Title	Constructing academic discourse : dialogic instruction in an EFL film class
Sub Title	映画教材を活用した授業 : ダイアログの方法を探る
Author	Shea, David
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要刊行委員会
Publication year	2020
Jtitle	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要. 英語英米文学 (The Hiyoshi review of English studies). No.72 (2020. 1) ,p.47- 72
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	In this paper, I present a practical, grounded analysis of a first-year university English film class, with the goal to chronicle both the elements of instruction and what students thought about class activities. As instructor, I have tried to adopt a dialogic approach to develop academic proficiency, grounded in the oral interaction of wholeclass discussion that aims to have students think critically and express ideas in a creative, productive manner. I draw on reflective teacher journals and anonymous student surveys, to describe how I have taught the course during my career at Keio University. I begin by noting the films selected, and discuss such features as how the quizzes were enacted to ensure that everyone did the homework. I also note how discussion was organized to improve both language skills and discursive argumentation, and how written essays were assigned to extend classroom discussion. I conclude by noting that shared talk within a supportive environment stimulated critical thinking, suggesting new identifications with English and carrying broad implications for EFL pedagogy.
Notes	
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN10030060-20200120-0047

Constructing Academic Discourse: Dialogic Instruction in an EFL Film Class

David Shea

Abstract: In this paper, I present a practical, grounded analysis of a first-year university English film class, with the goal to chronicle both the elements of instruction and what students thought about class activities. As instructor, I have tried to adopt a dialogic approach to develop academic proficiency, grounded in the oral interaction of whole-class discussion that aims to have students think critically and express ideas in a creative, productive manner. I draw on reflective teacher journals and anonymous student surveys, to describe how I have taught the course during my career at Keio University. I begin by noting the films selected, and discuss such features as how the quizzes were enacted to ensure that everyone did the homework. I also note how discussion was organized to improve both language skills and discursive argumentation, and how written essays were assigned to extend classroom discussion. I conclude by noting that shared talk within a supportive environment stimulated critical thinking, suggesting new identifications with English and carrying broad implications for EFL pedagogy.

Introduction

All of my classes involve a conscious commitment to dialogic instruction, which entails rejection of a delivery model that presents information to students, whether in lecture format or teacher-directed recitation. Instead, I see my role as constructing a social form of thinking in the classroom, orchestrating collaborative knowledge-building that is based

on interactive discussion and exploratory talk, which allows learners to jointly produce understanding (Barnes, 2008, p. 3). A dialogic approach is grounded in a sociocultural understanding of learning, wherein L2 acquisition is viewed not as the accumulation of information, but as active participation in language use. To learn advanced English, that is, to learn academic argument, requires not simply listening to a lecture; rather it entails practice in actually constructing academic argument with supportive and sustained guidance, employing practical language skills while fostering the creative explication of ideas, a particular kind of "accountable" talk (Alexander, 2008) that illustrates the reasoning process and makes clear the ways in which discourse is constructed. The idea is that, through participating in the collaborative production of cognitively demanding talk, students appropriate skills that increasingly allow them generate academic argument on their own.

This paper is both reflective and interpretive. I seek on the one hand to describe key components of an advanced content-based English film course which I have taught nearly every term of my 20-year career at Keio. I seek on the other hand to articulate the pedagogic theory of dialogic teaching that underlies the instruction, based on a qualitative analysis of student feedback about the class and its activities. Along with anonymous surveys of student opinion, I draw on teacher journal entries to chronicle the main activities used in class, the rational for their use, and student views of their efficacy. While I call the course a film class, it is in effect a required first-year foreign language seminar that carries graduation credit, even though there is a near exclusive focus on understanding the thematic and symbolic elements related to business and society, not the linguistic components of vocabulary or grammar. The topic makes it possible to talk about student academic development as well as identification with English as a foreign language,

and it prompts a re-evaluation of instruction as a means to engage student understanding and production of English.

Literature Review

Dialogic instruction is a particular kind of discursive engagement between the teacher and students (Hardman, 2008; Mercer 2016; Reznitskaya, 2012), where interaction is designed to elicit talk that develops thinking and critical reflection (O'Connor, et al, 2017). It is a kind of learning by speaking collaboratively, exploring ideas (Barnes, 2008) that "position" students as legitimate and knowledgeable (Thompson, 2008, p. 246). For many Japanese learners, there is a strong preference for silent participation (King, 2013), adopting a primarily passive listening stance, especially in high school EFL classrooms (Okada, 2016). However, it is axiomatic in much SLA research that active, productive engagement (in speech and writing) is fundamental to synthesizing cognition and thus facilitating/promoting acquisition (Swain, 2000; Wells 2015). Dialogic teaching exists in this constructed interaction between teacher and student, with the goal to make the thinking processes of academic English evident (Mercer, 2016). The teacher's role is to elicit substantiating evidence and reasoning that are at the heart of academic discourse (Wingate, 2012) yet are often missing in traditional teacher fronted instruction (Gibbons, 2009). Mercer & Littleton (2007) point out that many classrooms are "overwhelmingly monologic" (p. 67), often with few chances to engage with students "sharing knowledge, challenging ideas, evaluating evidence and considering options in a reasoned and equitable way" (p. 62). Although Mercer & Littleton are principally concerned with ways of thinking and using language in elementary contexts of primary school, their analysis also pertains to broader discursive contexts that are thought to give access to

professional communities (p. 66), which is also, precisely, the challenge of the foreign language classroom.

In spite of the growing recognition of dialogic teaching in L1 classrooms, however, the dominant tendency in much FL pedagogy is away from teacher-led interaction, toward autonomy and learner-directed inquiry (Benson, 2006), such as takes place in self-study centers and task-based learning modules. Along these lines, the instructor is supposed to step back, allowing students to become involved in peer-directed interaction. Although group work certainly plays a central role in dialogic teaching, the instructor also makes a concerted effort to engage students in whole class talk, trying to "model and support cognitive activity and inquiry" (Boyd & Markarian, 2015, p. 272) that both reflects and constructs ideas on which students draw, something that is not always done well in peer interaction (Mercer & Littleton, 2007).

Interactional competence

In Japan, the debate over English pedagogy is often limited to the contrast between communicative language teaching and a grammar translation approach, with classroom activities typically framed as either conversational practice or test-driven preparation (Stone & Kershaw, 2019). A broader, more dialogic conception of interaction is appropriate, with communicative ability defined not as individual fluency but as proficiency "jointly constructed by all participants" (Young, 2019, p. 87). In this respect, learning is situated socially, not in what a student expresses individually, but what is said collaboratively, in conjunction with other speakers (Shea, 1994). The significance of this view is that the development of competence is rooted in the context in which talk takes place – i.e., the classroom. Dialogic interaction thus leads us to analyze how students are *positioned* to

learn discursively.

This collaborative, dialogic understanding of proficiency points to the teacher's role in both guiding discourse and creating a supportive atmosphere in which talk takes place. Often, the social character of the classroom is described in simple, straightforward terms of anxiety, which is certainly critical for Japanese learners who feel a strong reluctance to express ideas openly and to participate in class activity (Okada, 2016), but student attitudes toward talk are dynamic and shift over time (Shea, 2017a). Also important are the orientations, motivations, and identifications with the L2 that are mediated within the dialogic exchange between student and teacher (Shea, 2017b). As learners step into the third space of language use (Kramsch, 1986; Lin, 2010), fundamental attitudes regarding the L2 are shaped by the teacher-mediated discourse they meet. The emphasis placed on the dialogic construction of meaning complements principles of the "flipped" classroom (Chen, Wu & Marek, 2017), where class time is reserved for discussion and students prepare assignments that they talk about when class begins.

Methodology

In this paper, I utilize a qualitative approach to delineate, first, from the teacher's perspective, core categories of the film class, involving such components as film selection, introductory tone setting, and class discussion. Second, I present from the student point of reference a grounded analysis of class activity, particularly what worked (and what did not). I draw on a range of source material for the analysis, including teaching journals, syllabuses, and activity notebooks to supplement personal recollection and observation. I also categorize a series of open-ended surveys designed to elicit student reflection, as well as class evaluations that students regularly complete at the

end of term. In total, I collected twelve sets of student feedback, all written in English, generated in response to questions about classroom activities. I analyzed in total over 200 comments, following principles of quantitative analysis (Patton, 2015; Thomas, 2006), using an inductive, recursive review of the data. My goal was to generate a grounded understanding of student perspectives, presented as salient themes and core categories in an active attempt to utilize "experiential knowledge" and integrate theory with "lived experience" in the L2 classroom (Johnson, 2006, p. 240).

I received both oral and written permission from students to use their comments for this essay. Students also agreed that I should edit the grammar of their comments, making surface changes in phrasing without changing the basic idea. Students requested that I respect their anonymity and I have no way of identifying individual authors. The quotes in this paper however, all include a reference code that locates the comment's origin (see Appendix A).

The class in question was a required first-year language seminar that carried graduation credit. There were two sections, fourth and fifth period with 20 students enrolled in fourth, and 22 students in fifth. Attendance was restricted to those who scored highest on the listening component of the institutional TOEIC test (ranging between 400 and 450) that was used as a placement instrument. I have always been interested in film, but the idea for the course grew in part from an aspiration to complement the other English course that advanced students were taking, which already had a heavy reading load. Consequently, I avoided a literature syllabus and chose film. I also wanted to give students a chance to think critically about social issues, along with the opportunity to practice listening, and the exposure to a variety of accents that film provides was a particularly appealing point.

Structure of the Course

The course was built around the assignment to watch one film per week for homework, while class time was given over almost exclusively to discussion. A copy of each film was placed on reserve in the Media Center, although students could pursue other viewing options, online (e.g., Netflix, Amazon, or iTunes) or a local DVD shop. Films were selected that fit the overarching theme of "business and social issues." The list of titles, which has changed slightly over the years, includes both serious drama and comedy (see Appendix B). Often, films recommended for business contain topics related to finance, such as *Wall Street*, but I prefer films that embody a broader definition of business and portray ordinary people in everyday contexts, engaging in quotidian pursuits like starting a small business (*Fried Green Tomatoes*, *Sunshine Cleaning)* looking for a job (*Morning Glory)*, or working in a family-based employment (*The Help, Julie & Julia*), government bureaucracy (*Hidden Figures, Invictus*), or large enterprise (*In Good Company*, *Social Network*). Some films, such as *Outsourced* and *Up in the Air,* address downsizing and job loss, while unusual career choices are introduced in *Sing Street, Whip It,* and *Bend it Like Beckham*. Environmental costs are shown in *The Descendants* and *Witness*. All films are realistic fiction, built on complex narratives, showing the diverse communities in which people live and work, as in *Bagdad Cafe* and *Freedom Writers*.

One issue that is a particular source of concern in a course with first-year students, most of whom only recently turned 18, is the depiction of sex, drugs, and violence. *Schindler's List,* for example, contains numerous scenes of gruesome Nazi atrocities, while *Social Network* portrays recreational drug use in California. I always introduce my concerns at the beginning of the semester and ask students to respond. For the most part, they seem to put the

explicit portrayal of adult situations in perspective. The following comments express the feeling of many. One stated, for example, that the films were, simply, "worth watching" (6/12/4/1), while another explained that

> *we have to know the truth of these kinds of things.* (6/12/5/1)

and yet another remarked that *Schindler's List*

> *was disgusting because there were many violent scenes and people were naked... but you have to deal with it.* (6/12/5/2).

One student noted pragmatically that "it's hard to find a movie with none of these [questionable] situations" and that the majority of students "have the ability to determine right or wrong" and not be influenced by the film (6/12/4/2).

The selection of films is itself a kind of dialogic endeavour, albeit enacted over time. For instance, it was because students responded so positively to *Schindler's List* – students noted it as their favorite film Spring term, one calling it "hard" but "impossible to forget" (CE/5/14) – that I selected *American History X* for Fall semester, reasoning that it would also elicit a thoughtful response, in spite of the racism and xenophobia. This negotiation invited students to greater participation and strengthened the sense that ideas are "collective enterprises" as the class was "thinking together" and involved in a "shared understanding of ... productive discussion" (Mercer & Dawes, 2008, p. 66). This collaborative engagement was also at the heart of class talk, both the introductory quiz and the in-depth discussion activity that followed, which I discuss in the section below.

Speaking Officially

Every class begins with what I call a "standup" quiz, which serves as a review that is also designed to get students used to speaking out. What is more, the quiz usually sets a generally lively tone for the class. Students are

assigned to watch the film in its entirety for homework, following principles of the flipped classroom, so the quiz encourages completion of the assignment. In order to take the quiz, students have to get out of their seats and stand. Those who raise their hand and answer correctly can sit down, a structure that usually generates a quick response and sometimes a game-like competitive atmosphere, with students vying to be called on. (An abbreviated list of quiz questions is included in Appendix C). While a primary goal of the quiz is to ensure full participation so that, as one student said, everyone is speaking "officially to others" (CE/5/10), the quiz also creates a social energy that builds confidence and encourages all students to speak, thus working to break down the cultural preference for silent participation and the social distance students feel among classmates.

The quiz is actually quite popular. A clear majority of students endorsed the activity on the term-final class evaluation, in spite of some anxiety about talking in front of peers. In most cases, students seemed to recognize that without encouragement, they would likely not speak up and thus not get practice using the language. What is more, the pressure seems to decrease over time as students "get used to" the activity (CE4/12). Many remarked, for example, about the ultimately positive function of being "pushed" to speak:

> *If we stand up, we have to say something so it encourages me to speak. Also, feeling nervous is somehow important. (CE/4/2)*
>
> *I'm not sure I would make a comment without doing standup. (CE/4/14)*
>
> *Sometimes it is stressful but I think that is what makes me better in English. (CE 4/16)*

Standup is surprisingly effective in creating a sense of camaraderie. Everyone must become involved, which contributes to a joint identification

and shared orientation so that, as one student put it:

No one feels that they're left out. (CE5/19)

In sum, standup is a central foundation for student engagement, a base on which both expression and membership are built – which is also to say that motivation is high and nearly all students are reliably committed to improving their language skills.

There is, however, a qualitative difference between asking students to remember plot details, and asking them to explain an idea or develop an interpretation, but standup functions to facilitate this transition. The larger aim is to present an academic argument, both orally and subsequently in writing, which is the kind of skill that most students, even those in an advanced language class, lack. However fluent in everyday conversation, many have never engaged in academic discussion with friends, and few were exempt in high school from a focus on test preparation, dominated by traditional vocabulary and grammar-translation. It is thus one function of the film class to introduce critical thinking and academic argument. Further, as discussed in the following section, it is through the medium of standup that students are encouraged to articulate ideas in spite of a lack of confidence, to gain new words and new ways of thinking.

Reflective Discussion

The main part of the seminar, the whole-class discussion, follows the introductory quiz, and observes a shift in the tone of talk, from summary review to academic analysis. This discursive transition is mediated by teacher support, seeking academic engagement to make critical thinking and creative interpretation accessible through joint participation. Typically, students are asked to describe what they see as the central theme of the film, and this inquiry is followed by a set of discussion questions designed to

encourage deeper reflection and critical engagement with the film's thematic and symbolic elements (see Appendix D for a sample list of questions). To allow students the opportunity to practice, the discussion is split into two parts, the first involving small group talk in preparation for the second, whole class interaction. Initially, students generate answers in the small groups of 3 – 4 members, either based on proximity (who they are sitting next to) or counting off (creating groups with members who likely do not know each other well). The small groups then discuss answers to the discussion questions they will subsequently present to the class. Though some groups occasionally stray off topic, the task generally works as an introduction to the whole class discussion, which is, from the students' point of view, the "chance to talk about opinion" (CE/4/1) and practice expressing and listening to ideas with classmates. Questions are designed to generate a variety of insightful, critical interpretations. From an instructional point of view, however, whole-class discussion also involves building interpretations *jointly*, in interaction with other class members, as students answer questions following the rules of standup. It is a chance to put individual ideas before the whole class, affirming both membership and dialog with classmates.

Actually, students seem to be aware of the shifting relationships that take place when expressing ideas. A number of students commented on ways in which questions worked to "expand thoughts" (CE/5/19), while others noted how the discussion was tied to full participation, so that every student contributes to the class atmosphere, a discursive space where students recognize different points of view and ways of looking at the same text. Students also gain the sense of audience, as they begin to understand that what they say affects others, in the same way that what others say affects them, which is a fundamental point of addressivity in dialogic instruction, in that the thinking of one student is tied to the thinking of another:

> *By exchanging opinions, we can listen to various thoughts and be introduced to different ideas. (6/5/4/4)*
>
> *Discussion helps me know about what others think. If their opinions are different from mine, I can understand more deeply by listening to them. (6/5/4/5)*
>
> *We can know other points of view and other ideas which you never come up with [on your own]. (6/5/4/6)*
>
> *Discussing with others, I get to know ideas I hadn't thought about. (6/5/4/9)*

The goal of getting students to address discussion questions is certainly to better understand what is going on in a film, but the value of the activity goes beyond the chance to express ideas. A supplementary goal is to show *how* to answer a question, both in terms of content and style (i.e., attitude). In particular, dialogic discussion aims to develop a sense of academic expression, to engage students in developing interpretation, where there is no right answer, but rather reasoned explanation and evidence, addressed to the audience of class members while recognizing the diversity of perspectives that is evident:

> *I like the way we are not taught English, but made to use English to explain things. (CE5/17)*
>
> *Discussion helps me know a different point which I am not able to find by myself. (6/5/7)*
>
> *Discussion about the movie has a chance for us to create a new vision. (6/5/8)*

Students are, on the whole, largely positive about class discussion both as a way to understand film and as a way to improve English proficiency. Those who normally do not talk about serious issues with friends recognize the opportunity that in-class discussion offers a way of using language

communicatively, while those who have had experience learning English in academic contexts recognize the value of seeing a text from different points of view. The orientation shifts from learning English for evaluation purposes (as on a test) to creating and communicating ideas in what Lave and Wenger (1991) term a community of practice. The purpose of study shifts, then, from getting the right answer, to getting an idea across and, in turn, understanding ideas and interpretations framed from a new perspective:

> *We can train our ability to break down complex ideas to something simple so that people can understand. (6/5/5/3)*
> *I can understand another point of view through talking. (6/5/4/10)*
> *Discussing topics with others not only makes an opportunity to communicate in English, it makes us more engage to the class itself. (6/5/4/12)*
> *Usually after I watched a movie, I never discussed it with my friends.* (6/5/5/14)

In this engagement lies a process of discovery that develops within the individual, and in turn locates the individual in the group.

Teacher's Role

Successful class discussion is dependent on teacher engagement and coordination. Generally, only the teacher can orchestrate longer, evidence-based answers from students by doing such things as explicitly asking for further explanation, or speaking in the learner's voice to expand a comment. In general, students in the class seem to recognize what the teacher is trying to do in dialogic interchange. In the words of one student, "after I speak the teacher says a comment [which] makes me understand better what I said myself" (CE5/18). In other words, students see that there is a shared orientation that serves as discursive support:

> *The teacher gives assistance when we're speaking and it helps us summarize the things we want to say, and deepens our thought. (6/26/4/10)*
>
> *The professor helps me a lot. He always sums up what we've said and that makes me feel I'm approved. (6/26/4/11)*
>
> *He always tries to figure out what I want to say even when I can't find words to express my ideas. (6/26/5/16)*
>
> *I appreciate that the teacher helps me when I struggle saying difficult things. (CE/ 4/11)*

Some students, however, express reservations about teacher coordinated discussion. Sometimes they are skeptical of the instructor's intentions, especially at the beginning of the semester, though occasionally the skepticism lasts until the end of term. Some students prefer presentation style solo talk and apparently feel that there is too much information to express in a dialogic back-and-forth conversation with the teacher, and some feel, simply, that the teacher interrupts too much. However, the point of an interactive classroom is to position students as speakers, which inevitably means doing things like interjecting comments, asking for clarification and/or evidence, and suggesting more explanation. Clearly, there is always a risk that the teacher will say too much or interrupt at the wrong moment. Although the principles of dialogic teaching are generally clear, actual practice is reliably cloudy. The way a teacher responds in real-time to a student is shaped by the practical exigencies of dealing with a room-full of students, and the reality of mistakes is simply unavoidable (cf. Shea, 2019). In the long run, the only means to overcome student skepticism is commitment and supportive engagement, trusting that students will see how dialogic interaction works to strengthen proficiency and expand academic voice.

Essay Writing

Although the pedagogic orientation of the film class is grounded in oral interaction, the course has always included a written component designed to build on and extend discussion, which works in a sense to stretch the classroom across space and time. That is, students are assigned to carry the discussion to the library (or home), where they may consider a theme talked about in class. In turn, the essays provide focus and direction to class activity, because they generate a more attentive stance in discussion, sharpening the way students listen and respond to classmates, and increasing motivation to pick up new ideas, vocabulary, and perspectives. In sum, the essays give students the chance to deepen their conception of academic literacy, making a connection between oral discussion and written argument.

Perhaps the major difficulty students face when writing academic essays involves the lack of experience constructing an argument. Many find themselves relying on summation, simply describing what happened, rather than developing an interpretation based on extended explanation and evidence. The development of a written argument becomes easier because it is located in class interaction, where students are not simply told how to develop a thesis but are actually *engaged* in the activity. In this way, class discussion positions students as generating ideas and building interpretations addressed to an audience, stimulated by their ideas and perspectives encountered there. This contextualization makes the next step, including citation, quotation, and reference, easier to understand.

Students find the academic essays particularly difficult to write, but given the strong motivation brought to the task, many realize that, in spite of the complexity, writing the essays offers a significant opportunity to improve language proficiency. One student commented that “writing the essay

improves English skills. I want ... to continue" (5/15/4/4), while others wrote:

> *It was complicated to find statements to support my opinion from the movie critics. (5/15/4/1)*
>
> *Writing the essay is difficult, but it is good to improve writing skills. (5/15/4/10)*
>
> *It's a good way to put our thinking into words and to learn citations. (5/15/5/9)*

Although difficult to master, students recognize that the strengthening of one's own voice and the incorporation of other voices into one's own are part of the shift to academic writing.

English Only

On first session of the first term, students are asked to consider the classroom a discursive third space, neither Japan nor the US (or the UK), but a place for using English exclusively (for the most part), in order to enact a new orientation to the L2. Although using Japanese is a natural part of living in Japan, using English as a shared medium of expression makes the language more than a communicative tool. The injunction to use English pushes students to reframe language study as a means of critical thinking, building ideas and creating new interpretations – of texts and of themselves. Students have told me over the years that opportunities to use English in everyday university life are limited. For example, one student noted:

> *This is literally the only class I take [where I] speak English. (CE4/20)*

Students may be proficient at the beginning of the academic year when entering the university, but many struggle to maintain their L2 ability in the face of attrition and the pressures of a largely monolingual environment.

Some teachers do not insist on an English-only policy, allowing students to respond to discussion questions in Japanese, as long as answers presented to the class are in English. For these teachers, the priority is critical thinking. My argument is that the means are as important as the ends – or rather, the means *are* the end. That is, discussion in English is part of the answer. In the long run, students find that maintaining an English-speaking environment actually provides encouragement and actually makes it easier to speak English, however frustrating it proves at the beginning of the term.

A related policy that facilitates a dialogic atmosphere is circular seating. From the first session, students arrange desks into a circle facing each other. Further, they make name-tags, which they bring to every class, so that they may *address* classmates. The seating policy helps avoid framing comments in terms of correctness because they are not directed to the teacher; rather, students are oriented to the class as a whole and their ideas are generated in response to ideas met in this dialogic space. In getting "to hear what others think" (CE5/19), students are orienting to diverse perspectives and a multivocality that is at the heart of language learning.

Shifting Identifications

Evidence suggest that as the year progresses, students begin to change the way they think about English. The dialogic interaction reframes, arguably, the way students use and thus relate to the language. Generally, this shift happens most noticeably for those students who in high school related to English in terms of grammatical structure, who begin to realize that in the development of ideas and interpretations, they have begun to change their view of the language, less as an assessment and more as a tool of thinking and creative inquiry. Students wrote, for example:

After taking this class, I realize that I pay less attention to others'

grammar and pronunciation mistakes, but I have more interest in the content of their talk and their ideas. English was something that I needed to memorize but now I think I may have actually started using it as a communicative tool in this class. 10/4/3

I came to speak more English... because of the courage which I gained in this class. (10/5/1)

English was the biggest part of my life until junior high. It was a way for me to communicate and I didn't consider it studying. However, there were times when I hated English in cram school. This class reminded me how fun it is to speak English. (10/5/6)

Clearly, the trend is to push beyond the exam orientation that characterized English study in high school, with the largely reproductive focus on listening and selecting the right answer on multiple choice test questions. Students are, in other words, stepping away from the ties of the L1, and toward a new dialogic identity constructed in the third space of L2 engagement.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have tried to present the ideas and practice of the film class taught in a dialogic manner. Class has effectively developed not only the English skills of the students, it has also increased confidence, strengthened identification, and deepened a feeling of proximity with the language. Certainly not everyone, however, feels positive. On the semester final survey, approximately 20 percent of students reported that they still lack confidence to speak English, which is understandable, given that the number of English classes, for most students, is just two per week. At the same time, it is a source of encouragement that halfway through the academic year, a full 70% report that they feel English has become a bigger part of their identity, with 85% reporting that the way they use English to

think about things has deepened, and 97% agreeing that they feel their ability to explain ideas in English has developed. There is no doubt that the way students are orienting to English is undergoing a major shift, due at least in part to the dialogic focus on critical thinking and the expression of ideas within an atmosphere of shared inquiry.

Admittedly, students enrolled in the film class score at the top levels of English test proficiency and bring strong motivation to the FL classroom, but advanced proficiency does not invalidate the need to make language study enjoyable, to build upon the intersection of English and the world, and to shift the parameters of instruction toward dialogic engagement and critical thinking. Most students report that the identification with English increased because of the class. There are likely various reasons for this finding: the appeal of the films themselves and the social support of classmates, for example, but it also suggests the value and efficacy of a dialogic approach that invites students to standup in the L2 classroom and join their classmates in constructing academic discourse with energy, commitment, and creativity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express special thanks to the students in both sections of the film class, 4th and 5th period, who have been so cooperative and enthusiastic week in and week out, and who have been so generous in allowing me to use their feedback. I am also grateful to the reserve books staff at the Media Center for being so accommodating to make the films available to students. Finally, I am deeply grateful to the two anonymous reviewers who read an earlier draft of this paper so carefully and with such care and perceptive insight. Their comments were immeasurably helpful.

References

Alexander, R. (2008). Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy. In N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson S (Eds.), *Exploring talk in schools* (pp. 91–114). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Barnes, D. (2008). Exploratory talk for learning. In: N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring talk in schools* (pp. 1–16). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Benson, P. (2006). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language teaching*, *40*(1), 21–40.

Boyd, M.P., & Markarian, W.C. (2015). Dialogic teaching and dialogic stance: Moving beyond interactional form. *Research in the Teaching of English, 49*, 272–296.

Chen Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. C. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(1–2), 1–21.

Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Hardman, F. (2008). Teachers' use of feedback in whole-class and group-based talk. In N. Mercer, & S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring talk in school: Inspired by the work of Douglas Barnes* (pp. 131–150). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Johnson, K.E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 235–257.

King, J. E. (2013). Silence in the second language classrooms of Japanese universities. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(3), 325–434.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(4), 366–372.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, A. (2010). English and me. In D. Nunan & J. Choi (Eds.), *Language and culture: Reflective narratives and the emergence of identity* (pp. 118–124). NY: Routledge.

Mercer, N. (2016). Education and the social brain: Linking language, thinking, teaching and learning, *Éducation et Didactique, 10*, 2–17.

Mercer, N. & Dawes, L. (2008) The value of exploratory talk. In N. Mercer and S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring talk in schools*. LA: Sage, pp. 55–72.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking*.

London: Routledge.

O'Connor, C. Michaels, S. Chapin & Harbaugh, A. (2017). The silent and the vocal: Participation and learning in whole-class discussion. *Learning and Instruction, 48*, 5–13.

Okada, R. (2016). Conflict between critical thinking and cultural values: Difficulty asking questions and expressing opinions in Japan. *Asian Education Studies*, *2*(1), 91.

Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 4th edition. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Reznitskaya, A. (2012). Dialogic teaching: Rethinking language use during literature discussions. *The Reading Teacher, 65*, 446–456.

Shea, D. (1994). Perspective and production: Constructing solidarity and status across cultural borders. *Pragmatics, 4*(3), 357–389.

Shea, D. (2017a). Compelled to speak: Addressing student reticence in a university EFL classroom. *Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4* (2), 173–184.

Shea, D. (2017b). Oriented to English: Motivations and attitudes of advanced students in the university classroom. *JALT Journal, 39* (2), 139–164.

Shea, D. (2019). Trying to teach dialogically: The good, the bad, and the misguided. *Language Teaching Research, 23(6), 787–804.*

Stone, P. & Kershaw, M. (2019). Task repetition and interactional competence: Designing a rubric for use in the classroom. *Language, Culture and Society*, *17*, 83–109.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, D.R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*, 237–246.

Thompson, P. (2008). Learning through extended talk. *Language and Education, 22*, 241–256.

Wells, G. (2015). Dialogic learning: Talking our way into understanding. In T. Dragonas, K. J. Gergen, S. McNamee, & E. Tseliou (Eds.), *Education as Social Construction* (pp. 62–89). Ohio: Taos Institute Publications.

Wingate, U. (2012). 'Argument!' helping students understand what essay writing is

about. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(2), 145–154.

Young, R. F. (2019). Interactional competence and L2 pragmatics. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 93–110). New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A – STUDENT SURVEYS

Code	Topic	Date	Class period	no. of students
5/15/4/1–19	value of film	May 15	4th	19
5/15/5/1–20	“ ”	May 15	5th	20
6/5/4/1–19	role of discussion	June 5	5th	19
6/5/5/1–22	“ ”	June 5	5th	22
6/12/4/1–18	nature of films	June 12	4th	18
6/19/4/1–19	“ ”	June 19	4th	19
6/26/4/1–18	role of teacher	June 26	4th	18
6/26/5/1–22	“ ”	June 26	5th	22
CE4/1–20	Class Evaluation	July 17	4th	20
CE4/1–19	“ ”	July 17	5th	19
10/4/1–19	identity	Oct 16	4th	19
10/5/1–17	“ ”	Oct 16	5th	17

APPENDIX B – FILMS

SPRING SEMESTER

Schindler's List (1993). Spielberg, Director. Miramax: USA.（シンドラーのリスト）. In the face of the cruellest hatred and violence, “whoever saves one life saves the world entire.”

Freedom Writers (2007), Richard LaGravenese, Director. Paramount: USA.（フリーダム・ライターズ）. Raise your hand if you know what the holocaust is.

Invictus (2009). Clint Eastwood, Director. Warner Bros.: USA/South Africa.（インビク

タス）. Mandela teaches us that forgiveness liberates the soul and that we are masters of our fate.

Fried Green Tomatoes (1991). Jon Avnet, Director. Universal: USA.（フライド・グリーン・トマト）. People will live if you remember them.

Social Network (2010). David Fincher, Director. Sony: USA.（ソーシャル・ネットワーク）. Facebook's founder Zuckerberg dropped the "the" and made a fortune as he lost his best friend.

Hidden Figures (2017). Theodore Melfi, Director. 20thC. Fox: USA.（ドリーム）. Why don't we see any women of color when we look at the history of space travel?

In Good Company (2004). Paul Weitz, Director. Universal: USA.（イン・グッド・カンパニー）. Sometimes the rug is pulled out from underneath us and it's all we can do to stay standing.

Thank You for Smoking (2005). Jason Reitman, Director. Fox: US.（サンキュー・スモーキング）. Selling bad ideas to pay the mortgage; the goal is not to be right but show the other is wrong.

Morning Glory (2010). Roger Michell. Paramount: USA.（恋とニュースのつくり方）. Donut entertainment versus "bran" news are reconciled by a "fluffy" frittata.

Sing Street (2016). John Carney, Director. Weinstein: UK.（シング・ストリート）. The power to create is the way we deal with problems.

Sunshine Cleaning (2008). Christine Jeffs, Director. Overture, USA.（サンシャイン・クリーニング）.

AUTUMN SEMESTER

Bend it Like Beckham (2002) Gurinder Chadha, Director. Kintop Pictures, USA.（ベッカムに恋して）. The Anglo mom has as many unfair expectations for her daughter as the immigrant mom.

American History X (1998) Tony Kaye, Director. New Line, USA.（アメリカン・ヒストリーX）. Blind hatred eats at the soul and hurts us as much as it hurts the other.

The Help (2011) Tate Taylor, Director. DreamWorks, USA.（ヘルプ：心がつなぐストーリー）. Although it presents another white savior, the film shows the hope and resistance to racial power.

In Her Shoes (2005) Curtis Hansen, Director. Fox: USA.（イン・ハー・シューズ）.

Looking at the world from another's perspective allows us to rethink notions of beauty and value.

Up in the Air (2009). Jason Reitman, Director. Paramount, USA.（マイレージ、マイライフ）. Everyone needs a co-pilot, and a light backpack, given the pitilessness of employers.

Witness (1985). Peter Weir, Director. Paramount, USA.（目撃者）. "Having seen you become one of them" we are told as we witness the Amish lifestyle.

Julie & Julia (2009) Nora Ephron, Director. Columbia Pictures, USAS.（ジュリー＆ジジュリア）. We write our life day in and day out, about food that sustains us.

Salmon Fishing in the Yemen (2011) UK Film Council.（砂漠でサーモン・フィッシング）. Salmon swim against the current; it's in their DNA.

Bagdad Cafe (1987). Percy Adlon. Director. Pelemele Film, W. Germany.（バグダッド・カフェ）. The foreigner is a mysterious visitor who brings strange customs and magical transformation.

USED IN YEARS PAST

Gandhi (1982). Richard Attenborough, Director. International Film, UK.（ガンジー）. The man of the century who changed the world as we know it.

Hotel Rwanda (2004). Terry George, Director. Metropolitan: France.（ホテル・ルワンダ）. While the world turned its back, one man had to make a choice.

Whip It (2009). Drew Barrymore, Director. Fox Searchlight.（ローラーガールズ・ダイアリー）. Bliss wasn't sure where her life was going, but she knew it had to go somewhere.

Lone Star. (1996). John Sayles, Director. Castle Rock: USA.（真実の嘯き）.

Do the Right Thing. (1989). Spike Lee, Director. 40 Acres: USA.（ドゥ・ザ・ライト・シング）. Racial tensions simmer on the hottest day of the summer.

APPENDIX C – Quizes

Morning Glory

1 Who rides the roller coaster?

2 Who kisses the frog?

3 Who says “kiss it again”?
4 Who wants to do a story on sauerkraut?
5 Who gets arrested?
6 What word does Mike use to describe a *frittata*?
7 Who calls Becky during her *Today Show* interview, says he won’t ask twice?
8 What piece of furniture in the office keeps breaking?
9 Where does Becky put her phone in Adam’s apartment?
10 Who’s walking in the last scene and what time is it?

The Help

1 What is Skeeter’s first job?
2 Who eats the poo pie?
3 What’s under Celia’s rose bushes?
4 Who says “ugly is inside you”?
5 Who goes on a blind date with Skeeter? (Stewart)
6 Who does Minnie teach to cook? (Celia)
7 Who does the “terrible awful”?
8 Who is Treelaw?
9 Who gets drunk at the party?
10 What’s the last scene?

Salmon Fishing in the Yemen

1 Who flies in by helicopter?
2 What is the source of hope at the end?
3 Who says “you’ll be back. It’s in your DNA”?
4 What is the last scene?
5 Who saves the Sheikh in Scotland?
6 Who says “I pay my debts”?
7 What is the last scene of the film?
8 Who gets a job in Geneva?
9 Who is the host of dinner at the castle in Scotland?
10 What does Fred bring to Harriet’s apartment?

APPENDIX D – Discussion Questions

Outsourced

1 The picture handing in Todd's room is of Kari, the Goddess of destruction. Where do you see scenes of destruction (list 3) and explain what they symbolize?

2 What do the things in the last scene (in Todd's apartment) symbolize: the mirror, the phone call, the sign, the sugar, the bindi on Washington, the groceries?

3 What do the following symbolize: Todd's dip in the pond? going over the wall? having his cell stolen?

Sunshine Cleaning

1 How do we think about those who do the "dirty work" and clean up messes?

2 What can you say about defining yourself by what others think?

3 What can you say about the way we see physical disability?

The Descendants

1 What does the couch in the final scene symbolize?

2 How are Matt's daughters symbols of what Hornaday calls the "burdens of stewardship"?

3 What does the fact that Matt doesn't really know his daughters symbolize?