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**ABSTRACT**

To organize the classes of primary school for the English classes and to provide feedback on student writing, should invoke it as a televised talent show where the videotape subjected to detailed linguistic ethnographic analysis. This hypothesis focused on the difficulties of flattened consensus in favor of importing beloved dictionary into classrooms by means of engaging students and comprehension of dialects. To reach this goal, lecturers and students as well, drew on and managed the possibilities of posed by the mixing of X Factor and homeroom interaction. Utterance genres are investigated. Although, to heightened student involvement and remarkable changes in homeroom interactional patterns the concatenation of X factor needed and its overall effect on occasion for student learning was mixed. The paper proposes a conceptual framework for contrasting utterances genres and for examining the realization of these genres in homeroom interaction.

INTRODUCTION

Much of the literature on adult reading has examined the processes underlying skilled reading without considering developmental constraints. That is, it has been assumed that once the skilled reading system has reached its “final” state, it does not matter much how it actually got there. Such a way of thinking ignores the possibility that different words may acquire different kinds of representations in the course of language development. Instead, it is often assumed that the “final” representations underlying skilled reading are identical across all words in terms of their orthographic and phonological specification. Computational models that code all words may therefore not be a suitable systemwide fashion, but on an item-by-item basis (Metsala & Walley, 2015). This segmental restructuring does not occur in an all-or-none systemwide fashion, but on an item-by-item basis (Metsala, 2019). Some words would experience more pressure to develop well-specified segmental representations than others. Thus, in contrast to the adult perspective, the developmental perspective naturally predicts that different words can acquire different kinds of lexical representations during the course of development.

The base is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development. The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them.

Every base has its own corresponding superstructure. The base of the feudal system has its superstructure, its political, legal and other views, and the corresponding institutions; the capitalist base has its own superstructure, so has the socialist base. If the base changes or are eliminated, then, following this, its superstructure changes or are eliminated; if a new base arises, then, following this, a superstructure arises corresponding to it. In this respect language radically differ from the superstructure. Take, for example, Russian society and the Russian language. In the course of the past thirty years the old, capitalist base has been eliminated in Russia and a new, socialist base has been built. Correspondingly, the superstructure on the capitalist base has been eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist base. The old political, legal and other institutions, consequently, have been supplanted by new, socialist institutions. But in spite of this the Russian language has remained basically what it was before the October Revolution. It cannot be otherwise. Language
exists, language has been created precisely in order to serve society as a whole, as a means of intercourse between people, in order to be common to the members of society and constitute the single language of society, serving members of society equally, irrespective of their class status. A language has only to depart from this position of being a language common to the whole people, it has only to give preference and support to some one social group to the detriment of other social groups of the society, and it loses its virtue, ceases to be a means of intercourse between the people of the society, and becomes the jargon of some social group, degenerates and is doomed to disappear. In this respect, while it differs in principle from the superstructure, language does not differ from instruments of production, from machines, let us say, which are as indifferent to classes as is language and may, like it, equally serve a capitalist system and a socialist system. There is no reasonable equation that we can apply to any group of complex language factors, nothing that permits us to say "X + Y + Z means that this sentence is too difficult for these users". Such evaluation remains more in the realm of an art than a science; it depends upon sensitivity, the direct contact with particular speakers which textbook writers don't have, and experience.
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**Fig. 1:** A realization of word-initial English /s/ excised from a token of ‘sodas’ as produced by an adult male speaker.

I can offer one encouraging comment from my own observation: where the intrinsic content of material is of great personal interest to the end-user, the level of structural complexity can often be escalated without destroying the message. Think of the analysis below as a mental starter kit. What is difficult for particular students will depend upon their stage of English acquisition at a given time. The kind of fascinating work being done by Pienemann and Johnston (1986) through Adult Migrant Education Services (AMES) in Sydney may eventually make it easier for us to be clearer about the acquisition stages learners are at.

Briefly, these researchers propose that language acquisition processes divide into developmental and variational features. Developmental features are acquired in a particular sequence while variation features are much more personal, depending upon things like attitude to the host culture. Taken together, these two types of features mean that there are many possible paths to successful language acquisition. Nevertheless, the developmental element has allowed Pienemann and Johnston (after Clahsen, 1984) suggest an order of complexity for the mental processing of language. It is as follows:

1. Single words only.
2. W X Y Z canonical order.
3. (W) X Y (Z) initialization/finalisation. Final elements can be moved into initial position or vice versa; that is, from salient position to salient position.
4. W X (Y) Z semi-internal permutation. Internal elements are permuted, but only into a salient (initial or final) position.

5. W (X) Y Z fully internal permutation. Salient positions are no longer used as a means of orientation for permuted elements.

Although I suspect that the whole truth may be rather more subtle than 1 to 5 above, the general approach is very promising. Pienemann and Johnston are looking for ways to use this "complexity list" as a tool for assessing the L2 development of AMES students. For reasons that I won't go into, they argue that it has great value where measures such as the ASLPR (Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating) fall down.

Research Methods:
The episode investigated in this article is drawn from an extended case study (cf. Burawoy, 1998) of procedures of continuity and change in homeroom interaction. Data anthology involved seeing and videotaping of 73ability to read and write lessons in seven upper primary homeroom and a professional development intervention plan to patronize and support dialogic upbringing, determined broadly as "an upbringing that exploits the power of talk to engage and facet children's meditation and learning and to secure and raise their comprehension" (Alexander, 2008, p. 92).

In this paper, we focus on one lesson from the corpus of data. In what follows, we briefly explain the research site; discuss case option, including situating the focal episode within our overall corpus; and elaborate the methods employed in analyzing the focal episode.

Abbeyford Primary School:
Abbeyford (a pseudonym) is a relatively large association school in East London, England, chose to work in this region because the Local power has a long-standing interest in dialogic pedagogy and the chronicle of developing and implementing pedagogical innovations. A eldest Local Authority consultant recommended Abbeyford Primary on arithmetic of its highly regarded, stable, and practiced teaching staff and a leadership team, plus, the staff had positive experiences in a previous intervention and were keen to experiment with their operation. School handling and instructors were under significant pressing to reverse this downward trend and success in the standardized evaluations task (SAT) tests and the upcoming governmental inspection were a major interest for all. Ms. Leigh, the instructor appearing in this paper, had been instructor for 11 years and also served as assistant head teacher and literacy coordinator. She was recognized by the Local power as a leading instructor for the aims of filming exemplary lessons. Likewise, we hold her in very high regard, as a highly motivated and reflective instructor who subtly draws her students into meaningful literacy practices while at the same time satisfying national curriculum provisions. Over an one-month period, we visited Ms. Leigh's homeroom 13times. Her lessons were always yummy and enjoyable, and often innovative in their integration of music, visual aids, noncurricular texts, and demonstrative proficiency with the official curriculum. It is unfortunate that the positive emotional tenor of her homeroom cannot be adequately captured in the text or even video recordings. Leigh works and against the boundaries of which she is pushing, and (b) Ms. Leigh was herself climacteric of many of these operations in discussions about the episode with us and with the other instructors.

The X Factor Episode:
Throughout the fieldwork we selected episodes that highlighted a subject related to dialogic upbringing or interactional change for use in breathtaking individual and group feedback discussions with the participating instructors. The lesson examined in this paper was among those selected, in the first instance, as basis for one to one feedback dialogue with Ms. Leigh in mid-March 2009; 10 weeks later, the X Factor episode was discussed in a seance with all seven participating instructors. We were drawn to this episode for a number of reasons.

First, it demonstrates relatively positive practice—for example, students are actively occupied, authority is decentralized (without loss of control), and multiple landscapes on story writing are drawn out in the discussion—yet also poses pedagogical problems from which the instructors can learn (e.g., how to shift from specific focus and feedback on one student's work to general axiom and insights relevant to the entire class). Second, the episode captures well a set of issues related to assessments of student writing, which had repeatedly emerged in our field notes, and which we wished to investigate with the instructors. Third, the episode displays considerable shifts in interactional patterns, including high occurrences of extended student utterances and student-to-student exchanges (not directly mediated by the instructor). Finally, we were interested in exploring with the instructors the supposition that importing discourse genres from outside of school can be an efficient way of changing homeroom interactional norms.

Analysis:
The methodological frame for loss of data in this study is linguistic ethnography, an emerging school in the United Kingdom that seeks to integrate ethnography's openness and holism (among other advantages) with the insights and rigor of linguistics (Rampton et al., 2004; Tusting & Maybin, 2007). In a sense, this combination constitutes a move to tie ethnography and an up linguistics, "pushing ethnography towards the
loss of clearly delimitable processes, increasing the amount of reported data that is open to garble, looking to saturate local description with analytic frameworks drawn from outside‖ (Rampton et al., 2004, p. 4). Linguistic ethnographers draw upon and combine analytic techniques from a diversity of approaches to the study of language, relationship, and society, including the ethnography of relationship, interactional social linguistics, linguistic anthropology, conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, and multimodality.

Table 1: Rate per Hour in Episode, Corpus, and National Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse move</th>
<th>X Factor episode</th>
<th>Average in Ms. Leigh’s lessons</th>
<th>School corpus average</th>
<th>National average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open questions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed questions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probe questions</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborated feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonelaborated feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student response to student</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participation (duration)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of student move</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>350.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in seconds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:
The introduction of X Factor led to a resonance of involvement of approximately the entire class, especially in the start of the episode. Students were given the opportunity to inhabit disparate kinds of roles. Harry rose to the opportunity, performing for the class and winning their appreciative laughter. His unconventional role as “X Factor contestant” granted him nonstudent interactional concessions (e.g., standing up, nominating students, interrupting). William has also takepart actively in this unconventional discourse genre—he spoke out of turn and was extremely active nonverbally. He was reprimanded once (line 172, at a point where Ms. Leigh had moved into a customary homeroom recitation), but otherwise his exuberance was tacitly accepted by the instructor. Not all of the students took part in this alternative interactional order, however. Although some students participated actively in the lesson—bidding enthusiastically for turns, self-selecting, gesturing, engaging other students in dialogue—others had to be drawn (sometimes reluctantly) into the conversation with the teacher. In this class, the more active students were generally male (though this was not the case in other homeroom observed during the study). In a feedback discussion based on this extract, Ms. Leigh commented, “There’s more or less a 50–50 split
among girls and boys, so it’s not as though, physically, they should dominate the chamber more or, proportionately, they would have more viewpoint, but it does tend to be the boys who talk more about their writing than the girls.”
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