phase 1 of my study) which involved six groups (see Table 6.1). My analysis was based on how the groups used 'we'

'us' 'our' 'ours' and 'ourselves' in their talk. 1stPP can vary according to context (Biber et al. 2002:94) and I was interested in the use of 1stPP in the context of the group, where ideas for their Vision were discussed. Research conducted by Scheibman (2002:383) identified coding categories of inclusivity and exclusivity specifically relating to the use of 'we'. These included: inclusive plural (in relation to a group) exclusive dual (self and one other) or exclusive plural (referring to self plus people outside the group). My analysis included the use of 'we' which referred to members of the group collectively, in other words Scheibmann's concept of 'inclusive plural' (Scheibman 2002:383). For further details of these coding categories see Chapter 2.

Within my analysis of my pilot study I noticed that there was a difference in the use of 1st PP between groups (Table 6.1). The first four groups on the table, who were the higher scoring, appeared to be relatively high users of the 1stPP. Whereas, the last two groups, who were the lowest scoring, were low users. Nickel and Copper groups also used fewer words overall than the other four groups. A possible explanation may be that the extracts of talk for these two groups were taken from later in that first meeting. Nickel group also had one member who had been withdrawn from the group presentation element and so was not present during my recording.

Table 6.1 Differences between groups in use of the 1stPP

Group	Grade	Total words (from 10 min recordings)	Total 1stPP	1stPP per 1000 words (to nearest whole number)
Titanium	72%	1615	27	17
Aluminium 72%	72%	1651	41	25
Nickel	65%	834	15	18
Copper	62%	808	20	25
Zinc	58%	1674	4	2
Lead	55%	1755	2	1

There was a clear difference in the groups that had achieved final presentation marks between 50-59% and those that had achieved marks above 60% (Table 6.1) shown in 1stPP

per 1000 words. I wondered how 1stPP use was distributed between group participants

(Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 Differences between participants in use of the 1stPP

Group/Participants	Total words (from 10 minute recordings)	Total 1st PP	1stPP per 1000 words (to nearest whole number)
Titanium (72%)	1615	27	17
Tina	482	1	2
Talisha	448	15	33
Tess	232	3	13
Tom	222	2	22
Tim	155	1	13
Tazmin	76	1	13
Aluminium (72%)	1651	41	25
Alan	421	23	54
Amy	402	7	15
Adam	285	2	7
Adele	272	6	22
Ann	240	2	8
Angus	31	1	32
Nickel (65%)	834	17	18
Narif	375	6	16
Norma	228	0	0
Noreen	185	4	21
Nicola	41	6	97
Naila	5	1	200
Copper (62%)	808	20	25
Cora	202	7	34
Cindy	188	0	0
Carol	181	5	27
Cala	162	5	37
Chandi	40	2	50
Chloe	35	1	28
Zinc (58%)	1674	4	2
Zara	931	1	1
Zoe	207	2	9
Zach	189	0	0
Zen	176	0	0
Zia	147	0	0
Zelda	24	1	41
Lead (55%)	1755	2	1
Leanne	706	0	0
Leah	439	2	2
Lois	364	0	0
Lubna	152	0	0
Lakshmi	90	0	0
Laila	0	0	0

I found that Titanium group who scored 72%, had one speaker who was responsible for the majority of 1stPP utterances within the short extract of talk and this did not correspond with the person who spoke the most. For example, Tina spoke the most (482 words) and used 1stPP once (approximately 2 per 1000 words). Talisha (448 words) used 1stPP fifteen times (33 uses per 1000 words). Tazmin in comparison, who spoke the least words (76 words) used 1stPP once like Tina. Alan in Aluminium group (421 words) used 1stPP more than other members of the group (54 per 1000) and spoke a similar amount of words to Amy (402 words) who used 1stPP seven times (15 per 1000). Interestingly, the speakers in the two groups who used 1stPP the most also appeared to open that first meeting and arguably in doing so assumed some co-ordination of the group.

Nickel group (834 total words) and Copper group (808 total words) had more of a distribution of 1stPP usage with no clear connection between the amount of words spoken and the instances of 1stPP used. However, there were speakers in Zinc and Lead groups who clearly spoke the most words and these two groups used the least amount of 1stPP forms in their talk. A possible explanation for this may be that these speakers dominated the discussion and there was less collaboration within the group.

Although these observations were inconclusive, due to the need for further evidence in longer extracts of talk, this was one of the reasons that motivated me to explore how groups used 1stPP in discursively construing themselves as a group, as a quantitative analysis alone served to identify surface forms, but not how they functioned in the interaction. For this purpose I needed data collected over time. I consequently decided to focus on the three consecutive recordings over the first three weeks of my case-study group's discussions within college.

6.3 The case-study group – use of 1stPP

Table 6.3 below represents the occurrence of the use of 1stPP ('we', 'us' and 'our' 'ours' 'ourselves') across the three meetings. There is no distinctive difference in the use of 1stPP per thousand words within Meeting 1 and 3. However, Meeting 2 is the shortest meeting and therefore has the least amount of words spoken, but overall has the highest incidence of 1stPP per thousand words spoken. It appears likely that the use of 1stPP cluster at certain points in the interaction and this is examined further in my qualitative analysis.

Table 6.3 Titanium group use of the 1stPP across three meetings

Meeting (duration)	Total words	Total 1st PP	1stPP per 1000 words (to nearest whole number)
Meeting 1 (55 mins)	8895	240	27
Meeting 2 (19 mins)	2948	122	41
Meeting 3 (46 mins)	6269	138	22
Total 2 hours	18112	500	28

Table 6.4 below represents the use of 1stPP in relation to the different participants across the three meetings. Talisha (4091 words) uses the most 1stPP across the three meetings, but speaks less than Tina (4844 words). However, what is interesting is that in Meeting 2, Tim and Tom both use more 1stPP than Talisha. I wondered whether there was a connection with 1stPP usage and the opening of each meeting and discovered that there was in relation to the first two meetings but not the third. What is notable is that Tina was not engaged in the opening of the first three meetings, but used 1stPP overall more than Tim and Tom who had. This is an interesting reflection of gender, which I had no time to explore in the context of this study.

Table 6.4 Titanium group use of the 1stPP by different participants

Participant/meeting	Total words	Total 1st PP	1stPP per 1000 words (to nearest whole number)
Tina all meetings	4844	107	22
Meeting 1	2474	62	25
Meeting 2	336	12	35
Meeting 3	2034	33	16
Talisha all meetings	4091	164	40
Meeting 1	1790	71	40
Meeting 2	1133	43	38
Meeting 3	1168	50	43
Tim all meetings	3129	85	27
Meeting 1	1566	36	23
Meeting 2	676	35	52
Meeting 3	887	14	16
Tom all meetings	2928	89	30
Meeting 1	1247	29	23
Meeting2	499	25	50
Meeting 3	1182	35	30
Tess all meetings	2442	48	20
Meeting 1	1500	23	15
Meeting 2	276	7	25
Meeting 3	666	18	27
Tazmin all meetings	678	6	9
Meeting 1	318	2	6
Meeting 2	28	0	0
Meeting 3	332	4	12

In relation to leadership of the group there were occasions when there was also evidence that Tina appeared to be co-ordinating the group and there was a shared co-ordination at other times involving Talisha, Tim, Tom and Tess. Further analysis was necessary in order to discover how 1stPP was used by speakers to discursively construe the group, particularly as quantitative data alone shows how 1stPP is distributed but it does not show how it is used within the discourse.

Within my analysis of the transcripts the use of 1stPP clustered at certain points during the meetings, in particular when the group were involved in discussing the management of the

process and the content of the Vision task, in reaching agreement and when discussing common shared experiences. I discuss these points in greater depth in the following sections.

6.4. Co-ordination of the task

The use of 1stPP was prominent when the group were organising the management of the process at the beginning and towards the end of meetings. It is not unusual for talk to focus on management of the process in the beginning of the meeting, as referring to procedure is a common opening to meetings used by Chairs (Nielson 2013:187), particularly as it has been identified that there are several kinds of openings associated with how chairs open meetings. These include reference to procedure, using a boundary marker to direct the pre talk to meeting talk; passing an opportunity to talk by adding a pause after the use of a boundary marker like 'well'; and using a start declaration often indicating what the meeting is about (Nielsen 2013:45). The extract below begins two seconds into the recording of the beginning of the first meeting of the group where Talisha is reminding the group about the procedure for keeping notes.

Extract 6.1: 'our first meeting' (Meeting 1)

[00.24-01.24]

1	TAL	yeah that's fine can I just very quickly erm if somebody does the minutes of the meeting say designate [a person]
2	TOM	[I'll do it]
3	TAL	it's just it's our first meeting and I think we've got to keep a record of each week cos if you remember at the beginning shall we all do (.) have (.) we've got the computer there get a stick in and then we'll type as we go along
4	TESS	where somebody has a (proforma)
5	TAL	yeah think it will just be easier =
6	TOM	=yeah okay it's a good idea
7	TAL	we can just e-mail each other off there anyway it's not a problem at all right (.) vision
8	TESS	could be better to actually take off the notes to actually write them down. yeah
9	TOM	we need to take notes
10	TAL	if we take turns one every week we'll pop that on to a stick and just type it up (.) easier right

Talisha (turn 1) reminds the group of the module requirements. ' The beginning' referred to the first lecture given in relation to Vision, where the module requirements were discussed, including the need for minutes from each meeting, so Talisha was evoking shared experience here. Within this extract there are several examples of the 1stPP , 'we' and 'our', used mainly by Talisha to refer to the collective responsibility of the group (turn 10). As discussed in Chapter 5 (Extract 5.1) Talisha is taking on the Co-ordinator role here. In her individual written evaluation Talisha comments:

The team worked co-operatively throughout to produce an innovative presentation...Our overall aim was to ensure everyone had a fair say and increasingly important to have a team that operated well.

Talisha's focus on the team in engaging individuals and building rapport through promoting a collective responsibility in the use of 'we' and 'our' may be related to a style of discourse associated with psychotherapy and described by Western as Therapist leader discourse, which 'Empowers through engaging individual and team…' (Western, 2012:17).

Talisha's Extract 6.2 below provides another illustration of the management of the process at the beginning of the second meeting.

Extract 6.2: Start declaration (Meeting 2)

[0.01-00.36]

1	TIM	right are we recording I think this confusion with the e-mails what we need to do is have a quick discussion and [then what direction we go
2	TAL	[shall I do minutes?
3	TESS	yes please
4	TIM	we need to what we've got to we've still an hour and a bit
5	TAL	let's really look at the time as well we need to look at the time don't we
6	TIM	shall I start and go around the table maybe (*Tim looks towards Talisha*)
7	TAL	yeah do that

Extract 6.2 begins with Tim's use of a boundary marker ('right'), marking a shift in topic into the business of the meeting. This is followed by Tim making a start declaration 'I think what we need to do is have a quick discussion and then what direction we go' . This is proposing a starting point for their discussion and is jointly negotiated between Tim and Talisha (turns 1 to 2, 4 to 5 and 6 to 7). It is appealing to the idea of the group and group activity, turn 4 and in turn 5..

There is a further example in the extract below where Tim continues to provide some co-ordination of the process in exploring what they are going to do for their Vision. This occurs towards the end of Meeting 2.

Extract 6.3: Dividing the task (Meeting 2)

[17.08- 18.06]

1	TIM	yeah [so all we're doing is
2	TESS	[so we're doing
3	TIM	so all we're doing is delivering a presentation like all the other groups but we just do in a more visualistic way
4	TOM	or just saying just saying how it would be delivered in a more visualistic way in a 100 years we're just saying we=
5	TIM	= if we can do all this with a few weeks to spare with a few weeks to spare dressing the set
6	TOM	yeah
7	TIM	and getting the lines together
8	TAL	yeah you see that's what (.)
9	TOM	shall we divide it up and we all take a section
10	TAL	yeah think we really need to
11	TAZ	yeah that's fine
12	TIM	and get the areas of specialism they'll be able to do best
13	TAL	well let's think about the sections what we need to think about first

The ideas discussed in Meeting 1 related to a 4D Vision idea (see Chapter 4) and within this extract the group are discussing how they are going to organise putting together the presentation of the Vision. Construal of the group forms an important part of this process. There is a prominent use of 'we' in reference to the group. Tim's comments (turn 3) appear to be seeking some confirmation of how the group are going to approach the presentation. Tom's later comments (turn 4) provide reassurance that they do not need to recreate the visual element. Tim, Tom and Talisha in particular seem to be jointly constructing this by building on each other's ideas, with some support from Tess and Tazmin, ('if we can do all this ', Tim turn 5), ('shall we divide it up', Tom turn 9), ('yeah think we really need to', Talisha turn 10). There is also an instance of 'let's' as Talisha (turn 13) politely directs the group to think about what is needed in referring to the sections of the Vision There is a lot of joint discursive work here with a repeated appeal to the

group in the use of 'we'. There is evidence of the talk being mutually supportive, where the group are working closely together in deciding on their approach to the task.

The extract below occurs approximately two thirds of the way into that first meeting. Prior to this extract Tom digresses as he discusses the idea of a table-like computer based on what he had seen on the Star Trek television series, which Talisha begins to explore further. Here Tina appears to be co-ordinating the process by interjecting to keep the meeting focussed with the time remaining before lunch.

Extract 6.4: 'What are we aiming for next week?' (Meeting 1)
[37.01-37.16]

1	TINA	can I just say we need to just focus in in other words it's nearly half past 12 and we do need to have a dinner break
2	TOM	we've got some good ideas though
3	TINA	what are we aiming for next week what are our jobs and what do we need to do before next week I'd like some kind of title ish kind of idea

Tina attempts to draw together the ideas from the meeting and organise the group's focus for the next meeting. She uses mitigation ('can I just say'), as she takes the conversational floor. This is not the end of the meeting, although arguably Tina is attempting to draw the meeting to a close (turn 1). The group had lectures in the afternoon. Tom makes an evaluation (turn 2) and Tina sets out what needs to be done again using 'we' and 'our' in referring to the group (turn 3). This extract is similar to other extracts in setting out activities as being joint/group activities and in demonstrating a clear coordination of the process.

The organisation of the process mainly occurred near the beginning and towards the end of meetings, where the use of 1stPP appeared to be prominent. However, there was evidence that these also occurred during discussions related to ideas and in seeking agreement about the Vision content.

124

6.5 Agreement and collective identity

A cluster of the 1stPP was found where the group was seeking agreement on an aspect of their Vision. A possible reason for this is that the group were working closely together in reaching decisions that reflected their collective ideas for their Vision. There were instances when one of their members asked a specific question in relation to whether they agreed on an aspect of their Vision and 'we' occurred when agreement was directly being sought in this way. This occurred five times within the first meeting and once in the second and third meetings. Tess was the speaker who was responsible for six out of seven instances of seeking agreement in this way. Extracts 6.5 and 6.6 below give examples to demonstrate how this was approached. Note that Extract 6.5 the relevant speaker is Tim.

Extract 6.5: Doubting the Vision focus (Meeting 2)
[01.46- 02.49]

1	TAL	right what it was on that first Monday I was just thinking about things I realised that we'd had no focus whatsoever but we left on that Tuesday we all said yes yes we'll do this we'll do that that's it nobody no concrete ideas as to where we were going it was for me to get where we were
2	TIM	right
3	TAL	we've got all week rather than wasting the week if everybody does get the time we can look up on the internet things like that that's all what was it we were going to do
4	TESS	that's why I was confused not sure whether I was doing the right thing what was one of your questions for that and how do we erm integrate this in the curriculum in the different subject areas so what I thought we were supposed to do anyway I'm not really sure
5	TAL	yeah
6	TIM	the basic question is are we going with the 21st century vision with the avatar type environment or are we coming back from that and doing something less than that

Talisha uses hedging ('I was just thinking') in expressing concern about the focus of the Vision. Tim consequently (turn 6) uses a recap of what had been discussed previously in posing an exploratory question in an attempt to seek agreement. Arguably, the use of a

recap here is an example of what Mercer refers to as 'a collective identity' (2000:106) in that they all had experience of teaching in a classroom. They also had a shared knowledge of their discussion related to an avatar style environment and had shared aims in that they were working collectively in developing a Vision for education hence Tim's use of 'we' here. Talisha and Tim also use 'we' in trying to elicit joint ownership of the Vision ideas.

Extract 6.6 here is an example of Tess seeking agreement on 4D-learning and clarification of what had been discussed previously:

Extract 6.6: 'Do we all agree' (Meeting 1)
[20.54-21.28]

1	TESS	I can't imagine not having to put up real displays and projections of children's work so do we all agree that this is 4D learning then it's not it's not outside the classroom it's within the same environment but it's bringing the outside in=
2	TAL	=the [outside in
3	TESS	[yeah
4	TAL	home so we're dropping the whole thing that can be accessed at home accessed at a school in Britain are doing something a school in America are=
5	TIM	=the same learning environment then yeah
6	TAL	yeah

In Extract 6.6 (Turn 1) the act of directly seeking agreement is done by Tess through the use of a question, ('so do we all agree that this is 4D learning then'). Tess does not wait for a response here, but qualifies her question. This is a common technique used by teachers in clarifying, or paraphrasing in order to create a common reference point during a teaching sequence (Mercer 2000:138). Talisha (turn 2) repeats 'the outside in' in affirming what has been said. Repetition can be used by teachers to either affirm what has been said or as means to further investigate what has been said by using a quizzical tone (Mercer

2000:54). Talisha then uses this approach to confirm that other previously discussed ideas by the group are no longer being considered (turn 4).

The example in Extract 6.7 below in relation to the seeking of agreement shows the group using 'we', 'our' and 'ourselves' in construing themselves as a group, as they work closely together in formulating their Vision statement

Extract 6.7: 'Does everyone agree'? (Meeting 3)

[10.00- 10.38]

1	TESS	does everyone agree then that that could be our like our opening statement
2	TOM	could you repeat
3	TAZ	I think so
4	TESS	our group Vision is to educate children through a 4D immersive learning environment
5	TOM	educate children can we improve on that
6	TESS	Yeah
7	TOM	And build it around er building you know building the whole child building their sort of problem solving and creating and reasoning [abilities
8	TESS	[yeah
9	TOM	perhaps it's a bit perhaps it's a bit generic education
10	TESS	yeah but, it is just a starting point and then we'll (.)
11	TAL	I do think we do need something that's quite relevant to education

Tess seeks agreement in turn 18, but it is not clear here what she is referring to and Tom (turn 19) asks her to repeat affirmed by Tazmin in turn 20. Tess's statement (turn 21) is a recap of previous ideas about the Vision, where she presents the Vision statement as a reformulation. 'Our group vision' is used in an indication of that group ownership of the ideas. Further discussion follows from this statement as the group build on this and we see hedging also being used by Tom in expressing doubt about including 'education' (turn 26). Tess (turn 27) supports this statement.The short pause here gives Talisha the opportunity to (turn 28) express her opinion.

Extract 6.8 below, which occurred near the beginning of the Meeting 3, is of particular importance in addressing my third research question of how the trainees discursively construed themselves as a group. It is evident that from the beginning of this meeting that the group were forming their Vision statement through cumulatively building ideas using repetition.

Extract 6.8: 'Do we need to get multisensory...' (Meeting 3)
[07.25- 08.04]

1	TAL	so to educate children through immersive=
2	TOM	=Carl Rogers
3	TINA	Carl Rogers?
4	TOM	yeah (*inaudible*)
5	TESS	think it might be too much
6	TAL	4D immersive learning environment
7	TESS	oh my god
8	TAL	that's a really good statement isn't it
9	TESS	To educate children through a
10	TAL	4D immersive learning environment yep the 4D aspect makes it hopefull unique
11	TINA	and immersive tells you it's everything and it's a whole
12	TAL	exactly
13	TESS	do we need to get multi-sensory in there
14	TAL	immersive is multi-sensory
15	TESS	I think we have to we have to
16	TAL	expand on it
17	TESS	erm (.)
18	TINA	or blended learning blended learning that were the term he used
19	TESS	he said blended learning and then (..) don't know where we are at the moment though
20	TOM	he used blended in a definition of blending ICT with traditional teaching and learning

Turns 9 and 10 indicate that Talisha and Tess build on each other's contributions, as Talisha completes Tess's sentence in formulating a Vision statement. This also occurs in turn 15 where Tess says: 'I think we have to we have to', which is completed by Talisha 'expand on it'. Talisha provides positive feedback of her own comments (turn 6): '4D

immersive learning environment' in her use of a tag question: 'that's a really good statement isn't it'(turn 8) in response to Tess's (turn 7) 'oh my god' in what arguably assists in aligning the group and this results in further exploration of the Vision statement. There are also indications of agreement within this short Extract in relation to Tina's response (turn 11): 'immersive tells you it's everything and it's a whole' to Talisha's comments (turn 10) '4D immersive learning environment yep the 4D aspect makes it hopefully unique'. Talisha then follows with 'exactly' indicating her agreement with Tina's comments. Tess (turn 13) asks a question about the Vision statement and refers to the group in her use of inclusive 'we' in 'do we need to get multisensory in there'.

In Extract 6.9 below there is evidence of a *high involvement* discourse style (Tannen 2005:40) as the group are building the Vision statement and using 'could we' and 'can we' in supportively constructing their ideas. There is also evidence of a direct disagreement by Tina, which momentarily moves away from the 'we' of the group, but this is quickly repaired with her use of a tag question which facilitates further discussion.

Extract 6.9: Forming the Vision statement (Meeting 3)

[04.56-05.44]

1	TOM	think it's part of our steps progression it can be we can even show that as part of the steps in 10 -20 years
2	TINA	can we say that all classrooms will look like this in 10-20 years
3	TAL	could we say instead of 4D learning could we say creating immersive classrooms
4	TESS	and then create a 4D inspirational immersive creative space
5	TAL	yeah
6	TINA	so what could it be we need to personalise that a bit better don't we
7	TESS	erm
8	TINA	our vision is
9	TESS	erm (.)
10	TAL	educate or teach
11	TINA	no I don't want to put teach in it's more exploring isn't it
12	TESS	environment or classroom or what if we say space
13	TINA	oops say that again sorry
14	TIM	educational experience

At the beginning of Extract 6.9 there is evidence of the use of quick-fire questioning, while the group were trying to formulate their Vision statement. This has the effect of establishing a higher involvement style in the discourse (Tannen 2005:40), as it increases the pace of the discussion as the group shared their ideas quickly. Note the use of 'can we' and 'could we' as the three speakers were engaging in talk which explored ideas by being constructive. Challenges were also present (turn 11) where Tina questioned Talisha's statement (turn 10) 'educate or teach'. Tina overtly disagrees with the use of 'teach' in the Vision statement and appears directive in her use of 'I don't want to', which appears to move away from the inclusive 'we'. However, she uses a tag question in checking the views of others in relation to 'it's more exploring isn't it' and this serves to allow the discussion to continue with Tess (turn 12) in her use of 'environment or classroom what if we say space'. Arguably this is reminiscent of exploratory talk (Mercer et al. 2004:362) as discussed in Chapter 2. Question-tags are also used (turn 6) by Tina in 'we need' with the tag 'don't we'. It can be argued that the use of the tag questions here appear to effectively encourage further discussion. It seems here that Tina is also using 'we' in the way it sometimes is used in a classroom to include the students and the teacher in a task by giving the impression that 'we are in this together' particularly in her use of: 'we need to personalise that a bit better don't we'.

6.6 Common knowledge and collective remembering

Within the following extracts are examples of 'collective remembering' (Mercer 2000:50) where the group refer to their common shared experiences in construing themselves as a group. Knowledge derived from prior experience is also featured (Kecskes and Zhang 2009:347) and 'do you remember' is discussed in terms of establishing common ground among participants (Hie-Jung You 2015:1).

In Extract 6.10 below the group discuss their shared experience in relation to a key-note lecture they attended and Tom reports some research he did in relation to this.

Extract 6.10: 'That place in America' (Meeting 3)

[06.23- 07.09]

1	TINA	I know to educate children though think it's got to be focussed on education not to teach children we're not going to allow the children to explore to educate them so it's going to be a combination of them exploring and finding out and us facilitating to help them do it
2	TIM	yeah
3	TINA	I think definitely like that place in America that he was talking about erm you know when Cal Fish the guy in America he took the children to do their own pre-learning (-)
4	TAL	yeah
5	TOM	I've done some research on that and it goes back to this guy called erm looked it up this morning
6	TAL	so to educate children through immersive=
7	TOM	=Carl Rogers
8	TINA	Carl Rogers?
9	TOM	yeah (*inaudible*)

Extract 6.10 demonstrates that the group refer to their common knowledge (turns 3,5,7 and

8) where Tina makes use of 'we're' and 'us' in her reference to the education of children in

the Vision (turn 1). Arguably, here she is referring to the group as teachers. In turn 3 Tina

recalls information from a keynote lecture which is responded to by Tom (turn 5). This is

an example of 'collective remembering' where the group are recalling their common

experience (Mercer 2000:50). The keynote lectures appeared of direct interest to the group,

as they also referred to their immediate shared experience of a lecture from the previous

week, which focussed on blended learning (turn 3). These references to common

knowledge particularly occurred during the formation of their Vision statement within

Meeting 3.

In extract 6.11 the group referred to their common knowledge in construing themselves as

a group.

Extract 6.11: 'Do you remember?'(Meeting 1)

[14.47-15.23]

1	TESS	I just think in a presentation I always remember like being told you know it's really good if you can to involve the audience audience participation
2	TOM	yeah
3	TESS	so at some point em you know like do you remember I know this is different but do you know that in my maths presentation the way M and I got you up=
4	TOM	=yeah
5	TESS	you know just something like that you know em (*inaudible overlapping talk*) D said give the audience stuff to do
6	TOM	yeah yeah yeah
7	TINA	thinking forward, are you thinking, thinking of senses if you've got like a tropical rain forest

Tess (turn 1): 'I always remember like being told', is revisiting what appears to be her previous knowledge. However, it can be argued that Tess is using 'I always remember like being told' to introduce the idea of audience participation, because we see in turn 5 reference to a previous group discussion with the tutor in: 'D said give the audience stuff to do'. In turn 3 : 'Do you remember I know this is different' Tess is referring to the group shared experience of viewing some previous presentations. Reference to shared events and memories in the form of *do you remember* 'serve to establish common ground among participants' (Hie-Jung You 2015:1).

Extract 6.12 is significant that it is an example where common knowledge is discussed in terms of immediate shared experiences in references to a tutor and knowledge that is derived from prior experience which is common to the group relating to a Facebook page. A tag question is used in trying to clarify the group's thinking. There is also evidence of support being provided in turn 14 through a refocussing of the group to concentrate on the Vision development.

Extract 6.12: 'Shall we' (Meeting 2)

[09.33- 11.18]

1	TOM	we do 4D learning in an immersive space or 4D learning in virtual immersive space in both scenarios we need to address the things that we need to address so might as well push the boat out
2	TESS	D still said like after we had our meeting (.)
3	TIM	She was elated wasn't she
4	TESS	yes she was excited about it but I'm worried guys……. cos I was on that there Facebook well I was on that Facebook page where I told you erm about erm comments erm asking them about 4D learning open day A had liked the page as well and he's seen it……[ ] so I'm sure he's going to do something like that
5	TIM	we were there first so
6	TINA	I understand what you are saying
7	TESS	so is it still a vision for the future or are we pulling that back a bit do you know
8	TIM	shall we have a show of hands who thinks it should be for a vision for=
9	TESS	=sorry can you say that again as Tina's talking to me
10	TIM	vision for set in a 100 years' time when in a virtual world who's for that
11	TESS	I really don't know
12	TAL	I just know it's fine
13	TIM	I think it's got to be grounded in=
14	TINA	=let's talk about how it would get there and how it would progress to that point
15	TIM	yeah

There are references to immediate shared common knowledge (turn 2) where Tess refers to the comment of one of the tutors: 'D said like after we had our meeting'. This was in relation to their Vision idea. Tim responds (turn 3) with : 'she was elated wasn't she' which is confirmed by Tess (turn 4). Mercer defines this as 'collective remembering' (2000:49-50). Another example of a reference to common knowledge occurs when Tess mentions (turn 4): 'I was on that Facebook page'. Here the common ground lies in the knowledge that is derived from prior experience within a community of Facebook users and the page discussed (Kecskes and Zhang 2009:347).

Note Tim's response (turn 5) which refers to the fact that the group had given an overview of what they wanted to look at for their Vision in the lecture session prior to Meeting 2: 'we were there first'. There were no further examples within the group discussion of competition between groups.

Tess (turn 7) explores the current state of the Vision idea in drawing on the group's collective common experience: 'so is it still a Vision for the future or are we pulling that back a bit do you know' She uses a question tag in checking the group's thinking on this 'do you know' where 'you' in this instance refers to the group. Tina takes the conversational floor after Tess and Talisha express that they don't know (turn 14) supportively refocusses the group to think about virtual reality in relation to their Vision b; her use of 'let's'.

Extract 6.13 is another example of 'collective remembering' (Mercer 2000:49-50) where the group refer to common knowledge of a lecture they had attended as part of their Visior preparatory lectures.

Extract 6.13: 'Definitely flipped learning' (Meeting 3)

[08.51- 09.57]

1	TINA	so definitely flipped learning definitely something to do with blended (.) all these phrases (.)
2	TAL	about that statement
3	TINA	think when we do it there's going to be a rationale but I like the idea did you call it (.) follow that thing he came back to on screen what was it
4	TAL	the open badges
5	TINA	definitely the open badges no were it task studios it's called that thingy task studios
6	TAL	Cantasia [studios
7	TINA	[Yeah
8	TAL	where you take a video and (.)
9	TINA	think that would be nice if we are going to present our vision to do something maybe if we don't want to stand and talk to do film ourselves beforehand and have ourself already on video (.) then if we wanted to do role-play or do it through a different way we're there doing it but

10	TESS	yeah
11	TOM	it's a good idea what's the video called
12	TAL	Cantasia
13	TOM	Cantasia
14	TAL	yeah
15	TESS	does everyone ( )
16	TINA	Cantasia
17	TAZ	Cantasia

The extract begins amid a discussion related to flipped learning. Tina positively evaluates the group ideas about flipped learning (turn 3). The group were trying to remember an aspect of the lecture where the lecturer referred to a particular ICT tool. This is another example of what Mercer defines as 'collective remembering' (2000:49-50). There is some agreement by Tina with Talisha (turn 7) 'yeah' followed by Talish's recall; 'where you take a video and (.)' During a short pause Tina uses hedging in turn 9: 'Maybe, if we don't want to stand and talk, to do to film ourselves beforehand and have ourself ready on video', this reflects her uncertainty about the proposition, but this is positively evaluated by Tom in turn 11. 'Ourselves' and 'ourself' appear to be prominent in Tina's suggestion indicating the group involvement. Further repetition follows Tom's comment (turn 11) as Talisha says: 'Cantasia' (turn 12) which is repeated by Tom (turn 13) in his confirmation of what was being said. There are further repetitions of 'Cantasia' by Tina (turn 16) and Tazmin (turn 17) demonstrating the close engagement of the group.

6.7 Summary and conclusion of Chapter 6

This chapter considered evidence in relation to my third research question: How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group? I was interested in the use of 1stPP, particularly the use of 'we' in expressing group membership (Scheibman 2002:382). I wondered how the group made use of 1stPP and started my analysis by counting instances of 1stPP within the transcripts. I began with my pilot study (six groups) which revealed that there was a difference in the use of 1stPP between groups. The groups who scored the lowest marks in their assessment (Zinc and Lead) in the range of 50-59% also were low users of 1stPP (Tables 6.1/6.2). Whereas, the groups who scored 60% and above had a much higher usage. There did not appear to be any clear connection between the amount of words spoken and the extent of 1stPP use.

In relation to my case-study group (Titanium) Talisha (Extract 6.4) clearly used 1stPP more than other speakers in the group, but again there was no clear connection between the number of words spoken and the use of 1stPP. However, Tazmin who spoke very little also used little 1stPP. Talisha used 1stPP fairly consistently throughout the three meetings Tim appeared to use them significantly more when he opened the second meeting than in the other two meetings. My analysis of the three meetings revealed that during the second meeting (the shortest meeting) there was a much higher use of 1stPP (Table 6.3) possibly indicating that the group were were working closely in establishing the group.

I realised that this initial quantitative approach to isolate features was limited in that it did not allow me to explore how those features were used in stretches of talk. Consequently, a qualitative analysis of the transcripts from my case-study group (Titanium) allowed me to identify where 1stPP clustered at certain points during the meetings. My transcripts showed that 1stPP were prominent when the group were discussing the management of the

process and the content of the Vision. They were also prominent when the group were reaching agreement and discussing common shared experiences.

My qualitative analysis revealed that the group discursively construed themselves as a group through several features within their talk. They identified themselves as a group in their ownership of the Vision task. 1stPP particularly occurred during the coordination of the Vision task in the emphasis of the collective responsibility of the group (Extract 6.1) and the setting out of activities as being joint (6.4). They also appeared in the joint construction of ideas (Extracts 6.3/6.7/6.8) and mutually supportive talk (6.3). Meeting Two was of significance in the group's joint construction of the Vision, where they settled on an ICT/4D Vision idea (Extracts, 6.3/6.5/6.12). When the group were specifically seeking agreement on their Vision ideas 'we' was also used prominently in questions to elicit responses from the group (Extract 6.7). Hedges were also used in a similar way in the offering of suggestions and facilitating further discussion. In general Talisha appears to be attempting to build rapport among the group with her use of hedges. Arguably, hedges as a form of supportive talk are used in maintaining relationships within the group in allowing others to express their ideas and therefore in contributing to the discursive construal of the group.

There were some instances of the use of common techniques used by teachers (Mercer 2000:138) in the use of clarification and repetition (Extracts 6.6/6.7), although, I expected that there might have been more instances given that the trainee teachers were part of a community of practice of teaching. However, the jargon of teaching was shared in discursively construing the group, as the trainees used terms like 'the curriculum' (Extract 6.5) and others particularly associated with teaching ICT like 'blended learning' (Extract 6.8), 'open badges' (Extract 6.13) and 'flipped learning' (Extract 6.13). A high involvement style (Tannen 2005:40) was also present in the discourse, as quick-fire

questioning was used as the group worked constructively in building their Vision (Extract 6.9).

The group also referred to knowledge that they had in common in discursively construing themselves as a group. This occurred (Extract 6.13) in the form of what Mercer would describe as 'collective remembering' (2000:50), where Tina refers to a lecture they had recently attended as part of the Vision module: 'like that place in America that he was talking about'. There was also an instance of 'do you remember' in Extract 6.14, which served to establish common ground among the group in creating a shared experience of viewing past events (Hie-Jung You 2015:1) and appears to be a specific form of collective remembering. Knowledge derived from shared experience (Kecskes and Zkang 2009:347) appeared in Extract 6.15 when Tess makes reference to Facebook.

In the light of my analysis this group of trainee teachers discursively construed themselves as a group through their use of 1stPP, a shared language of teaching and the knowledge they had in common.

Within my final chapter I discuss the themes that have been identified within my thesis and consider how my thesis contributes to the building of new knowledge.

Chapter 7 Discussion and Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

My aim in this chapter is to draw together ideas and key insights generated by my analysis of the data. I begin the chapter with a brief summary of my context and aims. I then discuss findings that emerged from my three analytical chapters (7.1). This is followed by an overview of the findings from my analysis, where I consider the extent to which they provide answers in relation to my three research questions (7.2). I then consider limitations of my research, where I discuss circumstantial and data limitations (7.3). This is followed by a discussion on the implications of the research (7.4). Finally, within my concluding statement I draw together the main ideas (7.5).

My research topic originated from observations I made in the course of teaching HE students who were training to become primary school teachers. In their final year of study they participated in a module entitled Vision for Education, where they were required to work together in groups on a joint task, in creating their Vision of Education for the future. In my work with these trainee teachers, I became aware that there were differences in the way trainees collaborated within their groups. Some groups appeared more effective than others in collaborating. Other groups appeared to struggle with the concept of collaboration and engaged less well as a group. These differences appeared to be reflected in the presentation marks that the groups were awarded. In a pilot study, I looked at characteristics of discussion in six different groups before focussing in greater depth on one group (Titanium) who had scored highly (72%) and analysed their first three group meetings, during the initial formation of the group in structuring their Vision ideas. The aim of my research was to discover how this successful group collaborated discursively towards their shared Vision of Education. I considered that an analysis of how the group developed their ideas, how they interacted within the group and how they construed

themselves as a group through their use of talk were important factors. These factors developed into my research questions which were eventually formulated as:

RQ1 How are ideas within the group collaboratively developed over time?

RQ2 To what extent and in what ways are particular discursive roles constructed within the group?

RQ3 How do the trainee teachers discursively construe themselves as a group?

I noted several overarching themes generated by my three RQs and some themes appeared across my three analytical chapters. The use of politeness and in particular hedging in shared leadership, exploratory talk in the development of knowledge, and the collective identity of the group in the use of first person plural forms (henceforth '1stPP') were prominent language features within my case-study group. Also noticeable in how this objectively successful group collaborated were references to common knowledge, the construction of discursive roles and the use of a shared vocabulary related to teaching. I discuss these in turn below.

7.2 Overview of findings

7.2.1 Politeness

A major focus of my analysis was the way group members collaborated in developing thei concept of the Vision and negotiating roles and relationships. The discourse analytic concept of politeness proved to be a useful tool in exploring this across my three RQs. Politeness features were particularly prominent when the group were making suggestions or presenting proposals in developing their Vision in relation to my first RQ (Extract 4.3). There was also evidence that hedging was used in politely taking the floor in changing the direction of the talk. For example, 'can I just very quickly' (Extract 5.1, 5.6) was used in maintaining control of the discussion. This is an example of negative politeness to imply ability rather than willingness, so the hearer has the opportunity to refuse without offence

(Leech 2014:13). Politeness emerged as a feature of the shared leadership within the group in relation to my second RQ (Chapter 5), particularly in the form of mitigating requests (Extract 5.1). A possible reason for this may have been the fact that the group were being audio/video recorded during their meetings and consequently wanted to appear to facilitate each other's talk without being confrontational. There was also evidence that hedging was used in the offering of suggestions in facilitating further discussion in relation to RQ3 (Extract 6.7).

7.2.2 Exploratory talk

Exploratory talk was used in several ways within the successful group. In relation to my first RQ, specific exploratory questions appeared to recap on what had been spoken about previously (Extract 4.10) and exploratory talk was used in collaboratively developing the Vision statement by considering the views of members of the group (Extract 4.14). During the building of consensus exploratory talk challenged ideas in reaching some joint understanding of the group's Vision (Extracts 5.8, 5.9, 5.10). The building of consensus was particularly linked to the discursive construction of the role of Co-ordinator in relation to my second RQ. Exploratory talk was also linked to the supportive exploration of ideas within the group, as the group were collaborating closely on their shared Vision (Extract 6.9, RQ3). Arguably, exploratory talk functioned in the co-construction of knowledge, as the group benefitted from working together in creatively addressing the task of formulating their Vision, which then became the property of the group (Littleton and Mercer, 2013:104). This construction of new knowledge generated by the group is rather like Lee's 'as though common ground' (2001:27). Central to my research is the idea of knowledge as a social phenomenon rather than as a product of an individual's thought (Mercer 1995:66) and exploratory talk facilitated successful collaborative discourse within the group.

7.2.3 First person plural forms and group formation

My quantitative analysis of first person plural forms ('1stPP') in my pilot study revealed that there was a difference in the way groups used 1stPP. Groups that had scored above sixty in their assessment had considerably more usage than groups who had scored below sixty. However, a quantitative approach did not allow me to discover why this might be the case. On the other hand, a qualitative analysis of my case-study group identified that the use of 1stPP clustered at certain points during the meetings. This occurred when the group were involved in discussing the management of the process and content of the Vision, in reaching agreement and in discussing common shared experiences. 1stPP, particularly the use of 'we', functioned in demonstrating the collective responsibility of the group (Section 6.1) and the joint construction of ideas and facilitated mutually supportive talk (Extract 6.3). A joint ownership of the Vision was demonstrated and a collective identity of the group emerged (RQ3) evident in the use of 1stPP. The group's use of 1stPP was prominen in their discussion of common shared experiences and appeared to allow them to discursively construe themselves as a community of trainee teachers.

7.2.4 References to common knowledge

I was concerned with how common knowledge was discursively contructed within the group talk. There were many references to the common shared experience of the group, especially in relation to keynote lectures (Extracts, 4.4 and 4.5). The sharing of common knowledge was particularly relevant in developing ideas over time (RQ1) and in discursively construing the group as a community of trainee teachers (RQ3).

There was evidence of common knowledge of the vocabulary and terminology related to teaching, which included references to V.A.K (visual, auditory and kinaesthetic) and common knowledge displayed of the assessment process (Extracts, 4.6 and 4.7). A form c collective remembering (Mercer 2000:50) in which the group recalled common experienc was particularly prominent during the formation of the Vision statement. Knowledge

derived from prior experience was drawn on when the group were referring to their shared knowledge of Facebook (Extract 6.12). References to shared events and memories in order to establish common ground (Hie-Jung You 2015:1) were used in the form of 'do you remember' (Extract 6.11, RQ3). Arguably, that shared knowledge established common ground in allowing points to be made quickly, so that the group could develop their Vision ideas (RQ1) in their creation of new knowledge. Prior experience and interaction of the group established a core common knowledge (Kecskes and Zhang 2009:347) and from this the group developed a new common knowledge, 'as though common knowledge' (Lee 2001:27) in the form of their Vision.

7.2.5 Discursive construction of team-roles

For Belbin (2010) the behaviour of participants was important in the identification of team-roles. Team-roles can be different from an individual's assigned functional role, where an individual may have been employed to do a task according to their existing skills (Belbin 2010:25). A variation in the team-role and any assigned functional role may occur due to differences in personality (Belbin 2010:25). My original approach to the application of the Belbin team-role categories, involved mapping the discursive practices I observed on to the Belbin team-roles. I found this a challenge without the help of the Team-Role Self-Perception Inventory tool, as the identification of team-roles was difficult to pinpoint precisely and was open to interpretation. My impressionistic observations, due to the small data set, could be debatable in relation to validity and reliability. However, the leadership role of Co-ordinator was easiest to identify. This role was not formally assigned by the group and it was shared by five out of the six members of the group at some point. However, on the basis of my research I would argue that a study of discourse is important when considering how a team operates and how leadership is demonstrated. It reflects authentic behaviour in context rather than personality traits, or perceptions on how teams operate. A study of discourse, as in this thesis, thus offers a potentially valuable

143

perspective on leadership practices and provides a means to better examine the often complex nature of leadership (Choi and Schnurr 2014:20).

Other discursive roles emerged from the data and these included that of Monitor Evaluator which is a problem-solving role where scepticism and an applied logic is central to the role (Belbin 2010:56). One person appeared to adopt this role (Extract 5.10) who also appeared to assume the action-orientated role of Completer Finisher in seeking a sense of urgency within the team (Belbin 2010:56, Extract 5.6a). Belbin's role of Specialist (2010:22) also emerged. Additional evidence in the form of individual evaluations suggested that the role of Resource Investigator was particularly assumed by two members of the group. The role of humour proved to be important in the group work and the use of humour varied between participants, hence my construction of an additional role to Belbin's team-roles, namely the Humorist. There was evidence to suggest that humour was used in maintaining conviviality within the group, building solidarity and instigating creativity. A single team member was responsible for the majority of instances involving the use of mime (Extracts 5.12 and 5.13) in instigating creativity. I was surprised that there was a very visual element in the use of mime that was responsible for generating humour. A possible reason for this may be that the group were training to be primary-school teachers and arguably, were more creative in expressing themselves multimodally, which gave me a multimodal perspective on discourse. There was also evidence that the group jointly constructed humour (Extract 5.16). This was equally important in discursively construing the group in relation to my third RQ, as the role of Humorist was people-orientated and served to create cohesion within the group in the form of joint laughter.

7.2.6 Teacher-like talk and the construal of the group as trainee teachers

There was evidence that the group were using a shared vocabulary related to teaching in construing themselves as a group of trainee teachers and in sharing the knowledge of teaching that they had in common (section 7.2.4 and RQ3). There was also some talk

characteristic of teachers, including, repetition, reformulation, and recapitulation, which emerged particularly in relation to RQ1 and RQ2. Repetition on the whole was not always used in the way teachers might use it in repeating something in an affirming or quizzical way (Mercer 2000:54), as much repetition in talk is automatic, where speakers repeat and echo words of others without thinking (Tannen 2007:94). Repetition occurred during a highly collaborative development of ideas (Extract 4.9) and it was used in the joint construction of the Vision statement (4.15). It was used as a cohesive device in that it allowed the group to cooperate closely in developing a joint Vision idea, and arguably, it was used as a device in allowing a speaker to 'set up a paradigm and slot in new information' (Tannen 2007:58). However, there was usage of repetition in a teacher-like move of affirming what had been said (Extracts 4.9 & 6.6). The use of reformulation appeared in the form of a paraphrased summary of the group's discussion, particularly at points when the group were considering options for their Vision (Extract 4.11). This functioned in simplifying the options in a similar way to how teachers might paraphrase a response in making it clearer. There was also some evidence of clarification used in creating a common reference point (Extract 6.6) which is a common technique used by teachers during a teaching sequence (Mercer 2000:138). I was surprised that the group did not automatically use more teacher-like talk, as they were a community of trainee teachers immersed in the language practices and vocabulary of teaching. However, group communication is going to be dependent on a number of factors including age and perceived status of participants, context and purpose. It would have been useful to know whether this group communicated in a distinctive way, by virtue of being trainee teachers compared to other HE students on other courses.

7.2.7 Summary of findings

The group of trainee teachers collaborated discursively towards a shared 'Vision' of education in several ways. My findings highlight the importance of the community of practice (Wenger 1998) in the sharing of communal resources, particularly in relation to

common knowledge. The formation of a shared repertoire in a shared vocabulary related to teaching and shared speech practices enabled the group to continue their discussion without re-orientation towards the topic (Meyeroff 2011:200). They utilised their common knowledge of teaching and shared experience, as they interacted together in the joint construction of ideas (RQ1). 'Common experience, collective remembering and past joint activity' (Mercer 2000:49-50) were significant in how the group developed their Vision ideas over time (RQ1) and construed themselves as a group (RQ3). Central to the collaborative working of the group were the 'common ground' of shared beliefs and knowledge as teachers (RQ3); the 'background common knowledge' and beliefs brought to the group by individuals and the new beliefs developed as the Vision concept formed (the 'as though' common ground, Lee 2001:27) (RQ1). The interaction enabled learning through the development of knowledge and problem-solving within the group reminiscent of Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (1986:187-188) and the zone of 'collaborative facilitation' (Nokes-Malach et al., 2012:39). Their use of exploratory talk functioned in the co-construction of knowledge by recapping on previous talk, considering the views of members of the group and challenging ideas in reaching consensus. It was also prominent in the leadership of the group related to the discursive role of the Co-ordinator (RQ2). The group's use of 1stPP forms, particularly their use of 'we', demonstrated a joint ownership of the Vision task and a collective identity. Negative politeness also emerged and was an unexpected feature of shared leadership within the group. The group's use of humour enabled creative thinking and conviviality within the group. It was a valuable resource in providing a break from some of the more serious discussion related to the Vision task (Baxter 2010:152).

My findings show that discourse analysis is important in revealing, how a successful group collaboratively constructs knowledge (their Vision) (RQ1); assumes discursive roles (RQ2); and constructs a common identity as a group (RQ3).

146

7.3 Limitations of the study

7.3.1 Circumstantial limitations

The limitations of my study were initially circumstantial in nature, where I had very few opportunities to collect data in relation to my research due to my role as a lecturer on the Vision for Education module and having a responsibility in monitoring students at the same time as conducting my research. There were also difficulties related to quiet areas in order to record the interaction of groups, as a limited number of rooms were available for groups to work. Consequently, many groups worked in open plan areas, where noise was an issue if recording equipment needed to be used. Another limitation was that my research was based on a very small study, where I initially examined six groups in my pilot study involving small amounts of talk. My main research was based on one of the more successful groups, during the course of their first three meetings. The analysis of these meetings was valuable in giving me some insight into how this successful group operated and interacted as a group and how ideas and the nature of the interaction developed over time. There was little opportunity to gather further evidence from the group after the Vision presentation, beyond that provided in their brief written evaluations, as they were engaged in their final teaching placement and were not due to attend college for teaching sessions after this. Ideally, I would have welcomed the opportunity to interview them about the process of their Vision task before they had completed their academic year.

7.3.2 Data limitations

A larger study may have enabled me to compare data between several groups and to carry out a quantitative analysis along Hallidayan lines. However, my qualitative case-study approach gave me a unique insight into the discursive interaction within my one successful group.

There were various issues that arose within my analysis, where research on a much wider scale over a longer time period would have been beneficial. My examination of discursive

roles in relation to Belbin's team-roles (2010:23) was revealing but limited, as it involved one group over a short period of time. A larger sample of groups, together with the use of concordance software might have allowed me to identify words and phrases that appeared common, which would have helped me in my discursive analysis. Concordance software is now more accessible than it was when I started my EdD. I did investigate buying and using software like AntConc at the time, which would have required time-consuming instruction and skills development. I decided against this given my time limitations and the financial outlay for the software.

Another limitation arose from my my findings related to negative politeness in shared leadership, which raised further questions about how relationship work is done in groups. wondered how other groups might demonstrate 'relationship work' in discourse, particularly during collaboration on a time-limited task exercise. I also wondered how other groups might have made use of common knowledge in developing their Vision ideas Given greater resources and a greater amount of time, I would have liked to have conducted further research in relation to group work across a larger number of groups to provide some comparison. On the other hand, the research reported here represents a case-study of how one successful group of trainee teachers discursively interacted over time in the context of a specific task and I make no claims that it is representative of other groups.

7.4 Implications of the research

The trainee teachers involved in this module (Vision for Education) were in their final semester of study. The majority would be in the position of starting their careers as primary school teachers in less than six months' time. They would be required to engage in the professional dialogue of a teacher and be able to discursively promote teaching and learning in the classroom. Teachers need to be proficient collaborators in order to be effective in their roles as teachers (Vangrieken et al. 2015:18), so that they can develop their practice in their application of shared ideas. However, projects involving

collaboration in student groups often present challenges for students. Assumptions are often made by tutors that groups have the ability to collaborate effectively as a group or team and possess the necessary skills to do so. 'Team-based projects require interpersonal interaction; however, they do not necessarily promote the development of teamwork skills' (Tombaugh 2014:71). This piece of research has implications for the building of community in relation to how groups of students are given guidance on working in groups and how discursive collaborative work is promoted.

My research is innovative in that it combines three different approaches including, management studies, SFL and sociocultural discourse analysis, the insights from which are not routinely combined, nor are the findings from linguistic research regularly drawn on by researchers in educational management. My research thus has potential value both in and outside educational contexts, as it is based on how a successful group collaborates discursively in sharing and developing ideas while working on a task achieved through the assumption of roles within the group and an adoption of a team identity, where there is a collective commitment to the success of the task. In particular, my findings may influence the use of language in collaborative groups and how subsequent trainee teachers are guided in the development of those skills necessary to communicate effectively and also to promote learning.

7.4.1 Significance of findings for the improvement of practice

My findings offer an insight in relation to how successful collaborative discourse can be achieved in a group task involving trainee teachers. I had not anticipated the emergence of negative politeness linked with the discourse of a shared leadership, which served to maintain the concept of 'face' (Goffman 1967:7) and in mitigating the force of speech acts (Lam 2011:361). Arguably, it presented a way of talking that was facilitative in enabling a form of smooth interaction throughout the group. I cannot speculate whether negative

politeness in shared leadership would be a feature of another similar successful group, but it is worthy of further consideration.

Raising awareness of politeness strategies in promoting collaborative discussion could be valuable, especially as a means of facilitating interaction and in a consideration of the discourse of leadership within groups. Equally, the concept of joint ownership of the task and a collective identity as a group in the use of 1stPP could also be of value in any programme designed to improve skills associated with discursive collaboration. A focus on the building of consensus in the use of exploratory talk could be beneficial in developing skills, which could be particularly relevant to trainee teachers in being transferable to the classroom. However, caution needs to be maintained in presenting discursive strategies like the use of 1stPP, politeness, or even the use of exploratory talk in any teaching programme, without first considering how groups engage in practice. It is important not to make the assumption that groups possess the skills to work as a team.

The implications of my research for teacher educators, is in offering a framework to help support trainee teachers in developing the skills to discursively collaborate within groups and to work as a team. A potential framework might include giving examples of politenes strategies, including the use of negative politeness and hedging. It could also include examples of how exploratory questions can be used in the building of consensus and guidance on maintaining an identity as a group through the use of 1stPP. The introduction of initial group-work activities involving short problem-solving tasks could be useful in allowing groups to reflect on their collective engagement before the Vision task. This would allow some reflection by trainee teachers on the discursive nature of group collaboration and support some discussion with teacher educators about any potential issues within the group and how the group might plan the Vision task. In addition, the one thousand word written evaluation at the end of the Vision module could be extended to include an evaluation of discursive collaboration within the group. The implication of thes

potential changes for trainee teachers is that an awareness of the role of discourse in the development of learning can be better understood particularly over time during the course of a collaborative task.

7.4.2 Avenues for further research

I considered the use of narrative as a further avenue for research. I wondered whether groups made use of the telling of stories in their collaborative discourse while working on a task. There were too few instances within my study to warrant analysis, but storytelling often from a personal perspective can have a role to play in collaborative discourse and serve as an involvement strategy (Tannen 2007:41). The gender dimension was another aspect that could be considered in future research. I noted differences which could have been gender-based (or possibly related to other social categories such as age or ethnicity) but each of these would have constituted a study in its own right. Gender was of particular interest, as a social constructivist approach to gender in discourse considers how people perform gender rather than the gender identities they already possess (McConnell-Ginet 2011:8). There is a view that the culture of politeness has replaced the authoritarian style of leadership in modern organisations, where according to Baxter there appears to be pressure on female leaders to perform politeness (Baxter 2010:110). This aspect is of interest in relation to my findings related to negative politeness and shared leadership. Non-verbal communication was also an area that could be explored, particularly as mime was used in the generation of humour within the group. Verbal and non-verbal communication may usefully be studied together (e.g.McNeil 2005:4). The study of narrative, gender and non-verbal communication could offer further perspectives into how effective collaboration is achieved within groups.

7.5 Concluding statement

There were some prominent features in the discourse of my high achieving group that could have been related to their success in regard to how the group collaboratively developed ideas, the construction of discursive roles and how they discursively construed themselves as a group. The use of politeness appeared in the generation of support, the joint exploration of ideas and as a feature of shared leadership within the group (RQ1-3). Exploratory talk was also a factor in the development of consensus and the co-construction of knowledge (RQ1-2). The collective responsibility of the group, the joint construction of ideas and the expression of mutual support was expressed through the use of 1stPP (RQ1&3). A shared knowledge and language of teaching, together with knowledge derived from prior experience and references to shared events and memories served to establish common ground (RQ 1-3). The group's establishment of common ground was central to the successful collaborative working of the group in the creation of new knowledge in their Vision of Education. I discussed the construction of the Vision by using a building metaphor in place of Tuckmans model (1965:396) which reflected the group's working (RQ2). My approach to Belbin's team-roles (2010:22) was original in that it focussed on discourse used in context in the construction of discursive roles (RQ2). There was also evidence to suggest that humour was used by more than one participant in maintaining conviviality within the group and I therefore introduced The Humorist, as an additional category to Belbin's team-roles (RQ2).

On the basis of my findings I conclude that discourse analysis is important in revealing at level of detail how a group perceived as effective jointly constructs knowledge (their Vision) (RQ1) alongside group relations (RQ2) and a common identity as a group (RQ3). It offers a contribution to the management literature in going beyond an interpretation of

152

team-roles through behaviour and psychometric testing and instead examines how these

are dynamically and interactionally achieved through discourse.

References

Adair, J. (2009) *Effective Teambuilding How to Make a Winning Team*, 2nd edn, London, Pan Macmillan.

Alexander, R. (2006, 3rd edn) *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*, 3rd edn, Cambridge, Dialogos UK Ltd.

Aritzeta, A., Senior, B. and Swailes, S. (2005). 'Team role preference and cognitive styles: a convergent validity study'. [online], *Small Group Research*, 36, 404–36. http://sgr.sagepub.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/content/36/4/404.full.pdf+html (accessed 6 May 2016).

Aritzeta, A., Swailes, S. and Senior, B.(2007) 'Belbin's team-role model: Development, validity and applications for team building', [online], *Journal of Management Studies*, 44 (1) http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/ (accessed 10 August 2015).

Bales, R.F. (1950) *Interaction Process Analysis: A Method For The Study of Small Groups*. Chicago: The Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Barnes, R. (2007) 'Formulations and the facilitation of common agreement in meetings talk', [online], *Text and Talk*, 27 (3), 273-296 http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.011(accessed 8 October 2014).

Barnes, D. and Todd, F. (1977) *Communication and Learning in Small Groups*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bassey, M. (1981) 'Pedagogic research; on the relative merits of the search for generalization and study of single events', *Oxford Review of Education,* 7(1),73-79.

Baxter, J. (2010) *The Language of Female Leadership*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Belbin, M. (1993) *Team Roles at Work*, London, Butterworth- Heinemann

Belbin, M. (2010) *Team Roles at Work*, 2nd edn, London, Butterworth- Heinemann.

Benne, K. and Sheats, P. (1958) 'Functional roles of group members', [online], *Journal of Social Issues*, 4, 41-49.

Biber, D., Conrad, S. and Leech, G. (2011) *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, 10th edn, Essex, Pearson.

Biech, E (2001) *The Pfeiffer Book Of Successful Team Building*, Sam Francisco, C.A, Josey-Bass/ Pfeiffer.

Bolden, G. (2009) 'Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker 'so' in English conversation', [online] *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 974-998, http://dx.doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2008.10.004 (accessed 19 April 2015).

Brannen, J. (2005) 'Prologue: Mixed methods for novice researchers: Reflections and themes', [online] *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(1) http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=17321495&site=ehost-live&scope=site (accessed 11 January 2016).

British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL) (2000) *Recommendations on good practice in applied linguistics* [online], http://www.baal.org.uk/goodprac.pdf. (accessed 23 December 2009).

British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011) *Revised ethical guidelines for educational research* [online], :http://www.bera.ac.uk/ (accessed 23 December 2009)

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978) 'Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena', in E. Goody (ed.) *Questions and Politeness*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1971) *The Relevance of Education*, London, Allen and Unwin.

Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S. and Yallop, C. (2001, 2nd edn) *Using Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn,Sydney, Macquarie University Press.

Choi, S. and Schnurr, S. (2014) 'Exploring distributed leadership: solving disagreements and negotiating consensus in a 'leaderless' team' [online], *Discourse Studies*, 16 (1), 3-24 http://sage.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/content/16/1/3.full.pdf+html (accessed 15 September 2015).

Coates, J. (2004) *Women Men and Language*, 3rd edn, Harlow, Pearson Longman.

Coates, J. (2007) 'Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy', [online] *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 29-49, www.elsevier.com/locate/program (accessed 3 September 2015

Coffey, A., Renold, E., Dicks, B., Soyinka, B. and Mason, B. (2006) 'Hypermedia ethnography in educational settings: possibilities and challenges' [online], *Ethnography and Education*, 1(1), http://www.informaworld.com (accessed 14 December 2009).

Coffin, C., Donohue, J. and North, S. (2009) *Exploring English Grammar*, London, Routledge.

Cohen, L., Marion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education*, London, Routledge.

Department For Education (2011) *Teachers' standards guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies,* [online], https://www.gov.uk/government/publications (accessed 22 April 2014).

Duszak, A. (2002) 'Us and others: An introduction', in A. Duszak (ed.) *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992) 'Think practically and look locally; Language and gender as community-based practice' *Annual Reiview Anthropology*, 21, 461-490, www.annualreviews.org (accessed 7th March 2014).

Edwards, D. and Mercer, N. (1987) *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in The Classroom*, London, Routledge.

Egolf, D, B. (2001) *Forming Storming Norming Performing*, USA, Writer's Club Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse*, London, Routledge.

Fetzer, A. and Bull, P. (2008) 'Well, I answer it by simply inviting you to look at the evidence' [online], *Journal of Language and Politics*, 7(2), http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=35026239&site=ehost-live&scope=site (accessed 21 April 2014).

Fisher, S.G., Hunter, T.A. and Macrossan, W.D.K (2001) 'A validation study of Belbin's team roles'[online], *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 121-144

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000591 (accessed 11 May 2016).

Flewitt, R. (2006) 'Using video to investigate preschool classroom interaction: education research assumptions and methodological practices' [online], *Visual Education*, 5(1), http://vg.sagepub.com (accessed 14 December 2009).

Foster, J. (2009) 'Understanding interaction in information seeking and use as a discourse: A dialogic approach'[online], *Journal of Documentation*, 65(1), http://www.emeraldinsight.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk (accessed 4 April 2010).

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archeology Of Knowledge And The Discourse On Language.* New York, Pantheon.

Fullan, M. (2001) *The New Meaning Of Educational Change*, 3rd edn, New York, Teachers College Press.

Gijlers, H., Saab, N., Van Joolingen, W.R., De Jong, T. and Van Hout-Wolterst, B.H.A.M (2009) 'Interaction between tool and talk: How instruction and tools support consensus building, in collaborative inquiry-learning environments', *Journal Of Computer Assisted Learning*, 25, 252-267.

Goffman, E.(1956) *The Presence of Self in Everyday Life.* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1967) 'On face work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction', *Reflections*, vol. 4(3), 7.

Gordon, J. (2002) 'A perspective on team building', *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 2(1), 85.

Graddol, D., Cheshire. J. and Swann, J. (2001) *Describing Language*, Buckingham, Open University Press

Gronn, P. (2000) 'Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership' [online], *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(3), http://ema.sagepub.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/content/28/3/317.full.pdf+html (accessed 22 June 2016).

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language As Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation Of Language and Meaning,* London, Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994) *An Introduction To Functional Grammar*, London, Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2002) *Linguistic Studies Of Text And Discourse*, London, Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2003) *On Language and Linguistics*, London, Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K, and Hasan, R (1976) *Cohesion in English*, Essex, Longman.

Hammersley, M. (2006) 'Ethnography: problems and prospects', [online], *Ethnography and Education*, 1(1), http://www.informaworld.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk (accessed 14 December 2009).

Harris, Z.S. (1952) 'Discourse analysis: A sample text', [online], *Language*, 28(4), http://www.jstor.org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/stable/409683 (accessed 28 September 2015).

Hellerman, J. (2003) 'The interactive work of prosody in IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves', [online], *Language in Society*, 32, 70-104, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4169241 (accessed 5 September 2015).

Hie-Jung You, (2015) 'Reference to shared past events and memories', [online], *Journal of pragmatics*, in press http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.02.003 (accessed 6 April 2015).

Holmes, J. (2007) 'Making humour work: Creativity on the job' [online], *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=27792837&site=ehost-live&scope=site (accessed 6 March 2014).

Holmes, J. and Marra, M. (2002) 'Over the edge? Subversive humor between colleagues and friends' [online], *Humor*, 15(1), http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=8940865&site=ehost-live&scope=site (accessed 6 March 2014).

Johnson, B. (1996) 'Repetition in discourse; a dialogues', *Advances in Discourse Processes*, 47, 1-20.

Kallia, A. (2004) 'Linguistic politeness: The implicative approach' *Multilingua,* 23, 145-169 .

Kecskes, I. and Zhang, Fenghui. (2009) 'Activating, seeking, and creating common ground: A socio-cognitive approach' [online], *Pragmatics & Cognition* 17(2),http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/ (accessed 27th October 2014)

Keller, R. (2013) *Doing Discourse Research: An Introduction For Social Scientists*, London, SAGE.

Kirton, M.J. (1976) *Adaptors and Innovators: Styles of Creativity and Problem Solving*. London, Routledge.

Kuo, C-H. (1999) 'The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles'. [online], *English For Specific Purposes*, 18(2),121-138,http://www.sciencedirect.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0889490697 00586 (9th August 2013)

Lam, C. (2011) 'Linguistic politeness in student- team emails: It's impact on trust between leaders and members' [online], *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 54(4)

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lee, B.H. (2001) 'Mutual knowledge, background knowledge and shared beliefs: Their roles in establishing common ground' [online], *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 21-44 www.sciencedirect.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk (accessed 27th October 2014)

Leech, G. (2014) *The Pragmatics of Politeness*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Lillis, T. and McKinney, C. (2003) *Analysing Language in Context: A Student Workbook*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books.

Litosseliti, L. (2010, ed) *Research Methods in Linguistics*, London, Bloomsbury.

Littleton, K. and Mercer, N. (2013) *Interthinking putting talk to work*, Oxon, Routledge.

Macphail, A., Patton, K., Parker, M. and Tannehill, D. (2014) 'Leading by example: Teacher educators' professional learning through communities of practice' [online], *Ques.* 66(1), http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2013.826139 (accessed 13 April 2014).

Markey, P.M., Suzuki, T. and Marino, D.P. (2014) 'The interpersonal meaning of humor styles' [online], *Humor*, 27(1), http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true &db=a9h&AN=94643026&site=ehost-live&scope=site (accessed 6 March 2014)

Martin, R.A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Grey, J. and Weir, K. (2003) 'Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of humor styles questionnaire' [online], *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, http://ac.els-cdn.comlibezproxy.open.uk/S00926566602005342 (accessed 22 April 2014)

Maybin, J. and Swann, J. (2007) 'Everyday creativity in language: Textuality contextuality, and critique' [online], *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4) 497-517 http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm036 (accessed 23 October 2014).

Mayor, B.M. (2006) 'Dialogic and hortatory features in the writing of Chinese candidates for the IELTS test' [online], *Language Culture & Curriculum*, 19(1), 104-121 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908210608668757 (accessed 28 September 2015).

McConnell-Ginet, S. (2011) *Gender Sexuality and Meaning*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning lessons: Social Organization In The Classroom*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Meirinka, J.A., Imants, J., Meijer, P.C. and Verloop, N. (2010) ' Teacher learning and collaboration in innovative teams' [online], *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(2), http://www.informaworld.com (accessed 2 August 2014)

Mercer, N. (1995) *The Guided Construction of Knowledge, Talk Amongst Teachers and Learners*, Avon, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mercer, N. (2000) *Words and Minds*, London, Routledge.

Mercer, N., Dawes, L., Wegeriff, R. and Sams, C. (2004) 'Reasoning as a scientist: ways of helping children to use language to learn science' [online], *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(3). http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk (accessed 23 April 2014).

Mercer, N. and Wegerif, R. (1997) *'A dialogical framework for researching peer talk'*, in R. Wegerif and P. Scrimshaw,(eds) *Computers and Talk In The Primary Classroom*, London, Multilingual Matters.

Meyerhoff, M. (2011) *Introducing* Sociolinguistics, 2nd edn, London, Routledge.

Moberg, U. and Eriksson, G. (2013) 'Managing ideological differences in joint political press conferences: A study of the strategic use of the personal pronoun 'we'' *Journal of*

Language and Politics, 12(3). http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login (accessed 27 October 2014).

Muijs, D. and Harris, A. (2007) 'Teacher leadership in (in) action: Three case studies of contrasting schools' [online], *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 35(1). http://ema.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/1/111 (accessed 04 May 2016).

Nielsen, M.N. (2013) 'Stepping stones in opening and closing department meetings' [online], *Journal of Business Communication*, 50(1). http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=10&sid 298c4e2b-212c-4a6d-be6d-2d9533bf8af7%40sessionmgr110&hid=103 (accessed 08 October 2014).

Nokes-Malach, T.J., Meade, M.L. and Morrow, D.G. (2012) 'The effect of expertise on collaborative problem solving' [online], *Thinking and Reasoning*, 18(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2011.642206 (accessed 04 April 2014).

Norrick, N.R. (1987) 'Functions of repetition in conversation', *Text*, 7, 245-264.

Norrick, N.R., Holmes, J. and Woodhams, J. (2013) 'Building interaction: the role of talk in joining a community of practice', *Discourse and Communication*, 7(3).

Nystrand, M., Wu, L., Gamorgan, A., Zeiser, S., and Long, D. (2003) 'Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse' [online], *Discourse Processes*, 35, 135-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP35023 (accessed 06 May 2016).

Ochs, E. (1979) 'Transciption as Theory' , in Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B.B. (eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics*, New York Academic Press.

O'Halloran, K.A. and Coffin, C. (2006) *Describing The Grammar of Speech and Writing*, 2nd edn, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Oliveira, A.W., Boz, U., Broadwell, G.A. and Sadler, T.D. (2014) ' Student leadership in small group science enquiry' [online]. *Research In Science And Technological Education*, 32(3), 281-297, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2014.942621 (accessed 31 March 2015).

Opie, C. (2004) *Doing Educational Research*, London, Sage.

Paltridge, B. (2012) *Discourse Analysis*, London, Bloomsbury.

Prusak, K.A., Vincent, S.D.and Pangrazi, R.P. (2005) 'Teacher talk' [online], *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76(3), http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2005.10608249 (accessed 07 April 2013).

Scheibman, J. (2002) 'Inclusive and exclusive patterning of the English first person plural: Evidence from conversation' [online], *Language, Culture, And Mind*, 26, http://ww2.odu.edu/~jscheibm/inclusive_and_exclusive.pdf (21 April 2013)

Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Schofield, P. (1994) *Quantifying Language*, Avon, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils,* London, Oxford University Press.

Smith, M., Polglase, G. and Parry, C. (2012) 'Construction of student groups using Belbin: Supporting group work in environmental management' [online], *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, (36) 4, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2012.692156 (accessed 06 May 2016).

Stockwell, P. (2008, 2nd edn) *Sociolinguistics A Resource Book for Students*, 2nd edn, London,   Routledge.

Sutherland, J. (2006) 'Promoting group talk and higher order thinking skills in pupils by 'coaching' secondary English teachers'[online], *Literacy*, 40(2), 106-114.

Swann, J. (2007) 'Designing 'educationally effective' discussion', *Language And Education*, 21(4), http://www.tandfonline.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.2167/le702.0 (accessed 21 April 2014).

Swann, J. (2010) 'Transcribing spoken interaction', in S. Hunston and D. Oakey, (eds) *Introducing Applied Linguistics: Key Concepts and Skills*, London, Routledge.

Swailes, S. and McIntyre-Bhatty, T. (2002) 'Scale structure of the Team Role Self Perception Inventory' [online], *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 525-529 http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=de09bc 52-2774-4473-a56b-81331b0334ed%40sessionmgr4004&vid=2&hid=4109 (accessed 6 May 2016).

Tannen, D. (1987) 'Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk', [online], *Language*, .63(3), 574-605, http://www.jstor.org/stable/415006 (accessed 5 September 2015).

Tannen, D. (2005) *Conversational Style*, 2nd edn,New York, Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (2007, 2nd edn) *Talking Voices Repetition, Dialogue And Imagery In Conversational Discourse*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, G. (2004) *Introducing Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn, London, Hodder Education.

Tombaugh, J.R. (2014) 'Teams on teams: Using advice from peers to create a more effective student team experience' [online], *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 18(4), http://web.b.ebscohost.com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/ehost/detail/detail?sid=38655a1a 81f9-4d58-95b5-a3d77cb0f19c%40sessionmgr114&vid=0&hid=123&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2Z!ZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=100277028&db=bth (accessed 30 March 2015).

Tuckman, B. (1965) 'Development sequences in small groups', *Psychological Bulletin*, 63 384-399.

Vangrieken, K.,Dochy, F an., Raes, E and Kynatt, E. (2015) 'Teacher collaboration: A systematic review', Educational Research Review, 15, 17-40, http://ac.els-cdn.cpm.libezproxy.open.ac.uk (accessed 5 August 2015)

Van Leeuwen, T. (2005) *Introducing Social Semiotics*, Oxon, Routledge.

Victoria, M. (2012) *Building Common Ground in Intercultural Encounters: How Canadia Immigrants Negotiate Communication and Establish Relations in an Employment Preparation Programme*. Unpublished PhD thesis, The Open University.

Vygotsky, L. (1986) *Thought and Language*, London, The MIT Press.

Wells, G. and Chang-Wells, G.L.(1992) *Constructing Knowledge Together*, Portsmouth, NH, Heinemann.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities Of Practice: Learning Meaning And Identity*, Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Wenger E., McDermott R, and Snyder W. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide To Managing Knowledge*, Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.

Western, S. (2012) '*An Overview of The Leadership Discourse*' in Preedy, M., Bennett, N. and Wise, C. (eds) *Educational Leadership Context, Strategy and Collaboration*, London Sage, Open University.

Wray, A. and Bloomer, A. (2013, 3rd edn.) *Projects in Linguistics and Language Studies*, 3rd edn, Oxon, Routledge.

Appendix 1 Vision for Education: Grading criteria for

group presentations

BEd Vision 40% of the mark for PDP

Your group is required to make a presentation at a conference entitled 'A Vision for Education'. You should provide a poster outlining the content of your presentation and submit this before the conference to the module leader.

Your group presentation will last approximately 15 minutes and may include multi-media presentation and distribution of documents

Following your presentation there will be an opportunity for members of the conference to ask questions, to make statements and for you to respond. This will explore the content of your presentation. There may also be comments on the process of your presentation. This will be approximately ten minutes.

All groups will be provided with evaluation sheets that will allow them to comment on each presentation and suggest a grade. Staff present will also complete evaluation sheets and agree a grade. A copy of the evaluation sheet is included in this module handbook with explanatory notes.

Module specific assessment criteria for the presentation:

Demonstrate an ability to articulate clearly and to present, through appropriate media, a reasoned argument in relation to educational issues chosen by your group.

Evidence that you have researched and evaluated a range of sources pertaining to an educational issue.

Demonstrate a sound base of subject knowledge and consideration of how particular subjects might contribute to possible future developments in education.

Appendix 2 A Vision for Education guidance notes

Guidance notes for the evaluation of group presentations

Peer group as well as academic staff assessment will be used as part of this element.

The form overleaf will be used for that purpose.

You are asked to consider each of the elements during the presentation and suggest a grade for each, and then offer an overall grade for the presentation.

Column 1 of the form gives you an indication of the points you should be looking for during the presentation. In that column you will see both specific questions and evidence that should be present.

You should use the following grades and the indicative criteria when making your assessment:

Grade A   An outstanding presentation both in terms of content and presentation. All elements of the form will have very positive responses. What you hear and see ought to be a very high level and worthy of presentation at a national event without further development. You may indicate A-, A or A+ to give some differentiation to outstanding presentations.

Grade B   A very good presentation to which you have given positive responses to each element group (Content, Presentation skills etc...). The group appeared confident in handling their material and in their manner of presentation. Again you may differentiate B- to B+.

Grade C   While this was a good performance overall, there were some weaknesses in one or two of the elements groups (Content, Presentation skills etc...). Additional work was needed to strengthen the content or presentation skills needed to be refined. Again you may differentiate C- to C+.

Grade D   This presentation was just about acceptable and it is likely that there will be some strong negative comments in one or two Elements groups. However, one or two better points saved it from being a fail. Do not differentiate this grade.

Grade E   You have recorded negative or very negative responses in three or four of the element groups. Overall you felt that the group did not understand their content nor were they able to give a coherent and clear presentation. Do not differentiate this grade.

Vision for Education – group evaluation sheet

Group doing presentation:

Elements of the presentation you are assessing	Notes and Grade for each element
Content: How easily were you able to identify the key issues that the group is presenting? To check how clear they are you ought to be able to note the main points they make – the easier you find it to do this the clearer their points are. To what extent do you think the presenters have researched the topic and feel confident about it?To check this you need to watch for references to authors, research work, sources of evidence for the claims they make etc. Overall, to what extent do you think the group addressed, in the content of their presentation, the task set?To check this you might wish to consider whether or not they wandered from the subject without justification, whether they included or omitted what you consider to be major issues. How well did the speaker(s) conclude the presentation and/or sum up their argument?	
Presentation skills: To what extent did you feel the group made the topic accessible to the audience? To what extent did you think there was a clear structure to the points made by the speaker(s)? To what extent did you think the group or speaker(s) were audible and spoke with ease and clarity? Was there an appropriate professional presentation of self in the approach taken by the speaker(s)? With what ease and appropriateness did the speaker(s) use different media to support the presentation?	

Quality of Resources/Material: List the variety of media used and consider whether the group chose appropriate and varied resources and media. How did the medium suit the message? Was there scope for other forms of media that were not used? If so, to what extent did this detract from the presentation?	
Ability to respond to questions and comments: How confident was the group or speaker(s) in responding to questions from the audience? You may wish to consider their ease in taking questions; the fluency of answers; their attitude to those asking the questions.	

Group

Final grade

Appendix 3 Pro-forma for file

Group File:

The group file will contain 3 sections:

Section A

The presentation poster
Copies of the 'papers' / speeches given at the presentation
Hard copies of multi-media material where appropriate
Evidence of research and how this was used to create the presentation
Copies of handouts

Section B

Records of meetings and discussions of the group prior to the presentation;
These records should use the proforma included in this handbook;
Group members should take turns in acting as recorder/secretary of each meeting.

Section C

Individual evaluations of the content and process (see below)

Module specific assessment criteria for the group file:

Demonstrate an ability to present, through appropriate media, a reasoned argument in
relation to educational issues chosen by your group;
Research and evaluate a range of sources pertaining to an educational issue;
Demonstrate a sound base of subject knowledge and consider how particular subjects
might contribute to possible future developments in education.
Produce a clear record of the group process including contributions to discussion, decision-
making, problem-solving and preparations for the presentation.

Appendix 4 Pro-forma for presentation

Group:	Names of group members:
Date submitted:	

Proposed title of presentation:

Brief outline of content:

Questions:

Appendix 5 Pro-forma for group meetings

Date	
Time	
Duration	
Names of those present (include apologies for absence and note how those absent will be informed and helped to contribute to the future work of the group)	
Recorder/secretary for this meeting	
Report of work undertaken since last meeting	
Issues discussed at this meeting (notes about main topics debated and reasons for accepting or rejecting ideas)	
Decisions taken (about ideas to be explored and tasks to be undertaken, by whom and by when)	
Date, time and place of next meeting	

Appendix 6 Letter of consent

From:

Desma Brown

School of Teaching Health and Care

University Centre

College X

Date: 2 February 2010

Dear Students,

Some of you will be aware that I am studying for a Doctorate in Education (Ed D.) with the Open University. My research interest is in sociolinguistics, which focuses on language used when we communicate with each other. I would like to invite you to take part in a research project which I am currently undertaking. My research is involved with the analysis of language in interaction and I very much hope that you will feel able to take part.

What is the project about?

The research is particularly concerned with an analysis of the language used during group interaction. I am particularly interested in the conversations that take place during your 'Vision' module preparation. This module has been recognised by external examiners as a strength of both courses involved with it and this is one of the reasons I chose to focus on an analysis of the interactional process that contribute to this.

If you agree to take part, what will you be asked to do?

You will not be asked to do any additional work or tasks. The research requires that you agree to your group meetings being recorded using a digital camera and voice recorder. From these I propose to produce transcripts of the conversation that takes place, so that I can conduct a linguistic analysis.

What's in it for you if you take part in the project?

It is a professional development experience for you. It will give you an insight into educational research and this will be valuable for you. It will be formally recognised in your reference that you have taken part in this research and of course you can add it to your CV.

What will happen to all the data collected on you?

In all accounts of the research, data will be anonymised and confidentiality will be assured. Although for those taking part in the same group interaction it may be possible for them to work out who said what.

Personal data (names etc) will be stored on dedicated computers and will be destroyed once the project has ended. Your own data will only be accessed by me.

I have a responsibility to behave ethically at all times and will follow the British Educational Research Association's Ethical Guidelines (2004).

Suppose you drop out of the project before the end?

This is an entirely voluntary project and is not linked in any way to teaching or assessment decisions relating to your work on the 'Vision' module or in any way to your degree qualification. You may withdraw from the study at any time without giving reasons and will be able to request the destruction of any data you have given me up to that point. I think you will find it an interesting project to be part of and I very much hope you will continue with me throughout the project.

What do you need to do now?

Please read through the consent information below. If you choose not to participate you need do nothing more. If, on the other hand, you choose, as I hope you will, then please sign below and return to me.

CONSENT INFORMATION:

I understand that this is a project examining language in group interaction.

There is no compulsion for me to participate in this research. If I choose not to take part, this will not affect my Vision module mark or training in any way.

If I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation. If I choose to withdraw, this will not affect my Vision module mark or training in any way.

Any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research which may include publications. No individuals will be identified in the final publication.

Confidentiality will be respected by the researcher with regard to the information which I give.

NAME

....

I have read and understood the nature of my involvement in the project and I will take part in it during this module 'Vision for Education'

Signed ....

Thank you

Desma Brown

Appendix 7 Transcription notation

= indicates no discernable gap between one speaker's utterance and the start of the next.

(.) shorter pause

(-) longer pause may refer to non-speech element such as laughter, sneeze etc.

((   )) doubt about the accuracy of the transcription

(   ) indecipherable word

(word) indecipherable word containing best guess

<u>Underlining</u> indicates words uttered with added emphasis

(pp) indicates words where the speaker speaks very quietly

[point at which an overlap between speakers begins

[…] some data omitted

(Swann 2007, p.166) (Stockwell 2008, p.76) – use of [in speaker overlap

Transcript coding
1stPP (we, us, our, ourselves, ourself)

bold text - repetition

politeness

shared experience

seeking agreement

Italics- tag question

183

Appendix 8 Transcript sample (Meeting 3)

01.33-12.00 minutes

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
basically I just						01.33
found that 4D						
really means						
4 dimensional						
which I think we						
already knew em						
already it's often						
used in em and so						
3D everything						
is 3D where scenes						
or objects appear						
to pop out but						
then the principle						
of 4D is that you						
actually you						
feel a fourth						
dimension to it						
smell						
you feel your						
feet shaking and						
vibrating under						
your seat that's						a few giggles around the table
it touch sensory						
that kind of						
thing and I looked						
at this website						
erm 4D creative						
they talk about a						
space being what's				Ohh sorry		02.29
what's wrong				just looking at the		
				website seeing and		
				(-) feeling as if		
				you've been		

186

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
yeah				there		
( )				do you want to		
				watch the video		
				now	you know they talk to schools if they	
					want 4D learning	
					they go to different	
( )					schools	some indecipherable talk from Tess and Talisha
4D inspirational						the group watch a clip of the video 03.02
				immersive		
immersive				space		
space				*that's what* we *were saying*		
				weren't		
				we		tag question
	the impact what do we call that			key point there		comments on video discussing enhancing the curriculum
					call it	
					transformational	
				did we call it that	learning	the video is playing in the background
		immersive				

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
				I'll think in		
				a minute		
				what I		04.36
				mean		
				so my		
				vision was		
( )			( )	(-)		looks down at video on i-pad
				<mark>we</mark> were talking		
				about it last week		
				what they're doing		
				doing now that's		looks at video on i-pad
				what I can see and		
				and that's what I		
				was thinking every		
				classroom would		
				look like		
	so it's already					
	something that is					
	out					
	there		( )			
		I think <mark>we</mark>				04.53
		can take				
		it beyond				
		that				
		think it's part of <mark>our</mark>				04.56
		steps progression				
		it can be <mark>we</mark> can				
		even show				
		that as part				
		of the steps				
		in **10 20**				
		years=		=<mark>can</mark> <mark>we</mark>		05.18

188

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
				say that all		
				classroom		
				will look like		
				this in **10**		
	=could we			**20 years**=		
	say					
	instead of					
	4D					
	learning					
	could we					
	say					
	creating					
	immersive					
	classrooms					05.29
and then create a						Tess and Tina look at Talisha
4D inspirational						
immersive creative						
space						05.14
	yeah			so what		
				could it be		
				we need		
				to personalise		
				that a bit better		
				don't we		05.20
				our vision is		
erm						
erm	educate or					
	teach			no I don't want to		
				put **teach** in it's		
				more exploring		
				isn't it		

189

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
environment						
or classroom						
or what if						
we say space				oops say that again		Tina looks down at Tess's notes
				sorry		
						05.44
our idea is to create			educational experience			Tom reaches for file
a 4D						
inspirational (.)						
immersive						
experience						
though						
immersive						
( )						
a 4D						
inspirational				creative		06.19
a 4D						
inspirational						
learning						
learning						
environment						
or do you want it						
exactly						
( )	got to explain how how and then it's					
	then it's					
( )						
just to get						
that title it's						

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
so..the title so like						
if you had to say						
what is our vision						
what is it is it						06.23
				I know to educate		
				children through a		
				think it's got to be		
				focussed on		
				education		
				not to teach		
				children		
				we're not		
				going to allow the		
				children to **explore**		
				to educate them so		
				it's going to be a		
				combination of		
				them		
				exploring and		
				finding		
				out and us		
				facilitating		
				to help them do it		
			yeah			Tom nods his head
				I think		
				definitely		shared experience
				like that place in		
				America that he		
				was		
				talking about erm		
				you know when		
				Cal Fish the guy in		
				America he took		
				the		

191

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
				children to do their own pre-learning (.)		
	yeah					06.59
		I've done some research on that and				
		it goes back to this guy called erm				
		looked it up this morning				Tom looking through notes reaches into bag to find notes
	so to educate children through immersive					
		=Carl Rogers		Carl Rogers		07.09
	( )	(yeah)				inaudible
( )		( )	( )			joint talk indecipherable
think it might be too much						
	4D immersive learning environment					
	that's a really good statement					
Oh my god						
	isn't it					07.49
to educate children through a						
	4D immersive learning environment					
	yep the 4D aspect					Talisha completes Tess's statement

192

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
	makes it hopefully					
	unique			and **immersive**		07.57
				tells you		
				it's everything		
				and it's a whole		
do **we** need						
to get						
multi-sensory in						
there	exactly					
	( )			( )		some joint talk
	immersion is					
	multi-sensory					
I think **we** have to						07.47
we have to						
expand on it						
erm (-)						
				or **blended**		
				learning		Tina faces Tess
				blended		
				learning		
		he used **blended**		that were the term		referring to a previous key-note lecture
		in a definition of		he used		
		of **blending** ICT with				
he said blended						
blended learning						
and then (.) don't						
know where we						
are at the						
moment though						

193

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
	we can touch on	traditional teaching				08.04
	we can go back to	and learning				
	all					
	that	this flipped				
		classroom				
		is what (.)		flipped		08.39
				classroom that		
				were it		
yeah				I think there would		
				be some emphasis		
				on our vision to		
				include (.)		
	( )			was somebody		
				ringing then		08.23
	could I just say who			to include		
	was it we said was			the flipped		
	doing minutes			classroom like (.)		
			me Tim			
	brilliant					Talisha looks around the group
do you have the						
proforma						
of like things you						
need to have in it						08.36

194

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
do you want to see			no			
it because		can we just				Tess looks in bag for the proforma
		outline				
		what we've done				
		the				
		proforma will speak				
		for itself we use this				
		as a guide				Tom hands paper to Terry
				so definitely		08.51
aw thanks				flipped learning		
				definitely		
				something		
				to do with blended		
				all these		
				phrases (.)		
	about that			( )		joint talk
	statement			think when		
				we do it		
				there's going to be		
				a		
				a rationale but I like		
				the idea did you call		
				it follow that thing		
				he came back to on		
				screen what was it		
						using tablet to scroll through the notes of the keynote lecture that morning
	the open badges			definitely		

195

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
				the open badges it		
				were it task studios		
				what were it called		
				that thingy		
	cantasia studios			task studios		09.39
	studios where you			Yeah		
	take a video and (.)					
				think that would be		
				nice if we are going		
				to present our		
				vision to do		
				something maybe if		
				we don't want to		
				to stand and talk		
				to do film		
				our-selves		
				beforehand		
				and have ourself		
				already on video (.)		
yeah				then if we wanted		
				to do role-play or		
				do it through a		
				different way we're		
				there doing it but (.)		
		it's a good ideal				
		what's the video				
		called?				
	Cantasia					
[does		[Cantasia				
everyone	yeah			Cantasia		
( )						

196

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
does everyone					cantasia	09.57
agree then that						
that could be our						
like our opening						
statement						
		could you				
		repeat				
our group vision is					I think so	
to educate						
children through						
a 4D immersive						
learning						
environment						
		educate children				10.27
		can we improve on				
		that				
yeah						
		and build it around				
		er building you				
		know				
		building the whole				
		child building their				
		sort of problem				
		solving and creating				
		and reasoning				
		abilities perhaps it's				
yeah		perhaps it's a bit				
yeah		generic education				10.38
but it is ( )	( )				( )	joint indecipherable talk
just a						
starting						
point and						

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
then **we'll**	I do think **we** need					
	something that's					
	quite relevant so					
	education think					
	have					
	to be it's nearly					
	we're into too					
	many					
	little words			you said about the		10.57
				rounded person cos		
				we did say that		
				originally and that		
				way **we've** been		
				in a group to talk		
				about it		
our vision to						11.04
educate children						
in a fully						
immersive						
learning						
environment						
to do something						
something			[the areas	[to develop		
			that **we**			
			we're going			
			to look at			
			anyway			
			there's the			
			learning			
			environment			
			the classroom			

198

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
			there's the role that the teacher has			11.17
	yeah cos it's not just					
	the child **we're**					
	thinking about the					
	whole **environment**					
	aren't we					tag question
where were **our**						
notes from last						
week sorry						
			maybe **we** use the badge system to			hedging with use of maybe
			assess or erm			11.30
		shall I read				
		the notes				
		out from				
		last week				
you know the big spider diagram he had is that in there						Tess looks at Tom
		yeah				
that was						
on the ( )						11.39
		I've taken that in				
		we talked about 4D				
		learning learning				
		environments				
		ICT projections				
		(......)				
		sound smell taste				
		feel which				
		transports				
		children into a				

Tess	Talisha	Tom	Tim	Tina	Tazmin	time /notes
		virtual world				
		the classroom then		children		Tina speaks quietly
		there's some				
		examples				
		child-led learning				
		learning where				
		teachers are				
	[that's all there it's	[facilitators				
	all there					12.00

200