

# **An Analysis of Online Lecture Discourse of a Korean NNS Teacher and an American NS Teacher\***

**Eun-Hee Lee**  
(Seoul Women's University)

**Lee, Eun-Hee. 2010. An Analysis of Online Lecture Discourse of a Korean NNS Teacher and an American NS Teacher.** *Linguistic Research* 27(1), 209-229. The number of online courses related to English language education has increased in recent years. Among the various types of online courses, video lectures have been found to be one of the most common types. This research examined lecture discourse in an online English class from one of the most prominent cyber universities in Korea in order to identify the structure and the characteristics of the teacher talk, and the modes and categories of the online lecture discourse. As there were no coding paradigms to analyze online lecture discourse, Walsh's (2001) and Cullen's (1998) coding paradigms, which were originally used to analyze teacher talk in face-to-face classrooms, were modified to analyze data in the present study. The structure and the characteristics of online lecture discourse are identified and discussed in the results section, and they are expected to provide researchers and educators with useful information on the nature of online lecture discourse. (Seoul Women's University)

**Key Words** online lecture discourse, teacher talk, video course

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Online language learning is booming in Korea (Lee and Lee, 2006), and online educators are trying to include diverse interactive conversation activities, animations, video clips, graphs, and so forth to meet online learners' diverse needs. Among them, a video lecture course hosted by one or two teachers is a common class type regardless of the main focus of a course. In fact, Lee and Lee (2006) explained that teachers' lectures are the most important factor to motivate

---

\* This paper was supported by a research grant from Seoul Women's University in 2010. I appreciate the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their helpful feedback and suggestions. All remaining errors are of my own.

students in online language courses. Consolo (2000) also claimed that a teacher's talk plays an important role in facilitating students' participation and learning. So far, researchers interested in using multimedia to teach language have mainly focused on methodologies for using multimedia interfaces in language classrooms, so the need to explore online lecture discourse conducted by several teachers or one teacher alone in cyber space remains. As research about online lecture discourse is believed to contribute to providing useful information about cyber discourse, which can help teachers better prepare to promote language learning in the long run, a video lecture course from one of the most prominent cyber universities was chosen and analyzed in the present study. One male American native speaking (NS, hereafter) teacher and one female Korean non-native-English-speaking (NNS, hereafter) teacher co-hosted the course. Their lecture discourse was analyzed in terms of characteristics of teacher talk, and modes and categories in online lecture discourse.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, as only a few researchers have studied online lecture discourse, literature related to face-to-face classroom discourse is reviewed instead in order to provide an overview of classroom discourse. Vygotsky (1978) explained that studying through interaction with classmates, friends or teachers resulted in a better outcome than studying alone. To facilitate interaction between a teacher and a student, the role of teacher talk has been greatly emphasized (Consolo, 2000; Johnson, 1995; Morell, 2007; Ryu and Sung, 2005; Walsh, 2002). The main purposes of teacher talk in face-to-face classrooms are to instruct, to inform (Coulthard, 1977, cited in Consolo 2000), to teach contents and to control social interactions (Lemke, 1989). Allwright (1984) claims that negotiation between a teacher and a student plays an important role in language learning, and Consolo (1996, cited in Consolo, 2000) claims that teacher talk is a critical factor that can influence students' language development.

In a common interaction sequence between a teacher and a student, a teacher initiates interaction (Initiation: I), students react (Response: R), and the teacher evaluates students' response (Follow-up: F): IRF sequence (Cazden, 1988; Consolo, 2000; Mehan, 1979a 1979b). As teacher talk can facilitate or hinder students' learning, Walsh (2002) claims that teachers need to (1) encourage

learners to participate in classroom discussion; (2) modify their speech depending on students' needs if necessary; (3) provide students with more opportunities for self-expression; and (4) encourage learners to facilitate and encourage clarification when they have questions. In the following sections, types and characteristics of classroom discourse are reviewed.

## 2.1 Types of Face-to-Face Classroom Discourse

Types of classroom discourse between a teacher and a student used in face-to-face classrooms could not be applied to analyze video lecture because students were not present in the class. Therefore, a new coding paradigm to analyze the data was needed. Before creating a new coding paradigm for cyber classroom discourse, existing coding paradigms for face-to-face classroom discourse were reviewed to provide the groundwork. Cullen (1998) categorized teacher talk into six: (1) questioning/eliciting; (2) responding to students' contributions; (3) presenting/explaining; (4) organizing/giving instructions; (5) evaluating/correcting; and (6) sociating/establishing and maintaining classroom rapport (p.186). Similarly, Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, and Smith (1966) analyzed teacher talk in terms of its functions: (1) structuring, (2) soliciting, (3) responding, and (4) reacting. When Bellack et al analyzed classroom discourse, the proportions of each function were about 30%, 30%, 30%, and 10% respectively. Teachers tended to do about 60% of the talking in class, mostly as structuring and soliciting. On the other hand, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) divided classroom discourse into six units on the basis of interaction between teachers and students: Act, Move, Exchange, Sequence, Transaction, and Lesson. Combined 'Exchanges' of these three 'Moves' of initiation, response and feedback (IRF) were said to form 'Transactions' and they worked together to form 'Lessons.' In sum, a typical discourse exchange in a classroom involves an initiation by a teacher, a response by a student, and feedback by the teacher (IRF).

Lastly, Walsh (2001, cited in Nunan, 2003) divided classroom discourse into four modes: (1) managerial mode; (2) materials mode; (3) skills and systems mode; and (4) classroom context mode. First, during managerial mode, which usually occurs at the beginning of a class, teachers explain objectives of the class and activities for the day. A teacher is usually a sole speaker in this mode. Second, materials mode occurs when a teacher explains contents in a textbook or

questions in an exercise; teachers initiate conversation, students respond and teachers provide feedback on the responses (a typical IRF sequence). Third, in skills and systems mode, teachers control turn-taking and topic choices, and the main focus is about language practice or language skills. IRF is common in this mode as well. Fourth, in classroom context mode, authentic and real-world type discourse occurs and teachers do not control turn-taking.

## 2.2 Characteristics of Face-to-Face Classroom Discourse

Previous research (Chaudron, 1988; Ryu and Sung, 2005; Walsh, 2002) about teacher talk in face-to-face language classrooms has mainly analyzed teachers' discourse modification depending on students' proficiency levels or other factors. Chaudron (1988, cited in Ryu and Sung, 2005) summarized that teachers often modify their speech when they realize students' comprehension difficulties:

- 1) Rate of speech appears to be slower,
- 2) Pauses, which may be evidence of the speaker planning more, are possibly more frequent and longer,
- 3) Pronunciation tends to be exaggerated and simplified,
- 4) Vocabulary use is more basic,
- 5) Degree of subordination is lower,
- 6) More declaratives and statements are used than questions,
- 7) Teachers may self-repeat more frequently. (Chaudron, 1988, p. 85)

As seen in the list above, teachers speak more clearly and simply to enhance students' comprehensibility. Walsh (2002) criticizes previous research which claims that teacher talk needs to be reduced to provide students with more speaking time and chances. He claims that research should focus on quality of teacher talk not the quantity or teachers' word choices. He characterized teacher talk as following:

- 1) Teachers largely control the topic of discussion
- 2) Teachers often control both content and procedure
- 3) Teachers usually control who may participate and when
- 4) Students take their cues from teachers

- 5) Role relationships between teachers and learners are unequal
- 6) Teachers are responsible for managing the interaction which occurs
- 7) Teachers talk most of the time
- 8) Teachers modify their talk to learners
- 9) Learners rarely modify their talk to teachers
- 10) Teachers ask questions (to which they know the answers) most of the time  
(Walsh, 2002, p. 4).

Teachers dominate classroom discourse and there is an unequal relationship between teacher talk and student talk. In most situations, teachers initiate conversation and usually ask questions, and students answer playing a passive role. In order to facilitate students' participation, Walsh (2002) claims that teachers should: (1) provide direct error correction not interrupting conversation flow; (2) provide feedback on contents; (3) provide students with more opportunities in learning by clarification checks; (4) wait for students' answers or participation because teachers' extended wait time can facilitate students' participation; and (5) provide students with necessary scaffolding in an appropriate timing.

Mehan (1979a) reports that teachers use a number of strategies to facilitate the balance of the IRF sequence. The strategies include 'prompting incorrect and incomplete replies,' 'repeating' or 'simplifying initiation acts' until the expected reply occurs. Morell (2007) analyzed teacher talk in a lecture course which is non-interactive and monologue. The characteristics of the discourse might be the most similar to those in video lecture discourse. Three main characteristics of lecture discourse in face-to-face classrooms are:

- 1) The lectures used clear and slow speech with a primarily questioning tone.
- 2) Teachers began the session with a statement or question that referred to the main objective(s).
- 3) All three included personal interactions: anecdotes, use of humor, petitions for personal opinion or examples, and positive feedback on responses made by students. (Morell, 2007, p.229)

Ryu and Sung (2005) claim that teacher talk can be different depending on a task type. The more students participate in a task that requires students'

response, the less teachers talk. However, students talk less when teachers explain complex grammar rules. Therefore, characteristics of teacher talk are different even in one class depending on a task type. Lee and Lee (2006) found that online university students' preferences about teacher talk differed depending on course purposes, but they generally preferred courses which had both professors' lecture and multimedia-related language activities. Students especially thought that lectures were important components in theoretical and introductory courses.

In Ryu and Sung (2005) study, NS teachers in language classrooms had difficulty in explaining idioms and giving directions in English. They suggested co-teaching between a NNS teacher and a NS teacher using multimedia activities to overcome this kind of difficulty. As they suggested, co-teaching is common in cyber lecture courses, so the elements and characteristics of cyber teacher talk need to be studied thoroughly.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Participants

In this research, a video-based online lecture course which was taught by a female Korean NNS teacher and a male American NS teacher, was observed for one semester. Both of the teachers were bilingual in Korean and English and they spoke both English and Korean during their video lecture. The female Korean teacher received a Ph.D. in TESOL in North America. She taught the course for two years at the time of recording the course. The male American teacher received a B.A. in Latin and Greek in North America and has taught English in Korea for 4 and a half years at the time of recording the course.

#### 3.2 Course Description

The course title was "English Conversation 2." Each class was 50 minutes. The target audience was seniors at an online university in Korea. This specific online course was chosen: (1) because the course was a typical video lecture course, and (2) because the teachers were known to be experienced in online education and popular among students. The focus of the course was English conversation, and each video lecture was provided without student-centered interactive activities.

### 3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The course was observed for one semester and a class from week 12, which was titled, "Violence in the media-A bone of contention," was randomly chosen and transcribed. As every class in the video lecture course used the same outline and format throughout the semester, one class was considered sufficient for analysis.

The data was analyzed and coded in order to identify the modes and their subcategories in online lecture discourse. Cullen's (1998) and Walsh's (2001) categories were modified in order to meet the special needs of online lecture discourse. The new coding paradigm is presented in Table 1. Each mode, (1) managerial mode; (2) materials mode; (3) skills and systems mode: and (4) culture mode, has the same sub-categories, so the categories of managerial mode are presented in Table 1 as an example.

Table 1. Modes and Categories in Online Lecture Discourse

Modes	Categories
Managerial Mode	Greeting (G)
	Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)
	Responding to the Other Teacher's Contributions (RE)
	Answers to a Question (A)
	Presenting/Explaining (PE)
	Organizing/Giving Instructions (INS)
	Giving Opinions (OPI)
	Establishing/Maintaining Classroom Rapport (Rapport)
	Review (RV)

Among Walsh's (2001) four modes, (1) managerial mode, (2) materials mode, (3) skills and systems mode, and (4) classroom context mode, classroom context mode was excluded for the coding of the data in this study because classroom context mode was not found in the data. According to Walsh (2001), in classroom context mode, students are provided opportunities for genuine, real-world-type discourse. Since the current data only consisted of teacher discourse, classroom context mode was naturally excluded. Instead, culture mode emerged because both teachers had chances to discuss and compare cultural differences between America and Korea.

The transcript was coded by using the four modes and each mode was analyzed by nine sub-categories. Among them, five categories, (1)

questioning/eliciting, (2) responding to the other teacher's contributions, (3) presenting/explaining, (4) organizing/giving instructions, and (5) establishing and maintaining classroom rapport, were from Cullen (1998). Cullen's "responding to students contributions" was changed into "responding to the other teacher's contribution" as the class was hosted by two teachers. "Evaluating/correcting" was excluded as there were no students present in the video lecture and the teachers did not have a chance to correct students' errors or to provide them with feedback.

The other four sub-categories emerged using the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, cited in Merriam, 1998). The researcher of this study listed all categories which had emerged from the data, compared them among data, and found themes. The themes which were constructed through continuous comparison of the data are (1) greeting, (2) answers to a question, (3) giving opinions, and (4) review. In face-to-face classrooms, teachers do not introduce themselves every time by telling the audience their names, but the teachers in online classrooms greeted and introduced themselves at the beginning of every class, so "greeting" was added. Second, "answers to a question" was added. In face-to-face classrooms, teachers ask questions to students or try to elicit conversation from students, but here, one teacher asked a question and the other teacher answered. These were coded as "questioning" and "answers to a questions" respectively. Third, "giving opinions" was added because the teachers often shared their opinions each other or asked the other teacher's opinions related to a topic. Lastly, "review" was added. In face-to-face classrooms, teachers usually provide a review at the beginning of a class and/or at the end of a class, but teachers reviewed more frequently in this online lecture class.

After the researcher developed the new coding paradigm as seen in Table 1, the researcher and another coder analyzed and coded every sentence in the transcription together. When there was a conflict in deciding which coding category was more appropriate for a sentence, discussions followed until an agreement was reached. After the data was divided by the modes, each section was analyzed in terms of nine sub-categories. The characteristics of the online lecture discourse were identified using the constant comparative method as well. They were (1) repetitions, (2) roles of the Korean NNS teacher and the American NS teacher, (3) comprehension checks, and (4) the teachers' code-switching.

## 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Course Structure

A typical structure is described in Table 2 which is organized in chronological order. After a holistic overview of the whole class structure in this section, the details are discussed in the next section.

Table 2: Class Structure of the Online Lecture

Mode	Explanations
Managerial Mode	Teachers' self-introduction; Introduction of the day's title and topic; Brainstorming about the topic
Materials Mode	Change of scenes and a video of the day's expression and the day's dialogue; Watching the video; Holistic explanations about the video
Culture Mode	Before explaining expressions line by line, teachers introduce the related culture
Materials Mode	Introduction of key expressions in the first half of the class
	Playing the video of the first half of the class
	Sharing opinions about the topics in the video clip
	Explanations about the expressions line by line; The American NS teacher read the expressions and the Korean NNS teacher translated what he said; The longest part in the class
Skills and Systems Mode	During the explanation about the expressions, presentation of "Focus on Pronunciation" lectured by the American NS teacher alone; In the section, pronunciation was explained and some grammar rules were explained as well
Materials Mode	Playing the video of the second half of the class
Skills and Systems Mode	"Real and Live" lectured by the American NS teacher alone; Explanation about one expression related the day's topic, providing synonyms and examples
Managerial Mode	Wrap-up; Summary of the lecture; Recommendation of a movie related to the topic; Greeting
Materials Mode	Playing the video again

As seen in Table 2, the class started with the teachers' greeting and the teachers explained the day's topic and expressions. After playing a short video that has the day's expression, they explained the expressions in the video clips. The NS teacher read the expressions in English and provided the audience with synonyms, and the NNS teacher translated what the NS teacher's explanation and added more details. They often asked questions to each other and shared their opinions related to the topic. For language skills such as pronunciation and useful expressions, special sections, "Focus on Pronunciation" and "Real and Live," were hosted by the NS teacher. At the end of the class, the day's video was shown one more time.

There were similarities and differences between face-to-face classroom discourse structure and online lecture discourse structure. One of the similarities was that managerial mode occurred at the beginning of class and at the end of class both in the online and face-to-face classrooms. Teachers in face-to-face classrooms often divide classes into several sections and explain language skills such as pronunciation or grammar. The same pattern was seen in the online class. One of the differences was found in teachers' greetings: in face-to-face classrooms, teachers do not introduce themselves at the beginning of every class, but in the online course, they introduced themselves at the beginning of each class and each activity. For example, after the NS teacher introduced himself at the beginning of the class, he introduced himself again at the beginning of "Focus on Pronunciation" and "Real and Live."

## 4.2 Modes and Categories in Online Lecture Discourse

### 4.2.1 Occurrence of Each Mode

In face-to-face classrooms, (1) managerial mode occurs at the beginning of lessons and at the end of class; (2) materials mode occurs during an exercise; (3) skills and systems mode occurs when teachers explain grammar or pronunciation; and (4) classroom context mode occurs when students and teachers have real-world-type conversation opportunities (Walsh, 2001). In the online class, (1) managerial mode occurred at the beginning of the class and at the end of class. In addition, it also occurred before the teachers started to explain each expression and before a special session such as "Focus on Pronunciation" started; (2) materials mode occurred when teachers explained the

day's expressions and provided the audience with synonyms and further examples of the expressions. No fill-in-the-blank exercises were included, but explanations about the day's expressions and playing of the video clips were coded as materials mode; (3) skills and systems mode occurred when the teachers explained grammar or specific skills related to speaking, listening, reading, writing, or pronunciation. This mode and materials mode were intertwined throughout the lecture and were the most frequently occurring. In face-to-face classrooms, in addition to these two modes, classroom context mode is frequently used to provide language learners with practice time; and (4) culture mode occurred at the beginning of the lecture when teachers discussed real-world examples related to the day's expressions. Frequency of each sub-category in each mode is reported below.

Table 3. Frequency of Each Category in Managerial Mode<sup>1)</sup>

Modes	Categories	N of Occurrence	% (M)
Managerial Mode (MM)	Greeting (G)	6	25
	Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)	1	4.2
	Responding <sup>2)</sup> (RE)	1	4.2
	Answers to a Question (A)	2	8.3
	Presenting/Explaining (PE)	0	0
	Organizing/Giving Instructions(INS)	2	8.3
	Giving Opinions (OPI)	2	8.3
	Rapport (Rapport) <sup>3)</sup>	7	29.2
	Review (RV)	3	12.5
	<b>MM Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>

In managerial mode, "rapport" occurred the most frequently, followed by "greeting" as seen in Table 3. Managerial mode was often used in order to make the classroom atmosphere relaxed and supportive. The teachers often spoke their personal ideas and shared opinions. Unlike face-to-face classrooms, because the teachers introduced themselves at the beginning of each class and of each activity, the percentage of "greeting" was high. At the end of a class and after each activity, they repeatedly summarized their explanations, so the percentage

1) As frequency or percentage of each mode or category in face-to-face classrooms or any other cyber courses was not found, any statistical comparison was not provided.

2) "Responding to the Other Teacher's Contributions" is shorten to "Responding" in the tables 3 to 7.

3) "Establishing and Maintaining Classroom Rapport" is shorten to "Rapport" in the tables 3 to 7.

of "review" was high as well.

Table 4. Frequency of Each Category in Materials Mode

Modes	Categories	N of Occurrence	% (M)
Materials Mode <sup>4)</sup> (MATM)	Greeting (G)	0	0
	Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)	17	8.3
	Responding (RE)	11	5.4
	Answers to a Question (A)	10	4.9
	Presenting/Explaining (PE)	132	64.7
	Organizing/Giving Instructions(INS)	17	8.3
	Giving Opinions (OPI)	13	6.4
	Rapport (Rapport)	0	0
	Review (RV)	4	2.0
	<b>MATM Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4 shows that in materials mode, "presenting and explaining" occurred the most frequently. After watching a video clip, each teacher played their typical role, which made the discourse somewhat of a monologue. The NS teacher read the day's expressions and explained them in English and the NNS teacher translated them into Korean and added more details. Interaction between the teachers in this mode was lower than that in other modes and they seemed to decide their roles before video-taping. The low percentages of "asking a question" and "answers to a question" were due to the lack of interaction. Even though students were not in front of the teachers, they repeated the same explanations. The same video clip was played three times (before, during, and after the teachers' explanations), which was counted as a review activity. If teachers' frequent repetitions had been counted as a review activity, the percentage would have gone much higher. Regardless of the low percentage, the review was emphasized more in online lecture class than ones in face-to-face classrooms. The teachers seemed to be concerned about reviewing their lecture as they were concerned about students' comprehension and learning effect.

4) The video clips were counted as materials mode.

Table 5. Frequency of Each Category in Skills and Systems Mode

Modes	Categories	N of Occurrence	% (M)
Skills and Systems Mode (SSM)	Greeting (G)	4	2.9
	Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)	5	3.6
	Responding (RE)	5	3.6
	Answers to a Question (A)	2	1.4
	Presenting/Explaining (PE)	100	71.4
	Organizing/Giving Instructions(INS)	16	11.4
	Giving Opinions (OPI)	3	2.1
	Rapport (Rapport)	5	3.6
	Review (RV)	0	0
<b>SSM Total</b>		<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>

In skills and systems mode, "presenting and explaining" occurred the most frequently as seen in Table 5 above. The percentage was even higher than that of materials mode. In this mode, the percentages of "questioning," "responding," and "answers" were lower than those in materials mode because the NS teacher solely hosted "Focus on Pronunciation" and "Real and Live" and he mainly lectured about the skills. For the new expressions, the NS teacher provided the audience with thorough explanations in English and Korean and added related examples of the day's expressions in "Real and Live." In "Focus on Pronunciation," the NS teacher explained pronunciation rules both in English and Korean. His gestures were exaggerated and his pronunciation was clearer, so his lecture was simple and clear enough to follow easily.

Table 6. Frequency of Each Category in Culture Mode

Modes	Categories	N of Occurrence	% (M)
Culture Mode (CM)	Greeting (G)	0	0
	Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)	5	12.2
	Responding (RE)	4	9.8
	Answers to a Question (A)	5	12.2
	Presenting/Explaining (PE)	24	58.5
	Organizing/Giving Instructions(INS)	1	2.4
	Giving Opinions (OPI)	1	2.4
	Rapport (Rapport)	1	2.4
	Review (RV)	0	0
<b>CM Total</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>100</b>

In culture mode, "presenting and explaining" occurred the most frequently as

well, but the percentage was lower than those in materials and in skills and systems mode as seen in Table 6. In culture mode, the percentages of "questioning," "answering" and "responding to questions" were higher than those in materials and in skills and systems mode. In the other three modes, each teacher played their typical roles so the interaction rate between them was lower than that in culture mode where each teacher had authority for their own culture and asked about the other's culture.

Table 7. Total Occurrence of Each Category in All Modes

Categories	N of Occurrence	% (M)
Greeting (G)	10	2.4
Questioning/ Eliciting (QE)	28	6.9
Responding (RE)	21	5.1
Answers to a Question (A)	19	4.7
Presenting/Explaining (PE)	256	62.59
Organizing/Giving Instructions(INS)	36	8.8
Giving Opinions (OPI)	19	4.7
Rapport (Rapport)	13	3.2
Review (RV)	7	1.7
Total	409	100

Table 7 summarizes the total occurrence of each category in all modes. The main purpose of reporting the numbers of occurrences and percentages is to provide an overview of online lecture discourse not to generalize into other contexts. Overall, explanations occurred the most frequently in online discourse, which was similar to face-to-face classrooms. In face-to-face classrooms, teachers ask questions or initiate conversations and students answer. However, in the online classroom, the teachers played both roles. As seen in the tables, the occurrences of each category in online classroom were similar to those in face-to-face classrooms, but the characteristics were different. To examine the differences in depth, the characteristics of online discourse are discussed in the next section.

### 4.3 Characteristics of Teacher Talk in a Video Lecture

The different characteristics between the online lecture discourse and face-to-face classroom discourse are that, in the video lecture, (1) the teachers tended to repeat themselves frequently to enhance students' comprehension; (2)

the NNS teacher and the NS teacher each had particular roles; (3) the teachers frequently used comprehension check questions as if students had been in front of them; and (4) they often code-switched between Korean and English. Each difference is explained in the following sections.

#### 4.3.1 Repetition

Throughout the lecture, when the teachers explained each expression, the NS teacher repeated the expression several times. After the NS teacher's explanation, the NNS teacher repeated and translated the English expression and the NS teacher's explanation. Repetition was the most commonly used strategy to explain.

##### Excerpt 1

The NS Teacher (NST): Ok, let's take a look at the first one. Nothing to write home about. It's nothing to write home about. So nothing very special, nothing unusual, 그냥<sup>5)</sup> nothing to write home about.

The NNS Teacher (NNST): 여기 'home' 들어가 있는 거 굉장히 재밌지 않으세요? nothing to write home about, 그러니까 집에다 우리가 쓸 일이 없었어요. 그러니까 뭐 특별한 건 없었어, 이런 표현이거든요. 자세한 내용은 또 나중에 살펴 보구요, nothing to write home about, "뭐 특별한 건 없어" 라는 표현입니다.

This interaction occurred at the beginning of materials mode. The NS teacher read the first expression, 'nothing to write home about' twice, and synonyms, 'nothing very special' and 'nothing unusual,' twice and read the expression one more time. After the NNS teacher added her personal opinions about the expression, saying that using 'home' in the expression was interesting, she translated what the NS teacher explained. This type of repetition showed that the teachers were concerned about their students' understandings and tried to promote students' comprehension even though students were not present at the time of the recording.

---

5) Korean expressions were not translated throughout the paper because Korean was used to translate or explain previously mentioned English expressions.

#### 4.3.2 Roles of the American NS Teacher and Those of the Korean NNS Teacher

The NS teacher and the NNS teacher had particular roles in the video lecture: as seen in excerpt 1, after the NS teacher read each expression and added synonyms to explain the expression, the NNS teacher translated what the NS teacher read and explained. When they explained the background information and details of the expressions, the NNS teacher usually initiated the conversation asking eliciting questions to the NS teacher. The NNS teacher (1) initiated conversation; (2) responded to the NS teacher's answers; (3) confirmed what he said; and (4) added more details if necessary, as the following excerpt 2 shows:

##### Excerpt 2

1. NST: Next sentence is "I don't know how they can get away with showing so
2. much detail. I don't know how they can get away with showing so much
3. detail." Ok? 'Get away with' is to succeed in doing something without getting
4. caught.
5. NNST: 네, 문장 한 번 살펴볼시겠습니까. "I don't know how they can get away with
6. showing so much detail." "어떻게 그렇게 자세하게 보여줄 수 있는지 모르겠어요"라는
7. 표현입니다. 여기서 여러분이 기억하실 표현이요, 'get away with'라는 표현입니다. 보통
8. 'get away'를 '사람들이 다 도망가다' 뭐 이런 표현으로, 혹은 '떠나다, 출발하다' 뭐 이런
9. 표현으로 많이 알고 있거든요. 근데 사실 여기 'get away with'는 그런 뜻이 아니거든요,
10. 그죠? 선생님. 조금만 설명해주세요, 'get away with.'
11. NST: 그럼, 원래는 제가 도둑입니다. I'm gonna steal your purse, ok? so this is your
12. 가방, right? So, um, if you're looking another way, I can run away. I get away
13. with this. 그래서 I can do something without any punishment. 그리고 특히 싸울
14. 때는 되게 잘 쓰는 말이거든요, 그럼 한국말로 뭐라 그럼 되는 거죠?
15. 뭐 그냥 내가 가만있을 줄 알았나? 그런 표현 있죠?

##### 16. NNST: 그쵸

17. NST: In English, we can say, you're not gonna get away with this. 상대방한테
18. You're not going to get away with this, right? 꼭 복수(할꺼야), right? I'm gonna
19. get revenge, 되게 잘 쓰는 말이거든요.
20. NNST: 맞습니다. 선생님이 지금 설명해주신 거 여러분이 다 이해하셨으면 너무 좋을 거
21. 같은데요, 'get away with'가 단순히 도망가다 차원이 아니구요, 'get away with' 하면,
22. 뭔가 나쁜 일을 우선 하는 거예요. 나쁜 일을 하는데, 나쁜 일을 하면서 어떻게 생각하느냐,
23. 이 나쁜 일을 했다고 해서 나한테 특별히 무슨 보복이나 이런게 오는 게 아니구, 아마 그냥
24. 벌일 없이, 그러니까 '걸리지 않고 해내다'라는 정도의 뜻이면 좋을 거 같아요, 그러니까 '떠
25. 나다, 도망치다' 이런 뜻에서 좀 더 발전을 해서, 무언가 좀 바람직하지 않구요, 사실은 불법

26. 적인 일을 했거든요, 그런데, “예, 별일이 없을 거다”라고 기대를 하는 거죠. 그래서 이제
27. ‘get away with’ 다음에 something, 이런 표현이 오거든요, 동사 오지 않고 명사가 오게
28. 되구요. 동사를 써야 되면 당연히 문법적으로 -ing형태가 오게 됩니다. 그러니까 “you’re
29. not, 그쵸? You’re not get away with it.” 예를 들어서, “그러면 너 그렇지 못 할 거야,
30. 니가 이 일이 별일 없을 줄 알았지, 니가 가만히 그렇게 될 줄 알았니, 뭔가 일을 당할거야,
31. 너 거기에 대해서 복수, 뭔가 당하게 될거야” 라는 표현이 되겠습니다. 그럼 요것도요, 혹시
32. 좀 더 약간 심화시키기 위해서 예문을 한 두 개 정도 살펴보면 어떨까요? 선생님?

When the teachers started to explain a new expression, the NS teacher read "I don't know how they can get away with showing so much detail" and explained the meaning of 'get away with.' Then, the NNS teacher read the expression in English and translated it into Korean. After the translation, she asked an eliciting question to the NS teacher about the expression. Responding to the question, the NS teacher explained the expression with various examples and the NNS teacher translated them. In addition to the translation, she added some grammatical explanations. At the end of her translation and explanations, she asked another eliciting question to the NS teacher for more examples.

In the excerpt, the NS teacher was in charge of reading an expression in English and providing synonyms, and the NNS teacher was in charge of translating and providing further examples and explanations. The NNS teacher explained grammar while the NS teacher hosted a special section for pronunciation and another one for related daily expressions. This pattern was consistent throughout the course, so it is assumed that they decided each one's role before recording the lectures.

#### 4.3.3 Comprehension Checks

As seen in the excerpt 2 above, the NS teacher kept asking "ok?" or "right?" while he explained the expressions. The number of confirmation checks increased during his monologue in his special sessions, "Focus on Pronunciation" and "Real and Live." The NNS teacher also repeated "그쵸?" (right?) during the conversations with the NS teacher. These expressions were checking an invisible audience's comprehension by asking comprehension check questions to the other teacher, meaning "correct?" or "do you understand me?" These were not really questions, but rather utterances to make sure that students were following them.

In the first "ok" with a rising tone in line 3, the NS teacher checked whether

the students understood him or not. When the NNS teacher asked the NS teacher to explain the expression, "get away with," more, the NS teacher said the second "ok?" in line 11. Before starting his explanations, he said "I am gonna steal your purse" to provide background information about his explanation, and said "ok?" to confirm the listener(s)' comprehension. The next word, "so," sounded like he moved to a next level of explanations on the basis of his comprehension check. This pattern looked similar to a teacher in face-to-face classrooms who wants to check students' understanding before he moves to a next step. "Right" with a rising intonation in lines 12 and 18 all meant "do you understand me?" as well.

In the case of the NNS teacher, she said "you are not, 그쵸?" in line 29, checking whether her listener(s)' were following her directions or not. However, "그쵸" with a falling intonation in line 16 was answering to the NS teacher's question. Pronouncing the same expression with a different intonation changed the meanings and the functions. As seen here, even though there were no students present, both teachers kept asking comprehension checks.

#### 4.4.4 The Teachers' Code Switching

Both teachers' frequent code switching was observed throughout the lecture. The NS teacher spoke Korean to explain, to emphasize, and to rapport. He spoke Korean (1) when he translated the expression after he introduced a new expression in English as seen in "원래는 제가 도둑입니다. I'm gonna steal your purse" in line 11 of excerpt 2; (2) when he wanted to emphasize an expression as seen in "I'm gonna get revenge, 되게 잘 쓰는 말이거든요" in lines 18 and 19; (3) when he used transitional words such as '그래서' in line 13; and (4) when he spoke a noun which was either easy or difficult such as '가방 (a bag)' in line 12 or '복수 (revenge)' in lines 18 and 19.

The NNS teacher spoke English when she introduced a new expression before she translated it into Korean as seen in "I don't know how they can get away with showing so much detail, 어떻게 그렇게 자세하게 보여줄 수 있는지 모르겠어요 라는 표현입니다" in lines from 5 to 6. She also spoke Korean when (1) she asked a question to the NS teacher; and (2) she responded to the NS teacher. She seemed to communicate with the NS teacher in Korean instead of English in order to enhance students' comprehension and to avoid translating their

conversation.

In sum, even though both teachers switched codes, their purposes for code switching seemed different from each other. The NS teacher switched codes when he wanted to emphasize a point or to enhance the audience's understanding by speaking in their mother tongue. On the other hand, the NNS teacher switched codes when she presented a new expression before she translated it. Her goal for code switching did not seem to be related to promoting students' understanding.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The current research examined the teachers talk in a video lecture class and found similarities and differences between face-to-face classroom discourse and online classroom discourse. Like face-to-face classroom discourse, materials mode occurred the most frequently and the teachers' explanations and presentation were the most common category in the online lecture discourse as well. The main differences were in the teachers' roles and the characteristics of the discourse. The teachers answered each other's questions and each teacher had an established role; the NS teacher was in charge of explaining pronunciation and daily expressions and the NNS teacher was in charge of translating and explaining grammar. It was the NNS teacher who mainly led the discourse and class activities, and initiated conversation; she frequently played a traditional face-to-face classroom teacher role, and the NS teacher often assisted her lead.

Even though students were not present at the time of the recoding, both teachers often repeated their explanations several times and provided various examples about the day's expressions. They often asked comprehension check questions to the invisible audience, showing their concerns about students' comprehension. They also frequently code-switched between Korean and English in order to promote students' comprehension.

It is admitted that the results of the study cannot be generalized into other contexts because of the particularity of the context at hand. However, as studies about online lecture discourse are rare, this study is expected to provide online educators useful information for online lecture discourse and its characteristics so that they can better prepare and design their classes.

## References

- Allwright, R. 1984. The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 156-171.
- Bellack, A., H. Kliebard, R. Hyman, and F. Smith, Jr. 1966. *The language of the classroom*. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University.
- Cazden, C. 1988. *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Consolo, D. A. 1996. *Classroom discourse in language teaching: A study of oral interaction in EFL lessons in Brazil*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, CALS, University of Reading, UK.
- Consolo, D. 2000. Teachers' action and student oral participation in classroom interaction. In J. Hall and L. Verplaetse (eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 91-107). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Coulthard, M. 1977. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Cullen, R. 1998. Teacher talk and the classroom context. *EFL Journal*, 52(3), 179-187.
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The discoveries of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Johnson, K. E. 1995. *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. 2004. The effective use of live and recorded video on satellite TV and the internet in FLT/L. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 7(1), 83-108.
- Lee, Y. & Lee, C. 2006. A study on students' preferences and attitudes toward online English contents in a cyber university. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 7(3), 151-185.
- Lemke, J. L. 1989. *Using language in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mehan, H. 1979a. *Learning lessons: social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mehan, H. 1979b. "What time is it, Denise?: Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice*, 18, 285-294.
- Merriam, S. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Morell, T. 2007. What enhances EFL students' participation in lecture discourse? Student, lecturer, and discourse perspectives. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 222-237.
- Nunan, D. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ryu, Y. and Sung, K. 2005. Teacher talk in an EFL university classroom. *English Teaching*, 60(1), 41-68.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Walsh, S. 2001. *Characterizing teacher talk in the second language classroom: A process approach of reflective practice*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Queen's University of Belfast, Northern Ireland.
- Walsh, S. 2002. Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3-23.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. MA: Harvard University Press.

**Eun-Hee Lee**

Seoul Women's University  
General English Department  
623 Hwarangno, Nowon-Gu  
Seoul, S. Korea, 139-774  
Email: el1@swu.ac.kr  
Phone: +82-2-970-7856

Received: 2010. 03. 11

Revised: 2010. 04. 11

Accepted: 2010. 04. 19