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Abstract

This paper reports on the self-perceptions of two university lecturers who teach via a combination of face-to-face and online modes. Interpretative analysis of case study material (based on conversations with the researcher and participant-selected online teaching extracts) is providing insights into how experienced lecturers perceive their teaching selves in the different contexts and how their teaching identities are being transformed through the experience of online teaching.

By telling stories, we make identity claims (Ronai, 1997). In this study, narrative elicitation procedures offer participants the opportunity to articulate and reflect on their teaching selves in website material, computer-mediated communication and face-to-face teaching/learning contexts. Several extracts from the many stories told by two of the participants in this study are revealed and discussed to exemplify the approach and to highlight some of the research issues.

The paper concludes with an outline of the implications of the research conducted thus far for the next phase of the study (researcher and participant roles, procedures).

1. Introduction

Universities are changing. The roles of the people who research, teach, learn and work within universities are changing too. The expanding use of information technologies in administration and education is frequently associated with this transformation. In terms of university teaching and learning, face-to-face lectures and tutorials continue in theatres, halls and classrooms. These ways of learning are being supplemented with online (web-based) materials and interactive activities. In my role as an academic staff developer, I work with lecturers who are faced with the challenges of adapting online teaching into their existing teaching practices.

The study on which this paper is based aims to understand how academics who engage in online teaching are adapting to the changed circumstances it entails. My central research question is: How does the experience of teaching online change the teaching subjectivities, beliefs and practices of academics?
The planning, procedures and documentation of the study are being shaped by the intention to represent two perspectives on this topic. These are, firstly, academics' perceptions of the challenges and changes to them as teachers as a result of engaging in online teaching and secondly, my interpretation of the academics' teaching subjectivities, beliefs and practices, based on an analysis of their situation in a context of educational, technological and social change.

In this paper I will present analyses from case study material which documents the experiences of two university lecturers who teach face-to-face and online. These case studies model the procedures I have designed and as part of a larger PhD research study.

2. Themes in the Literature

There is little critical research dialogue in/about the field of online teaching in higher education, much less about the subjective impact on academics who actually teach online. One exception to this observation is the sustained research into computer-mediated communication (CMC) conducted in North American colleges and universities during the 1990s. Research which has emerged from the Virtual Classroom™ project (Hiltz, 1994) reports that online (text-based) interaction and dialogue can lead to the development of supportive personal relationships between individuals and foster the development of peer learning communities. Hiltz (1994) also elaborates on the mentoring, parenting, and facilitation which characterised the two-way, interactive online teaching conducted in the project.

Research conducted by Taylor, Lopez and Quadrelli (1996) with lecturers in three Brisbane universities found that 'making the move' to online teaching/learning environments augurs shifting, changing roles for teachers and learners. (Changing teacher roles are also discussed in Allen, 1998; Dexter, Anderson & Becker, 1999; Fraser & Deane, 1997; Jones & Schieman, 1995; Laurillard, 1993; Warschauer & Lepeintre, 1997). It seems likely that significant challenges confront the academic who, although experienced in face-to-face lecturing and tutoring, decides to embark on online teaching. One implication is that the authority, status and power of the academic (as online teacher) may be under threat or set to change.

Barglow (1994) asserts that technology is contributing to the process of identity dissolution and fragmentation of the (Western) autonomous, rationalist individual. He contends that the human self both shapes and submits to information technologies, and that information processing concepts and practices are playing an important role in subverting the unity and coherence of the modernist world. That is, modernist social tenets of boundary, centred subjectivity, ethics, recognition and identification are being undermined by the many ways we manipulate (and are manipulated by) information technologies (Barglow, 1994: 63 - 65; see also Castells, 1999). My broad interest is in how the fixed, autonomous individual - in this instance, the university lecturer - is responding these challenges when she or he engages in web-based teaching.

The suggestion that information technologies (in this case the Internet in education) may be the catalyst for a modernist-postmodernist shift in identity/subjectivity has inspired my inquiry into how university lecturers, experienced in face-to-face teaching, will respond to the challenges of web-based teaching.

3. Methodology

Lewis (1999: 5) identifies a need for inquiry into the experiences of teachers who use technology, and he recommends longitudinal qualitative studies, including individual case
studies. My research methodology reflects these qualities. My broad plan is to conduct an interpretative, qualitative study, where the focus will be on the participants, their online and institutional contexts and my interpretation of their situation and the meanings they express.

During the main phase of this research I intend working with 10 experienced university lecturers with no prior experience in online teaching, who are preparing to teach subjects which combine face-to-face teaching and online components (website material, e-mail, threaded discussion). The study is intended to be longitudinal (12 - 18 months) and participants will be selected so as to achieve a balance of discipline, gender and university campus.

The field texts, or primary research material, will include taped conversational interviews (including narratives within these, and transcript summaries), participants' profile sheets, participants' subject outlines and self-selected online teaching 'artefacts' and, finally, my own field notes and PhD journal.

In the conversational interviews, participants will be invited to tell stories about their teaching to exemplify or describe their (face-to-face and online) teaching beliefs and practices. The conversational material is analysed by means of a two-step discourse analysis and narrative analysis procedures. Interpretative material, which incorporates case studies and conversational narrative extracts, is being developed as part of the substantive research text.

For the pilot phase of this study I interviewed 5 academic colleagues who had been using web-based teaching methods for at least two semesters. The field texts for this step include participant-selected online teaching texts, conversational transcripts (and narrative passages extracted from these), and my research notes and research journal. In the remaining sections of this paper I will outline two case studies from my pilot study, and in the process demonstrate the analysis procedures.

4. Narratives and Narrative Analysis

The decision to adopt story-telling as a procedure in this study is supported by Goodson's call for educational research that takes account of teachers' personal, biographical perspectives (1992: 141). Telling stories is a significant way for individuals to give meaning to and express their understandings of their experiences. Through telling stories we make identity claims and articulate self-concept (Mischler, 1991; Ronai, 1997; Shotter in MacLure, 1993).

My analytical approach to the conversational interview transcripts has developed into a two-step process which entails both a global ('top-down') analysis and a specific ('bottom-up') analysis. The global discourse analysis enables me to identify themes around each participants' views about (online) teaching, their various and changing teaching roles and self-perceptions as lecturers. To explore and refine these broad themes I then conduct a specific analysis of conversational extracts which are reformatted. These short selected passages are formatted along the lines of the narrative analysis layouts of Kohler-Riessman (1993) and Gee (1996).

To exemplify this process I will outline case study material for two participants, Ron and Hilary (pseudonyms). I will introduce each participant and present a brief global thematic analysis. In section 8 of this paper I will demonstrate a closer analysis of the formatted narrative extracts which set out each participants' response to the same conversational topic.
5. Case Study 1: Ron

Ron has been lecturing at university level for 25 years. He currently lectures in Public Health subjects, including e-Health, e-Health Research Methods and Health Informatics subjects. He has been using computers (e-mail, mailing lists and discussion lists) in his teaching for 6 years. He has introduced online components into his subjects: a. as a 'back-up' for busy post-graduates who can't always attend classes, b. because of the good online resources in his field, and c. to introduce students to the 'real-world' where, in his view, these skills are important.

Ron plays an active role in Health policy forums at state and national levels. He maintains he is a communicator, and as a teacher he thinks he is best described (metaphorically) as a performer on stage. He says his role is to 'inspire and cajole', and he believes that it's important for him and his students to have 'the big picture'. Ron talks about himself as a teacher in a global classroom, as a communicator on a world stage, who wants to model his use of technology in his teaching, research and policy forums, as well as encourage, cajole and entice his students to use it.

A recurring theme in Ron's discourse about his teaching relates to crossing boundaries, and he refers to an 'open wall type concept', by which he means that he uses technology to enable his student to reach outside the normal classroom for interaction and information. In describing how he uses his laptop in a lecture he comments:

R: ....the people are out there, ahm... The people are out there. Ahm, but I'm using a laptop. And ah, and it's extending, it's both... it's both improving what I'm doing if I'm giving a lecture on the screen behind, and it's linking me to that online world of resources and people and needs, and whatever [Ron1: 25].

The Internet provides Ron with a more powerful way of communicating, teaching, and 'reaching out there', regardless of where he is in the world.

6. Case Study 2: Hilary

Hilary began lecturing in librarianship in 1983. After several years she moved to lecturing in computer science, and since 1986 she has taught information technology subjects and topics such Systems Analysis and Design and Research Methods. Over the past 3 years, Hilary has taught a Communications subject four times, as lecturer and/or tutor. It is to this subject that Hilary refers mostly during conversational material reported here. This subject is taught via in combination of lectures, tutorials and an online discussion list.

A content analysis of the field texts collected for Hilary reveals themes which centre on her relationships with her students. Hilary remembers herself as a 'good student', and at times she refers to the need for her own students to learn and exhibit appropriate behaviours and language. She admits a strong commitment to fostering 'personal responsibility' in her students in this subject. In her view, effective teaching is about helping and guiding students.

At different times Hilary mentions distinct roles (teacher-student), and this separation is reinforced by references to contrasting age/generation binaries: adult-child; mother-18 year olds. Hilary describes a distance between herself and her students, and in discussing her broad teaching beliefs and practices, she expresses a desire to be able to 'reach' more of her students. Later in our conversation, she reveals that through e-mail and discussion list communication, she has found a way to 'reach' her students more effectively and get to know them better than she would in face-to-face teaching contexts only.
7. Analysis of Narrative Extracts

During the conversations with each of the pilot phase participants I focussed the discussion on a comparison of online teaching versus face-to-face teaching. (Participants had received a list of topics we could discuss prior to the meetings). Ron and Hilary were interviewed in late 1999, and in separate conversations I asked them if there were things they thought they could teach online that they couldn't teach in face-to-face contexts. Appendix 1 (Ron) and Appendix 2 (Hilary) present formatted transcript data of their respective responses to this 'lead'.

The extracts have been formatted along the lines of the narrative analysis layouts of Kohler-Riessman (1993) and Gee (1996). Line breaks are identified by listening and breaking up the material according to the phrasing and intonation patterns of the speakers. The resultant material resembles poetry, and it lays the discourse open for closer linguistic analysis.

Kohler-Riessman, an exponent of narrative analysis, recommends beginning with an analysis of the structure of the narrative (1993: 61). In both passages, we find canonically structured narratives which reflect Ron and Hilary's very different experiences of online teaching. Story boundaries are clearly marked and their discourse contains the structural features of more formal narrative: abstract, story cue, orientation, conflict, resolution and point of the story (or 'coda', which will naturally reflect or repeat the abstract) (Mishler, 1991: 74). I will briefly analyse Ron's and Hilary's extracts in terms of this narrative structure, before turning to a closer analysis of particular features in their discourse. In the following sections, italicised segments are lines repeated from the formatted extracts, and numbers in brackets refer to lines from the respective transcript extracts (see Appendices 1 and 2)

7.1 Ron's Narrative

In his response Ron provides an abstract 'frame' for what he is about to discuss: the way the world is increasingly communicating in the future and I I mean the world, ... internationally, is... e-mail, discussion groups, et cetera. (4 - 6). He orients us to characters and their actions: We're never going to be meet all the people we would like to meet face-to-face that we wanna deal with (7 - 8).

The point of conflict and its resolution reveal tensions for Ron in his role. Conflict for Ron arises around the fact that he can't separate his online teaching from his professional work: To me that's all... one and the same, I mean ahm... (15). He goes on to describe what he did that morning, and then resolves his conflict by asserting that what he was doing was teaching: it's communicating with colleagues, it's sort of advancing the agenda, ahm, (26, 27). Ron uses the technology to 'communicate' and 'advance the agenda' and he wants his students to see him doing that. He 'models' his use of the technology for his students. His metaphor for teaching as performance emerges in the coda to the extract: we've gotta teach our students, ahm best we best do it through modelling ahm, (31, 32).

7.2 Hilary's Narrative

Hilary's response to the lead about what she can do online that she can't do face-to-face surprised me: Yeah, I can control myself much better (04). This forms the framing abstract for her observations in the extract, and it is reiterated in the coda (27). Hilary appears to orient herself as teacher, being asked a question by a student. Conflict arises around the difficulty she has in resisting the impulse to provide an answer to a student's question, when she believes it would be better practice to respond with a question herself: And I find it so hard to do...(15). Hilary's resolution rests on having her students provide answers. This
strategy is consistent with her commitment to fostering personal responsibility on the part of her students.

The coda to Hilary's narrative, the fact that she can control herself much better online, enriches our understanding of Hilary's self-concept as teacher. At an early stage of our conversation about her perceptions of herself as a teacher, Hilary expressed her desire to keep improving as a teacher. In this extract, Hilary positions herself as both teacher and learner. What she has been learning through her online teaching is self-control, something she says she finds hard in face-to-face contexts. She is a 'good student', and a 'better' teacher for the experience.

8. A Closer Analysis

These interpretations focussed around the narrative structure in each extract are necessarily cursory. We can unpick and unpack the rich linguistic material in the extracts further to refine these analyses. In this section I will focus mainly on word choice, repetition and 'constructed dialogue' (Tannen, 1989).

Ron's metaphor for teaching as performance is sustained by the words *jazz up* (21) and *scripts* (23). *Communicating* (04, 26) and *communication* (11, 22) are central to his activities, and Ron *deals* (08) with people in a range of contexts: workshops, meetings, agendas, as well as through e-mail, attachments and discussion groups. His students have to *master these tools* (09) and *skills* (28) in order to be able to communicate in the *(real)* world (04, 05, 25, 33).

Indeed, Ron's emphasis on 'the real world' merits further attention. In this extract, Ron implies that 'teaching in the real world' (25) entails just those activities which have taken up his time that morning prior to our conversation: answering e-mails, organising meetings, 'jazzing up' agendas, clear communication, working on electronic scripts. In other words: it's *communicating with colleagues, it's sort of advancing the agenda* (26 - 27). Yet these activities were conducted online, and in what some would argue is a 'virtual world'. However, Ron *genuinely* (30) believes that this is the real world. Ron's *real world* takes him beyond the walls of the classroom onto an international stage.

Hilary response to the same 'lead' is focussed more on herself and her teaching strategy of responding to a student's questions with another question. The change in strategy is reflected in the pattern of the words *question* and *answer* across this short transcript. These two words are repeated in this order between lines 08 and 19. In the resolution phase of her narrative (21 - 25), the terms are noticeably reversed - twice. This reversal matches the reversal in her approach. This strategy has helped her improve her face-to-face teaching:

H: You know like, asking, asking a question instead of making a statement.... um, it

sort of helps you move your mindset around, when you can deliberate on it and think no, this is not the way I should do this, it would be better if I did it this way, and you can do it on paper, you can sort of train yourself a bit to do a bit more, in person. So I think, in that way, it's probably changed my teaching [Hilary1: 12].

The interested reader could also consider more generally Hilary's repetition and placement of the terms 'good' and 'better' throughout the narrative extract. Hilary's statement: *I know that I would rather they thought of* (21) is consistent with observations I have made in previous case studies about each academics' sense of authority as teacher (McShane,
1999; McShane 2000). This authority is frequently focussed on verbs such as 'want' (Ron: wanna), 'need', 'must', 'have to' (Ron: gotta).

In lines 9 and 10, Hilary employs 'constructed dialogue' (reported speech) by reporting a student's utterance and her reply to it. In lines 13 and 14 she also reconstructs her own mental response to the situation: I think, 'No I won't give an answer, I'll ask a question'. Constructed dialogue enables speakers give voice to characters, and it provides a means of injecting authenticity into the narrative. 'Dialogue makes story into drama and listeners into an interpreting audience to the drama (Tannen, 1989: 133)'. In Hilary's case, the rhetorical effect is to involve and convince the listener - me.

An analysis of word choice, repetition and features such as 'constructed dialogue' can offer deeper insights into the thematic material gathered in the course of the conversations. The interested reader is invited to continue this process by exploring the grammatical items (eg. pronoun shifts; verb tense, aspect and mood; adverbs, articles) and phonological repetition (assonance, alliteration, rhyme) which are present in both Ron's and Hilary's transcripts.

In the next section I will summarise these thematic analyses in terms of my central research question. I will also reflect on researcher-participant roles, and implications for the next phases of my research.

9. Discussion

These two abbreviated case studies reveal two very different responses to the challenges faced by academics in engaging in online teaching.

9.1 Summarising the Stories of Ron and Hilary

The use of online technology has enabled Ron to expand his communication, teaching and professional activities. At the same time, these functions have merged to become one and the same (15) and Ron says he cannot divorce (14) his online teaching from his professional work. The term 'divorce' has a powerful personal resonance here. Online technology has enabled Ron to blend his teaching and work roles and in doing so, he has and committed himself in a meaningful way to an international network of local and international relationships.

On the other hand, online teaching has enabled Hilary to control herself better and develop closer relationships with some of her students. She describes elsewhere how she believes she can reach her students better across the divide that she perceives exists in face-to-face teaching interactions. By being able to control herself better in online contexts, Hilary is also able to guide her students more carefully. She can choose to reverse the teacher-student Question-Answer routine, while still controlling the discourse and maintaining her authority as teacher.

These two case studies together demonstrate the complexities of the 'lived experience' of (online) teaching for each lecturer. Ron and Hilary teach and work in very different 'real world' contexts, and their responses to the challenges of online teaching are framed by very different histories, personal values and beliefs about teaching. Yet what they both have in common is the fact that they have found ways of developing or enhancing particular kinds of interpersonal relationships through the medium of online communication. This is consistent with Hiltz' CMC research (1994) which reports that online (text-based) interaction and dialogue encourages the development of supportive personal relationships between individuals and foster the development of peer learning communities.
9.2 'Personal Involvement' and Rigour in this Study

Through retelling their lived experiences, Ron and Hilary are able to articulate how technology is transforming their teaching and perceptions of themselves as lecturers. I have chosen to examine and interpret their stories in a particular way, through a combination of discourse and narrative analysis.

The focus on word choice and repetition in the specific analysis of these two extracts was deliberate. Tannen notes that repetition ‘facilitates production, comprehension, connection, and interaction ...[it] serves an over-arching purpose of creating personal involvement (1989: 52)’.

Indeed, these conversations reflect particular kinds of 'personal involvement' between these participants and myself. My relationships with the 5 pilot participants were shaped by my collegial interactions with them outside this study. Ron and Hilary are very aware of my work in academic staff development. For example, when Ron refers to 'we' in his extract, he may (or may not) be including me in the assertions he makes about, for example, what we've gotta teach our students (31). Hilary is aware of my Unit's emphasis on 'good teaching and learning' in all its promotional material and developmental work. Her reference to good teaching (11) could be read ambiguously as an acknowledgement of my university role.

My presence and my central role in the design of the study frame the discourse of the participants as well as its interpretation. Clandinin and Connelly point out that 'whether the topic is chosen by participants or by researcher, the kinds of questions asked and they ways they are structured provide a frame within which participants shape their accounts of their experience (2000: 110)'. In planning my pilot phase, I addressed a long and comprehensive list of topics in a single conversation with each of the participants. In my main study, however, I am setting out to engage with participants (novice online lecturers) in reflecting on similar topics, but in interactions and conversations dispersed across an extended period of time. This will foster the growth of more fluid relationships in the study. My interactions with the participants may become less structured and more participant-directed.

I am conscious of the need to remain aware of how my presence will affect how the participants perceive and respond to me and the issues we canvas. In all of this, I seek to maintain a careful reflexivity, to keep uppermost in my mind questions such as 'Why is this lecturer saying these things to me?', 'What is my part in this exchange?', 'How might my presence have shaped this perspective or this assertion?' I aim to anchor any claims I make to rigour in the research by acknowledging and documenting this reflexive engagement (Ball, 1990: 159, 170).

9.3 Procedures in this Study

The close linguistic analysis (framed by the narrative structure) which has been demonstrated in this paper, reveals patterns and word choices to support the global themes identified in a broader discourse analysis. This kind of analysis seems appropriate to my topic, particularly so given that identity claims and self-concept emerge in narratives. In all my case studies so far, these global-specific analyses have been harmonious, and I have noticed that the specific 'bottom up' process is particularly effective in refining and focussing the broad themes.

At this stage, I intend to continue this approach to the analysis of academics' narratives in conversations with me. Our conversations and interactions will also be enriched by the online teaching materials which they select as representative of their online teaching persona.
10. Closing Comments

In this paper, as with all case studies, I have set out to offer new insights into particular situations (Kemmis, 1982: 107). Telling stories is a significant way for individuals to give meaning to and express their understandings of their experiences. The stories of Ron and Hilary illuminate two very different, authentic perspectives on the experience of teaching online. Clandinin and Connelly (2000: 60) maintain that all stories offer possible plotlines for our futures, and so I invite other researchers to explore further, and in different ways, some of the claims or insights which Ron and Hilary have made about their very real worlds.
Appendices

Appendix 1 : Extract from Ron’s Narrative

K: Kim (researcher) R: 'Ron' (participant pseudonym)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(K:)</th>
<th>(R:)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>... is there teaching that you can do online that you can't do face-to-face?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• STORY CUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Yes. Yes, I think..</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ABSTRACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>because I see... [...]</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>I mean, I see...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>the way the world is increasingly communicating in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>and I I mean the <em>world</em>. [K: mm] ahm, internationally, is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>e-mail, discussion groups, et cetera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>We're never going to be meet all the people we would like to meet face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>that we wanna deal with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>and.. we've gotta master these tools, I believe.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• CONFLICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ahm, e-mail, attachments, discussion group, trying to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>cope</em> with the difficulties of communication, ahm..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>So, I suppose what I'm s..,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y'know, I mean, <em>what</em> is online teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• RESOLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>and I I can't divorce teaching online from my professional interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To me that's all.. one and the same, I mean ahm..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[...].. how I spend my day. [K: Yeah] Ahm,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>y'know aah, answering emails this morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>about[inaudible] coding workshops,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>organising meetings in Sydney to sort of progress this ah..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[(R) draws breath] ah..... y'know, we were, ahm,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>trying to jazz up some agendas and some ah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>clear communication about what we're on about,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working on electronic scripts and all the rest.

I mean to me, that's....

teaching in the real world ah,

it's communicating with colleagues,

it's sort of advancing the agenda, ahm,

and... those are the skills that I believe

our students have gotta have, [...]

because I genuinely believe that

we've gotta teach our students, ahm

best we best do it through modelling ahm,

and the real w... y'kn.. modelling the real world

an' using the technology.
**Appendix 2: Extract from Hilary's Narrative**

K: Kim (researcher)

H: 'Hilary' (participant pseudonym)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K:</th>
<th>...do you think there are things that you can do online as a teacher that you can't do in face-to-face...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H:</td>
<td>teaching contexts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K:</td>
<td>Yeah, I can control myself much better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:</td>
<td>Oh that's interesting! [H laughs] Oh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K:</td>
<td>And so I can...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:</td>
<td>That's interesting..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K:</td>
<td>When someone asks a question...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| H: | 'Why [ æ ].'
| K: | It's easy to say 'Do this'. |
| H: | And.. I know that's not a good teaching thing, and in a.. discussion thing, |
| K: | I think, 'No I won't give an answer, I'll ask a question'. |
| H: | And I find it so hard to do.. |
| K: | Face-to-face? |
| H: | Face-to-face. |
| K: | Because what comes to my mind, is... |
| H: | an answer. |
| K: | And I want, I really, |

- **ABSTRACT**
- **STORY CUE**
- **ORIENTATION**
- **CONFLICT**
- **RESOLUTION**
- **POINT OF THE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I know that I would rather they thought of...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>an answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Even better get a question,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>but if, if they can think of an answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>and I ask them a question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>it’s better. [K: Mm.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>And so, I can control myself much better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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