



Researching change and literacy development,





Teaching and learning are mediated through the discourse of the classroom, and thus teacher-student interaction plays a very important role in students' language development, especially for students for whom the language or dialect of school is different from that used at home. For students from cultural backgrounds with interactional styles different from that which dominates in most classrooms, the ways in which teachers interact with them may become a barrier to success at school if students and teachers are operating according to different sociolinguistic conventions. This paper will explore aspects of this issue, drawing on examples of different ways in which teachers of Indigenous Australian students follow-up students' responses to questions or other forms of teacher-initiated interaction. It will consider how different types of teacher follow-up of student responses may serve to foster or impede opportunities for interaction, and thus aspects of language development. The classroom interaction data on which this paper is based are drawn from that collected as part of a large, cross-sectoral project, funded by the Australian Research Council and industry partners¹, and is investigating the effectiveness of the literacy teaching strategies that teachers employ when working with junior primary-aged Indigenous Australian students with conductive hearing loss.






This paper is an exploratory study of some of the ways in which teachers respond to responses given by students in Pre-Primary to Year 3 during lessons whose main objective is language development. These lessons include oral language skills, such as phonological awareness, and production and reception of various types of extended oral language. As learning is mediated through classroom discourse, it is important to investigate not only what the teachers do, or say they do, but also how their interaction with students may contribute to language development. The data on which this paper is based are drawn from Pre-primary to Year 3 classes (5-8 year-olds) in various parts of Western Australia, and include Indigenous² Australian students who have conductive hearing loss as a result of otitis media (middle ear infection). For these children, there is not only the issue of hearing impairment having impacted negatively on early language development, with the consequences that may have for acquiring written literacy, but also the issue of having to adjust at school to different sociolinguistic conventions. This too can have a significant impact on students and their acquisition of written literacy. Thus, the way in which teachers interact with their students is very important.

Teacher talk has frequently been characterised as controlling, reinforcing the asymmetry of power between teachers and students. Fisher (1993), for example, sums up the distinguishing features of teacher talk as "[asking] a lot of questions... [initiating] discourse topics... [attempting] to control the content of classwork by a variety of discourse strategies such as feedback... elicits, reformulations, constructions and selected emphases through repetition" (p. 239).

The implication of Fisher's characterisation of classroom interaction is that the typical pattern of interaction inhibits student participation (Candela, 1999). The analytical framework from which analyses such as Fisher's derive is the I-R-F (also known as the I-R-E) pattern of classroom interaction, first explicated by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), and now generally identified as the unmarked, or default, pattern of classroom interaction (Cazden, 1988). In this pattern, classroom interaction consists of a tri-partite exchange of Initiation - Response - Follow-up or Feedback (Evaluation, in the case of I-R-E). Generally, the teacher is the speaker who initiates an exchange, often by means of a display question (that is, a question to which the teacher already knows the answer but wants to check the student's knowledge). Then, a student responds, and the teacher follows up, comments on, or evaluates the student's response. The following exchange from a Year 1 class typifies the I-R-F pattern:

Example 1

T	What are some words that rhyme with pig?	
	Sally!	
S	Jig.	
T	Jig.	
	Well done!	

[AW10802]⁴

It is this type of interaction in which the teacher repeats the student's reply and then 'evaluates' the quality of the reply, here by adding a word of praise for its correctness, that has given rise to comments that classroom interaction inhibits student participation. I-R-F interactions frequently generate only one or a few words from the student by way of answer. Then, participation in the interaction is very tightly controlled by the teacher as they determine the topic, the type of questions to be asked, who will answer them and what answers will be accepted, and even in what form they will be accepted. Such interactional

patterns have significant implications for language development, as they appear to limit opportunities for students to have extended speaking turns, and one of the factors that contributes to language development is lengthy turns at talking.

Many utterances in the F slot of typical classroom interactions serve an evaluative function, but there are also other functions served by utterances in that position. A number of recent studies focussing on classroom interaction and language development (e.g., Cullen, 1998, 2002; Hall, 1998; Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Westgate & Hughes, 1998) have drawn attention to some of the other functions that utterances in the F slot of I-R-F exchanges may serve in classroom discourse, given that most of the interaction in classrooms has "a pedagogical purpose" (Nassaji & Wells, 2000, p. 239) of supporting and enhancing learning (Cullen, 1998). Among the functions identified as served by teachers' follow-ups to students' responses are evaluating (accepting/rejecting/correcting), repeating, reformulating, exemplifying, expanding (extending), eliciting, justifying, qualifying, and exploring (Fisher, 1993; Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Westgate & Hughes, 1998). In addition, as Westgate and Hughes demonstrate, follow-ups can also serve to support students' cognitive development. Consideration of the cognitive development function of follow-ups is outside the scope of the present paper, but is the subject of a forthcoming publication.

Cullen (2002) suggests that follow-ups have two main roles - evaluative and discursal - and that each role supports learning in different ways. The functions listed above can be broadly categorised as fulfilling one or other of those roles. Evaluative follow-ups are those in which the teacher responds on the basis of accuracy or correctness, for example, of information supplied or of linguistic form used, as the teacher in Example 1 does. Evaluative follow-ups generally co-occur with interactions initiated with display questions, and may be realised in a number of different ways. One realisation is repetition of a student's response (see Example 1, above). Another common form is reformulation, or recast, of a response to express the same idea more correctly, for example,

Example 2

T Mac, what is the dog doing?

S **La**ughing.

T **La**ughing.

(bolding added)

[MD300702]

A third common way is, of course, a simple affirmative, such as, *Yes, Right,* or *OK*. Alternatively, it may be a simple negative, such as *No,* or *Not quite,* either with the correct answer given, as in Example 3, or a further initiation to seek to elicit the correct answer.

Example 3

T What did he do, Zane?

S He went to his Nan and Pop's and played on the trampoline.

T ~~He~~ He didn't go to Nanna and Pop's, he went to some different family.

[JB190802]

Jarvis and Robinson (1997) describe these types of follow-ups as 'retrospective,' meaning that they link back to the preceding interaction, and serve functions such as providing a correct model for students, and ensuring, for example, that the information is available to all participants so that everyone can be part of the ongoing interaction (Cullen, 1998, 2002).

Thus, if children have hearing problems and the student responding spoke softly, a repetition or reformulation by the teacher, given a louder voice, is more likely to be heard by these children. Further, if the reformulation focuses on a word ending (as in Example 2, with *he's*), the repetition may help the child to hear the word final sound.

Discoursal follow-ups, on the other hand, generally focus on the message or content a student is trying to contribute, and frequently co-occur with 'referential' questions, that is, questions that are seeking information not already known to the questioner. Discoursal follow-ups have both a retrospective and a prospective focus (Jarvis & Robinson, 1997). They follow-up what has previously been said or spoken about, but also provide a foundation for moving the interaction forward, for example, by eliciting more information about the topic under discussion, as in Example 4.

Example 4

T Do you think they're all made out of
different stuff, do you?

S Yeah.

T 

S They might not be.

[AG300702]

The foregoing outline has presented a somewhat broader perspective of the tri-partite exchange pattern from that frequently presented in discussions of classroom interaction, where the focus is often on the consequences of the power differentials in classrooms, and the effects of teacher control of interaction. Before considering how teachers participating in the present project followed up students' responses, some aspects of the teacher's role within the classroom need to be considered briefly.

In tri-partite exchanges there are three roles involved - initiator of interaction, 'primary knower' (that is the participant who has the knowledge to provide the information required), and secondary knower (the one who needs information). In a classroom situation, the roles of initiator and primary knower may, and commonly do, come together in one person, the teacher (Nassaji & Wells, 2000). Teachers generally initiate interaction because they are the primary knowers and also have vested in them the responsibility to pass on knowledge (Gerot, 1992). Furthermore, Nassaji and Wells suggest, someone has to assume the role of manager of classroom interaction so that discussion proceeds in an orderly manner and everyone involved can benefit. In classrooms, this role of manager of interaction is almost always filled by the teacher, even if they are not the primary knower. Even if the teacher does not initiate interaction (I slot), they frequently assume a role akin to that taken by the initiator of interaction, of following-up as well as responding to the initiation. This also serves to put the teacher more firmly in control of classroom interaction, and arbiter of what topics may be talked about, by whom, and for how long.

When considering the teacher as manager of classroom interaction within the I-R-F framework, the issue may not so much be who initiates the interaction, but how it is followed up; that is, what functions are (potentially) fulfilled by the ways in which the teacher follows up student responses. In the context of working with Indigenous students, there is a further issue involved, which is not only what functions follow-ups might serve, especially in relation to literacy development, but also the extent to which the follow-ups may or may not be compatible with Indigenous interaction styles. It is therefore of interest to investigate the

types of interaction that occur between teachers and students, in particular the ways in which teachers respond to, or follow-up, responses that students' give.



The data are drawn from lessons given by some of the teachers participating in a large cross-sectoral research project, investigating literacy teaching strategies used by teachers whose classes include Indigenous students with conductive hearing loss. The samples include data from both urban and remote area schools. Class sizes vary from eight to 30 students, and the proportion of Indigenous students in each class varies from 15% to 100%. The lessons on which this analysis and discussion have drawn were all language and literacy lessons, but varied in terms of specific focus and activities used. Table 1 provides an overview of the composition of a sample of 20 lessons. Further analysis of the larger sample is needed to confirm the pattern shown in Table 1, but indications to date suggest that the outcome would be similar.

Table 1 Components of language and literacy lessons

Component	n	%
Reading books	13	65
Writing preparation/writing	12	60
Phonological awareness	8	40
Language games	3	15

Note: Most lessons included several activities; hence totals are greater than 100%



Analysis of the types of follow-ups used by teachers in each activity indicates some common interactional patterns across activities. Lessons involving reading books, writing preparation/writing, and development of phonological awareness skills are characterised by the use of display questions as the teachers' main form of initiation; short responses from students (often only one or a few words); and teacher follow-up that includes evaluation of the accuracy or acceptability of responses. The following examples illustrate some of these characteristics:

Example 5 (Year 1 - Reading books)

- T What sort of animals can you see there, Damien?
- D Elephants **R**
- T Mm hmm
- T What about you, Troy? You name one?
- [JG210802]

Example 6 (Pre-primary - Year 2 - Reading books)

- T What do we call this part of the book?
- S Cover **R**
- T Ah, ah, no, I'm not going to talk to anyone who calls out today.
- T What do we call this part of the book – this hard bit that looks after the pages and stops them getting all broken and torn? What's it called Mark?

M Cover R
 T It's called the cover. Good boy ☛
[PC310702]

Example 7 (Year 2 - Writing preparation)

T Put up your hand and tell me what did you ☛
 have on Friday?
 [Students put hands up] ☛
 Lovely hand up Paul. ☛h
 P Pupil free day. R
 T Good. You had a pupil free day on Friday, ☛h
 which means you didn't come to school.
[SO109802]

The interactions in Examples 5, 6 and 7 commence with an initiation by the teacher, a student responds (usually only after nomination by the teacher), and then a follow-up by the teacher, with an indication of correctness or acceptability of the response. The realisation of the follow-up varies. In Example 5, the acceptability of the student's response is primarily signalled intonationally (*Mm hmm*) but also by the teacher moving on immediately to ask another student for an answer to a question. The teacher in Example 6 engages in two exchanges. The first overtly corrects a student's behaviour and serves to reinforce required classroom routines of waiting to be nominated before responding. (In some other contexts, teachers simply ignore violations of classroom norms and do not acknowledge the speaker at all.) She then recommences the exchange and nominates a student to respond, and follows-up in several ways. The reformulation of the student's answer into a 'full sentence' provides all her students with a model of a Standard Australian English⁴ grammatical form. Further, the teacher's repetition of the content of the student's answer serves to signal it as correct. An even more elaborated follow-up is evidenced in Example 7, with a reformulation and an expansion of the ideas in the student's answer, as well as an evaluation of his performance.

In cases where a student's response is incorrect, the teacher may explicitly correct the student in the follow-up (e.g., Example 3). Alternatively, the teacher may ask a question that is intended, implicitly, to indicate to the student that their answer was incorrect and needs modification in some way, as in Example 8.

Example 8 (Year 1)

T What else could you make that starts with I
 the letter 'p'?
 Michael?
 M Um, a tower. R
 T Does that start with the letter 'p'? ☛
 Do we hear the /p/ sound at the front?
 M No. R
[AW10802]

Teacher-student interaction in these lessons is characterised by teacher initiations, frequently by means of a display question, a student response of a few words, and teacher follow-up that includes an evaluation of its correctness or acceptability, and frequently some further modelling of linguistic form, realised by a repetition of the student's own words, or more often by a reformulation or an expansion of the student's response. In such lessons, the

teacher focus is very firmly on accuracy of linguistic form or of information recalled. This form of I-R-F exchange fits within Cullen's (2002) categorisation of the evaluative role of classroom discourse, which focuses on language form, rather than the message being conveyed, and is intended to provide students with good models of the target language. The question that these follow-ups raise, though, is whether Indigenous students are able to make use of such models in their language learning, or whether they simply 'play the language game,' as it is sometimes called, supplying the information required without benefiting from the modelling provided by the teacher feedback. Further, the exchanges are very tightly controlled by the teacher in their role as primary knower (Nassaji & Wells, 2000), who determines what the topic will be, who will speak, and what is acceptable. This may not be helpful to these students if it is not the pattern to which they are accustomed at home.

The other broad pattern of interaction identified in these data is evidenced primarily in lessons involving newstelling or similar sessions when oral presentation of information is the focus (e.g., an oral recount after an excursion). The teacher is generally also the initiator in these lessons, reflecting their adoption of the manager role, and they continues to be in control of the interaction as their follow-ups scaffold students' contributions and elicit further information so that the students have longer speaking turns. The tri-partite exchange pattern is still evident, but the teacher's follow-up slot is, in reality, a new initiation, as more information is elicited from the student to move the interaction on. Examples 9 and 10 illustrate this pattern of interaction. They are extracts from much longer exchanges between teacher and students sharing news at the start of the school day.

Example 9 (Pre-primary)

S	I married the bird.	R
T	What bird?	F
S	The magpie bird.	R
T	And you did what to it?	F
S	Married it.	R
T	Married it?	F
S	[Giggles]	
T	What does that mean?	F
S	You dig it and you put it in the ground.	R
T	Oh, you b-b-buried it.	F
	Oh, was it dead when you found it?	F
S	Yes.	R
T	Oh.	F
S	It was dead [inaudible].	I
T	I wonder what happened to it Amelie.	R

[JR190802]

The exchange in Example 9 continued for 38 turns, with two or three other students becoming involved as the session progressed and they discussed not only how the magpie might have died, but also about pets dying or running away. The teacher built on students' contributions by asking questions to elicit further information from the children about what were obviously topics of relevance and interest to them, evidenced by the way in which others joined in.

In terms of language development, this type of interaction provides scaffolding to help children take extended turns at talking, and also experience in dealing with different ways of using language. In Example 9, most of the questions only required short answers, so it was

easy for Amelie to participate. However, her teacher also included an opportunity to develop Amelie's skills in explanatory language by asking Amelie what she meant by saying she had 'married the bird.' And at the end of the extract, the teacher used an indirect question form to elicit information that required Amelie to hypothesise or speculate about what might have caused the bird's death.

Example 10 provides a further example of scaffolding interaction. In this case the teacher's follow-ups regularly reformulate what the student, Sara, had said, and expresses her ideas more succinctly, then builds on the information provided to move the discourse forward. The reformulations here not only serve to provide models of different ways of expressing the same message, but also to make the information available to the whole group, given the student's very quiet voice. The information being accessible to the whole group was important in terms of keeping their attention and providing language models, and also necessary for the activity the teacher had programmed to follow the news session.

Example 10 (Year 2/3)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| T | Sara, why was yours a bad weekend? | I |
| S | Cause my mummy wouldn't let me go tapping. | R |
| T | [Inaudible] go to tapping and you weren't allowed to.
Was she a bit busy? | ■ |
| S | [Inaudible] cause we have dancing at [inaudible] | R |
| T | Oh, they moved where you do it.
Have they moved to a different place? | ■ |
| S | No, my mum said that [inaudible]. | R |
| T | Oh, okay, I see, they're changing.
And you're hoping that soon she'll find somewhere | ■ |

[JB190802]

The follow-ups employed by the teachers in Examples 9 and 10 fit Cullen's (2002) description of follow-ups serving a discursial pedagogic role in language development, of helping to focus on the message content and move the discourse along. Exchanges such as those in Examples 9 and 10 provide opportunities for students to learn to use the types of language that enable them to express sequences of events, explain relationships between events or entities, speculate about causes, or justify points of view, and develop their decontextualised language skills, types of language use that may not form part of their home literacy environment, but very important for the development of written literacy. The exchanges are both retrospective and prospective (Jarvis & Robinson, 1997), and build on previous interactions as a foundation for moving on in the discourse. The questions that form the basis of these I-R-F exchanges are frequently 'referential' questions, that is, ones that genuinely seek information unknown to the questioner. The use of these types of questions makes for greater equality of interactional roles because the initiator (the teacher) of the interaction is not the primary knower as well.



The examples of teacher-student interaction that have been presented here have been identified as fulfilling functions identified by researchers such as Cullen (2002) and Hughes and Westgate (1998) as supportive of different aspects of language development. However, a

very important issue that still needs to be addressed when considering patterns of classroom interaction is that of the extent to which such patterns of interaction are compatible with Indigenous interaction and learning styles.

There are a number of aspects of the I-R-F exchange pattern of classroom interaction, and the nature of the follow-ups that occur, that may impede interaction between Indigenous students and their non-Indigenous teachers (Commonwealth of Australia, 1996; Harris & Malin, 1994; Malcolm, 1998; Malin, 1998). Inspection of the data indicates a number of aspects of classroom interaction that may potentially contribute to interactional breakdowns, because they may not be compatible with Indigenous interaction styles. These include teachers nominating individuals to answer questions (see Examples 1, 2, 3, and 5), explicitly praising individuals (Examples 1, 6 and 7), public correction of students (Examples 3 and 8), and ignoring or explicitly rejecting unsolicited responses to initiations (Example 6). Other issues that may impact negatively on classroom interaction include the use of display questions, the directness of questions asked, topics about which questions are asked, the amount of time allowed for responses to questions or other initiations, and the teacher's dominant role in classroom interaction. Some of these matters touch on the broader issue of the need to learn the sociolinguistic conventions associated with a particular language or dialect. In the classroom context, this should, of course, be two-way learning, not just an expectation on the teacher's part that students will be the only ones learning different sociolinguistic conventions. While it is not possible within the scope of this paper to address all of these issues, it is important to consider several factors arising from the investigation of follow-ups.

One of the issues that arises from the investigation of the follow-ups employed in these data is the evaluative nature of many of them. Teachers regularly praise students for the accuracy, quality, and so on, of their responses, or even, in the case of shy or weak students, for responding in any way at all. Evaluative follow-ups, such as *Excellent! Good girl!*, or other forms of reward are commonplace in classroom interaction. In the data for the present study, negative follow-ups are much less common than positive ones, and when they occur may be mitigated, as in Example 3, above, with a form such as *Almost*, rather than *No*, or *That's not right*. The rationale for the use of praise is usually to encourage continued good performance, or to build self-esteem. However, in the context of interacting with Indigenous students, singling out a student for commendation may be detrimental because, as Malcolm (1998) explains, it may imply the student is "aspiring to be above or apart from their fellows" (p. 139), which is contrary to the notion of interdependence central to Indigenous culture. Hence, an evaluative follow-up, no matter how well-intentioned, may prove a barrier to interaction between Indigenous students and their non-Indigenous teachers. Furthermore, any potential benefit for language learning of modelling correct forms is likely to be impaired if the interaction is culturally inappropriate.

A second issue in classroom interaction, especially in the tri-partite exchange pattern, is the rejection by teachers of 'unsolicited' student responses, either explicitly as occurred in example 6, above, or ignoring them, as in the following example:

Example 11 (Year 1)

T When he was in the oven thinking there's a
big ogre and a giant he might be thinking,
I'm frightened.

S 

T Frightened. I don't even know if I've spelt
that right. Frightened. I think so. We might

have to check that.
(bolding added)

[EA10802]

The bolded utterance in Example 11 is an unsolicited initiation by a student, but is completely ignored by the teacher, who continues with the activity she was working on with the class. Non-Indigenous teachers may interpret such 'interruptions' as violations of classroom norms, and discipline or ignore students engaging in such behaviour, not realising that the child may be operating according to different sociolinguistic conventions, in which it is the norm for people to join in conversations when they wish to and without having to bid for a turn.

In a similar way, a student's apparent 'failure' to respond to teacher questions, as Joseph does in Example 12, below, may be the result of operating according to different sociolinguistic conventions, or even not hearing the teacher's question due to a hearing loss.

Example 12 (Year 2/3)

T	Joseph, how did you feel about your weekend that's just happened?	I
J	[No response that is audible.]	R
S	I haven't said one.	♣
T	How did you feel about it? Did you have a good weekend Joseph?	F
J	[No response that is audible.]	R
T	Did you stay home, or did you go to Nan's?	F
J	[Inaudible] stayed at home.	R
T	You stayed home. Did you play with your brothers and sisters?	F
J	[No response that is audible.]	R

[JB190803]

Silence is an acceptable and normal part of Indigenous interaction (Eades, 1994), unlike the conventions of Standard Australian English, which demand silences be filled. Further, as Walsh (1991) comments, in Indigenous society conversations are continuous and there is no requirement to respond just because someone else speaks. Failure to acknowledge and accommodate the positive role of silence in Indigenous interaction has the potential to cause breakdown in interaction between Indigenous students and non-Indigenous teachers, because typical classroom interaction patterns demand responses, and if a response is not forthcoming (from the teacher's perspective), they will move to repeat the initiation, possibly also redirecting the initiation to another speaker.

A further, related issue is that of the amount of wait time a teacher allows after posing a question. Typically, in mainstream classroom interactions, teachers expect an answer within a second (Wood, 1992). However, longer wait times are more consistent with Indigenous interaction styles, and may also be important in contexts where English is an additional language for students, and/or there is a hearing problem. Students may need more time to process the input and work out how to respond (see Galloway, in press, for further discussion on this point).

In the following example, the teacher asks Clive four times in one turn what a possum is, with little space for him to reflect before he is expected to answer:

Example 13 (PP-Year 2)

T What's a possum?

- S That thing that [inaudible].
 T What's a possum Clive?
 Ah, ah, I asked Clive.
 What's a possum Clive?
 Don't talk to him, he's trying to listen to me.
 Clive, what's a possum?
 Do you know what a possum is?
 C Na.

[PC310702]

The failure to recognise the role of silence has potential to make a student appear ignorant, and also cause them to feel frustrated because they miss out on opportunities to show what they know or can do. Failure to accommodate different interactional styles in the classroom will be counterproductive in terms of language development and learning.



This paper has explored some issues arising from patterns of interaction evidenced in classes involved in a research project investigating literacy teaching strategies being used with Indigenous students. In particular, it has considered the types of follow-ups that teachers employ to student responses. Both evaluative and discursal follow-ups may have the potential to be supportive of different aspects of language development. However, that will only be so if the interactional patterns of the classroom incorporate Indigenous ways of interaction and modify mainstream ways so that Indigenous students can learn in ways with which they are already familiar, while also learning new ways of interacting. Without that support, there will be barriers to learning because of incompatibility of ways of interacting. Many teachers, even experienced ones, may need help with modifying their own interactional style so they are interacting in ways more compatible with, and more appropriate for, those of their Indigenous students.



1. This research project, *Teaching Indigenous students with conductive hearing loss in remote and urban schools in Western Australia*, was funded by an Australian Research Council SPIRT Grant and industry partners: the Department of Education and Training, Western Australia; the Catholic Education Commission, Western Australia; and the Association of Independent Schools, Western Australia.
2. Unless otherwise indicated, when the term 'Indigenous' is used in this paper, the reference is to Australian Indigenous people/children/students, and not intended to apply to Indigenous peoples of other countries. The word 'Indigenous' is used in preference to Aboriginal, as it is considered to include both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, all of whom are Indigenous to Australia.
3. Code numbers at the end of examples are the research project codes for the transcripts from which the data are taken. All names in the examples are pseudonyms.
4. For many students in these classes, Aboriginal English, Kriol, or an Aboriginal language is their first language, not the Standard Australian English used in mainstream society, so the English used in school is a second (or subsequent) dialect or language for most students in these classes.



- Candela, A. (1999). Students' power in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 10(2), 139-163.
- Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (1996). *Desert schools*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56/2, 117-127.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52/3, 179-187.
- Eades, D. (1994). *Aboriginal English*. Sydney: Board of Studies NSW.
- Fisher, E. (1993). Distinctive features of pupil-pupil classroom talk and their relationship to learning: How discursive exploration might be encouraged. *Language and Education*, 7(4), 239-257.
- Galloway, A. (in press). Questions: Help or hindrance? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*.
- Gerot, L. L. (1992). *Questions of choice in classroom discourse*. Darwin, NT: Centre for Studies of Language in Education, Northern Territory University.
- Hall, J. K. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: The construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF. *Linguistics and Education*, 9(3), 287-311.
- Harris, S. & Malin, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Aboriginal kids in urban classrooms*. Katoomba, NSW: Social Science Press.
- Hughes, M. & Westgate, D. (1998). Possible enabling strategies in teacher-led talk with young pupils. *Language and Education*, 12(3), 174-191.
- Jarvis, J. & Robinson, M. (1997). Analysing educational discourse: An exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 18 (2), 212-228.
- Malcolm, I. G. (1998). 'You gotta talk the proper way': Language and education. In G. Partington (Ed.), *Perspectives on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education*. Katoomba, NSW: Social Science Press.
- Malin, M. (1998). They listen and they've got respect: Culture and pedagogy. In G. Partington (Ed.), *Perspectives on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education*. Katoomba, NSW: Social Science Press.
- Nassaji, H. & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'triadic dialogue'? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21/3, 376-406.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, M. (1991). Conversational styles and intercultural communication: An example from northern Australia. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 18(1), 1-12.
- Wood, D. (1992). Teaching talk: how modes of teacher talk affect pupil interaction. In K. Norman (Ed.), *Thinking voices*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.