

摘 要

责任性谈话理念下的课堂倡导师生共同对课堂教学目标的实现做出贡献,分为对学习共同体负责、对准确知识负责和对严谨思维负责三个维度,要求教师具有较高的课堂组织能力。而建构观下的课堂会话身份研究可以帮助教师更好了解课堂会话的组织和交际过程,帮助教师有意识地利用身份资源促进学生课堂参与。然而,现阶段国内对责任性谈话的研究尚处于萌芽阶段,教师身份研究虽然备受关注,但针对初中英语教师会话身份建构的实证探索不足。因此,本研究将会话身份置于责任性谈话的背景下,探究责任性谈话片段中教师会话身份的建构,以期为初中英语教师打造责任性谈话课堂提供参考。

基于身份会话分析路径,本研究采用课堂观察和会话分析的研究方法,以19节初中英语常态课为研究对象,提取出40个可用于责任性谈话评估的片段,按照等级量表打分后分为高低质量,从中探究教师会话身份建构的特点,分析其对责任性谈话质量的影响。研究旨在回答以下三个问题:(1)初中英语教师在责任性谈话中倾向于建构何种会话身份?(2)每种会话身份建构所采用的会话常规特点是什么?(3)教师会话身份建构如何影响责任性谈话的质量?研究结果如下:

首先,本研究发现教师在责任性谈话中主要建构了交流者、教授者、组织者和监管者四种会话身份。在高低质量责任性谈话中,教师均倾向于建构交流者和教授者身份,然后是组织者,监管者的占比最小。

其次,每种会话身份建构所采用的会话常规在高低质量责任性谈话中有其共同特点,也存在显著差异。具体而言,教师在建构组织者身份时,通过发指令组织课堂,并使用点名、提问等方式引导学生参与讨论。在高质量责任性谈话中,作为组织者,教师多通过提问实现话轮转换以增加学生输出;在低质量责任性谈话中,教师则多采用点名实现话轮转换,但转换较少,话轮设计也以要求学生跟上课堂进程为主。建构监管者身份时,教师大量使用指令并扩展序列来规约学生行为。在高质量责任性谈话中,作为监管者,教师使用陈述句和祈使句强调责任性谈话相关规则,并使用逻辑关系客观化指令;在低质量责任性谈话中,教师的规约监管行为更为专制,没有使用客观化指令。建构教授者身份时,教师通过提

供信息、提问和发指令使自身话语占据主导。在高质量责任性谈话中，作为教授者，教师多采用提问、澄清请求等行为促进师生知识共建；在低质量责任性谈话中，教师往往会解释学生观点或者直接提供信息，以知识传输为主。建构交流者身份时，教师采用点名和提问实现话轮转换，以接受、评价和评论给予反馈，教师话语主导下降，学生话轮长度增加。在高质量责任性谈话中，作为交流者，教师通过提问引导学生合理表述观点，并给予针对性反馈促进发言者观点间的联系；在低质量责任性谈话中，教师通过点名实现多次话轮转换，但给予的反馈以接受或简单评价为主，学生发言走向不合逻辑，讨论氛围不够严谨。

最后，教师会话身份建构主要从如何控制自身权威和如何有效引导讨论两方面影响责任性谈话质量。弱话轮控制、客观化指令、问答基本相邻对以及自然的过渡有助于控制教师指令性权威，促进学生对责任性谈话规则的理解与执行；而师生知识共建、扩展序列结构以及严谨活跃的讨论氛围有助于控制教师知识性权威，提高学生课堂参与度，推进教学目标实现。

基于上述研究结论，为打造高质量责任性谈话课堂，本研究建议教师（1）降低话轮控制，采用客观化指令，合理控制教师权威；（2）灵活扩展序列结构，区分传输知识和共建知识，组织严谨而活跃的课堂讨论。

关键词：责任性谈话；会话身份；会话常规；初中英语课堂

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
ABSTRACT	II
摘 要	V
CONTENTS	VII
List of Tables	IX
List of Figures	X
Chapter One Introduction	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Research Significance	2
1.3 Layout of the Thesis	2
Chapter Two Literature Review	4
2.1 Major Concepts in This Study	4
2.1.1 Accountable Talk	4
2.1.2 Conversational Identity	8
2.2 Previous Research on Accountable Talk and Teacher Identity Construction	11
2.2.1 Previous Research on Accountable Talk	11
2.2.2 Previous Research on Teacher Identity Construction	13
2.3 Theoretical Foundations	15
2.3.1 The Social Constructionist Approach to Identity	15
2.3.2 The Conversation Analytic Approach to Identity	16
Chapter Three Research Methodology	21
3.1 Research Questions	21
3.2 Research Participants	22
3.3 Research Methods	22
3.3.1 Classroom Observation	22
3.3.2 Conversation Analysis	23
3.3.3 Rubrics of Accountable Talk Practice	23
3.4 Data Collection and Analysis	25

Chapter Four Results and Discussion	28
4.1 Conversational Identities of English Teachers in Accountable Talk Extracts	28
4.1.1 Types of Conversational Identities	28
4.1.2 Tendency of Conversational Identity Construction	29
4.2 Conversational Practices in Conversational Identity Construction	31
4.2.1 Identity Construction as Organizers	31
4.2.2 Identity Construction as Regulators	35
4.2.3 Identity Construction as Instructors	40
4.2.4 Identity Construction as Communicators	45
4.3 Conversational Identities' Influence on Accountable Talk Practice's Quality	51
4.3.1 Teachers' Ways of Controlling Their Authority over the Classes	52
4.3.2 Teachers' Ways of Leading Discussions	53
Chapter Five Conclusion	55
5.1 Major Findings of the Research	55
5.1.1 Tendency of Conversational Identity Construction in Extracts	55
5.1.2 The Features of Conversational Practices in Identity Construction	55
5.1.3 Conversational Identities' Influence on Accountable Talk Practice	57
5.2 Pedagogical Implications	58
5.3 Limitations of the Research and Suggestions for Future Study	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDICES	65
Appendix 1: The Transcription Symbols Used in Accountable Talk Extracts	65
Appendix 2: Scores on Accountable Talk Categories in 40 Extracts	66
Appendix 3: Different Acts Performed in the Construction of Identity	67
Appendix 4: Examples of High and Low Levels of Accountable Talk Extracts ..	69
攻读学位期间发表的学术论文	73
浙江师范大学学位论文诚信承诺书	74
浙江师范大学学位论文独创性声明	75
学位论文使用授权声明	75

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Taxonomy of Accountable Talk	5
Table 2-2 Categories of Accountability to Learning Community	5
Table 2-3 Categories of Accountability to Accurate Knowledge	6
Table 2-4 Categories of Accountability to Rigorous Thinking	7
Table 3-1 Information of English Teachers	22
Table 3-2 Rubrics of Accountable Talk Practice	24
Table 3-3 Information of Observed Extracts	25
Table 4-1 Time Used in Conversational Identity Construction	30
Table 4-2 Features of Positive and Negative Conversational Identities	52

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 Analytical Framework for the Present Study	20
Figure 4-1 Distribution of Acts Performed in Organizers' Construction	31
Figure 4-2 Distribution of Acts Performed in Regulators' Construction	36
Figure 4-3 Distribution of Acts Performed in Instructors' Construction	40
Figure 4-4 Distribution of Acts Performed in Communicators' Construction	46

Chapter One Introduction

Three parts are included in this chapter. Firstly, the research background is introduced, and then the research significance from both theoretical and practical aspects is stated. Lastly, the layout of the thesis is presented.

1.1 Research Background

At present, the discourse of foreign language curriculum in China emphasizes the changes from teacher-centered to learner-centered; from knowledge transmission to knowledge co-construction; from the cultivation of foreign language skills to the development of comprehensive language application ability (Chen Lin et al., 2002). These changes entail a more dynamic, interactive and dialogic-intensive approach rather than the traditional way of teaching which relies on rote-learning.

Accountable Talk is a kind of dialogic teaching approach, which is a part of the Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) tool developed by the University of Pittsburgh. It believes that for classroom discourse to promote learning it must be accountable: to the learning community, to accurate and appropriate knowledge, and to rigorous thinking (Michaels et al., 2010). Although there are studies employing accountable talk to assess the instructional quality of mathematics lessons (Boston & Wolf, 2006), science lessons (Motlhabane, 2016), and reading comprehension lessons (Wolf et al., 2004; Matsumura et al., 2004; Ardasheva et al., 2016), little research has been conducted under the context of junior middle school English classes in China. And prior research on accountable talk has concentrated largely on exploring the features of talk moves and correlation among scores of each dimension, while the issue of dynamic nature of identity construction and its relationship to the development of ongoing talk has received little attention.

In terms of the situation, the present research attempts to explore what conversational identities English teachers construct in accountable talk extracts, and then analyze how they construct these conversational identities. The research intends to propose an analytic perspective that combines identity construction with

accountable talk practice to offer pedagogical implications.

1.2 Research Significance

The significance of this research involving both theoretical and practical aspects is presented and discussed in this part.

As for the theoretical significance, there are mainly two aspects. On the one hand, exploring accountable talk in junior middle school English classes in China can broaden the research scope of this theory and provide more empirical evidence, which can in turn help to prove and improve its practicality. Although many foreign researchers have applied accountable talk to different lesson types such as mathematics and sciences, related research in the EFL (English as a foreign language) field at home is scant. Therefore, applying it to analyze the quality of accountable talk in English classes in China can help enrich the use of this theory. On the other hand, this research reveals the conversational identities of teachers in accountable talk practice, which enriches the study of identity construction in specific pedagogic contexts, and proves that identity as a tool can achieve communication purposes, and influence the development of ongoing talk.

In terms of the practical significance, firstly, it can give English teachers a direct insight into the quality of accountable talk practice to help them improve talk moves in their classrooms. Furthermore, it can help to create an accountable talk community where students are willing to listen, talk, and more importantly capable of providing warranted evidence for their claims. Secondly, it inspires English teachers to cultivate the awareness of constructing conversational identities by consciously choosing appropriate conversational strategies that suit the given classroom contexts.

1.3 Layout of the Thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter one is an introduction to the research, in which the research background, significance and organization are presented.

Chapter two made up of three parts offers the literature review of the thesis. The first part explains the major concepts, and the second part reviews the previous

research on accountable talk and teacher identity construction. The third part focuses on elaborating the theoretical foundations of the research to come up with the analytical framework.

Chapter three deals with the research methodology. It first presents the research questions and hypothesis, and then it describes research participants, methods as well as data collection and analysis in detail.

Chapter four is the main body of the research, which presents and discusses the results of the three research questions. Specifically, the types and tendency of teachers' conversational identities are revealed in the first part; teachers' conversational practices applied in the identity construction are distinguished and analyzed in the second part with the help of figures and examples; conversational identities' influence on the quality of accountable talk practice is summarized in the third part.

Chapter five is the conclusion part. It gives a summary of major findings based on chapter four, and then provides pedagogical implications for English teachers in junior middle school to improve their practices of accountable talk through constructing conversational identities properly. At last, the limitations of the research and suggestions for future study are stated.

Chapter Two Literature Review

Chapter two provides an overall review of relevant studies. Firstly, the major concepts including accountable talk and conversational identity are explained. Then the previous research on accountable talk and teacher identity construction is presented to rationalize the theoretical foundations of the study. At last, the analytical framework is formed based on the theoretical foundations.

2.1 Major Concepts in This Study

The focus of this study is to explore teachers' conversational identity construction in accountable talk extracts, so it is necessary to have a clear view of these two concepts: accountable talk and conversational identity.

2.1.1 Accountable Talk

Accountable talk emphasizes the forms and norms of discourse that support and promote equity and access to learning (Michaels et al., 2008). Under the context of accountable talk, every participant is identified as both a listener and a speaker, to promote the realization of teaching objectives together (Wang Juan, 2017). Accountable talk classrooms are filled with talk that seriously responds to and further develops what others have said. This productive talk uses evidence appropriately and follows norms of good reasoning, which sharpens students' thinking by reinforcing their ability to use and create knowledge (Michaels et al., 2010). Thus, three dimensions are summarized: (1) accountability to the learning community; (2) accountability to accurate knowledge; (3) accountability to rigorous thinking (Michaels et al., 2010). To be more specific, the accountable talk dimensions, regardless of the content area, serve as the mechanism for socializing students into communities of practice by creating a discourse community that asks students to listen to others' perspectives in an effort to learn more, make reference to specific information, support their claims or understandings with evidence, and question concepts they do not understand or agree with (Ardasheva et al., 2016).

Under three dimensions, there are seven categories: (1) participation rate, (2)

teacher's linking, (3) students' linking, (4) teacher's asking for accurate knowledge, (5) students' providing accurate knowledge, (6) teacher's asking for rigorous thinking, and (7) students' providing rigorous thinking (Wolf et al., 2004). Among these categories, the first one, participation rate is not concerned in this research since it measures only the quantity of classroom discourse which is not the focus of this research. The following table presents a clear structure of accountable talk.

Table 2-1 Taxonomy of Accountable Talk

Dimensions	Categories
Accountability to the Learning Community (ALC)	Teacher's linking (T:L)
	Students' linking (S:L)
Accountability to Accurate Knowledge (AAK)	Teacher's asking for accurate knowledge (T:K)
	Students' providing accurate knowledge (S:K)
Accountability to Rigorous Thinking (ART)	Teacher's asking for rigorous thinking (T:Th)
	Students' providing rigorous thinking (S:Th)

2.1.1.1 Accountability to the Learning Community

According to Wolf et al. (2005), accountability to the learning community measures the extent to which the teacher and students explicitly link different people's ideas. Specifically, under this dimension, there are two categories. Detailed descriptions and relevant indicators are presented in the following table.

Table 2-2 Categories of Accountability to Learning Community

Categories	Description	Indicators
Teacher's linking	To what extent does the teacher explicitly link different people's ideas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Keeping the channels open; ◆ Keeping everyone together; ◆ Linking contributions; ◆ Verifying and clarifying.
Students' linking	To what extent do the student explicitly link different people's ideas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Active participating in classroom talk and listening attentively to one another; ◆ Challenging, clarifying each others' contributions, and building up ideas together.

Based on Wolf et al. (2005) and Michaels et al. (2010)

There are four indicators when teachers link different ideas. Firstly, keeping the channels open can be achieved by talk moves like "Did everyone hear that?" or "Say that again, so everyone can hear you" to make sure that all the students can hear and

be heard. By using these kinds of talk moves, teachers give students opportunities to reflect on their participation during the interaction. Secondly, teachers can keep everyone together on the same page with talk moves like “Can you repeat that in your own words?” or “Was that what you were trying to say?”, which can assess students’ attention and encourage them to output. Thirdly, linking contributions by asking questions like “Who wants to add on what he just said?”, “Who disagrees?” to help students frame their contributions and elaborate ideas on each others’ contributions. Finally, verifying and clarifying students’ contributions by saying “So, are you saying...?” or “You mean...?” is to offer speakers another chance to make them understood by others. And students’ linking moves can be observed and analyzed according to the above indicators, i.e. whether they actively participate, attentively listen and elaborate on others’ ideas or not. Students’ linking requires teachers to guide and scaffold their participation (Michaels et al., 2010).

2.1.1.2 Accountability to Accurate Knowledge

Accountability to accurate knowledge measures the degree to which the teacher and students make sure that participants provide specific and accurate knowledge as evidence to support their statements. Under this dimension, there are also two categories. Detailed information is shown below.

Table 2-3 Categories of Accountability to Accurate Knowledge

Categories	Description	Indicators
Teacher’s asking for accurate knowledge	To what extent does the teacher press students to support their ideas with evidence based on the text?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Pressing for accuracy; ◆ Building on prior knowledge.
Students’ providing accurate knowledge	To what extent do the students support their ideas with evidence based on the text?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Proving evidence by making use of specific and accurate knowledge; ◆ Making reference to the text or prior classroom experience.

Based on Wolf et al. (2005) and Michaels et al. (2010)

To display accountability to accurate knowledge, students should make use of specific and accurate knowledge, like evidence from the text, citing an example, and referring to prior classroom experience to back up their claims. And teachers should

以上内容仅为本文档的试下载部分，为可阅读页数的一半内容。如要下载或阅读全文，请访问：<https://d.book118.com/455020333211011244>