Self-Representation of Filipino Teachers and Korean Learners of English in Online Classes

Leonardo MUNALIM
Philippine Women's University, Philippines
Email: lomunalim@pwu.edu.ph

Betty TUTTLE
De La Salle University–Dasmariñas, Philippines
Email: betuttle@dlsud.edu.ph

Cecilia GENUINO
Philippine Normal University-Manila, Philippines
Email: genuino.cf@pnu.edu.ph

Abstract

With an exhaustive survey of published studies, we found that no attempts have been made to analyze classroom talks between Filipino teachers and Korean students of English in online ESL classes. The reason may be attributed to the arduous labor of transcribing and analyzing the data both macro- and microscopically. This lacuna may have provided teachers and students a poor understanding of the features of talk of both interlocutors in an online modality. For this study, we looked at the way Filipino teachers and Korean students of English represented themselves using the first-person pronoun "I" (1PP) through the lens of transitivity processes via Systemic Functional Linguistics. The transcribed data were culled through transitivity concordancing analysis of "I" social actors from five 20-minute audio-recorded classes (1 hour and 40 minutes), which were secured from a leading online academy in Metro Manila. An interesting result disclosed that the teachers and the students dominantly used mental processes when self-

representing. Material and relational processes are traditionally known as the default processes based on M.A.K. Halliday's (1985) framework. At a comparative level, they tended to share the same means of self-representing at the level of material, mental and relational process, but different in terms of verbal processes. Overall, the identical pattern of self-representation may be an indication of their attempts to mitigate the psychological and communications space called 'transactional distance' in an online ESL education. We offer limitations, recommendations, and implications toward the end of the paper.

Keywords: *ESL/EFL; Filipino; Korean; first-person pronoun; online classes; self-representation; transactional distance; transitivity concordancing; transitivity*

Introduction

To use first-person pronouns (1PP) is to center one's own multimodal experiential space upon one's own body, thus operating in an egocentric reference frame (Vogeley & Fink, 2003). Bhat (2004) asserts that "personal pronouns are used primarily for denoting speech roles like 'being the speaker' and 'being the addressee' of the sentence in which they occur" (p. 272). To date, there has been no definite definition of the term self-representation, as it has been used in different disciplines, mostly in psychology. For instance, Liu (2012) claims that the "*I* necessarily exists as the subject of thinking. It is a thinking thing embodied in the act of thinking itself" (p. i). For this present study, self-representation was coursed through the use of first-person-perspective (1PP) using transitivity processes within the Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1985).

Because of the lack of categorical definitions, we have surveyed a few of the related studies and literature from other disciplines. For instance in general education like Mathematics education, Chapman (2010) states that "mathematics teachers' self-representation is considered in terms of the selves teachers intentionally represent in their teaching of mathematics, in particular, their mathematical self-representation and personal

self-representation. These representations, then, are from the perspective of the teachers and are conveyed to students through language and actions" (p. 291). By personal self-representation, Chapman means that it "is more about the ways the teacher wishes to be perceived by her or his students. Thus, it is related to teacher identity. It can represent the image a teacher has of him or herself based on his or her interpretation or perception of what students consider as an accepted teacher self for a given classroom situation" (p. 292).

In language and linguistics, Cramer and Schuman (1975) historically investigated I-saying and We-saying in discourses. Accordingly, in contrast to I-saying, We-They coding is significantly related to negative attitudes, while They-saying reflects a more general lack of positive feelings toward government. They also assert that the use of "we" and "they" expresses distance between the self and the larger society. Newen and Vogeley (2003), on the one hand, maintains that "the correct assignment and involvement of 1PP is reflected by the use of first-person pronoun. 1PP is furthermore a key constituent in any of our relations to our environment, e.g., spatial cognition, action in the environment and all forms of social interaction" (p. 536). Situating from a discourse level, van Leeuwen (1995) holds that written genres are a form of distillation, that is, they connect social actors to different social practices, actions and various speech acts.

In a written genre, Sheldon (2009) investigated the use of first-person pronoun in English and Castilian Spanish research articles. She used a six-pronged typological taxonomy of possible identities realized by first-person pronouns such as *I* as a conveyor of general knowledge; *I* as a guide or navigator; *I* as conductor of research; *I* as evaluator of previous claims; *I* as originator of claims; and the reflexive *I*. Overall, Sheldon argues that "through the examination of these roles and their variants, the data may reveal how these roles help construct a scholarly text that not only persuades or convinces the reader of one side of an argument but also illuminates the ways in which writers claim responsibility" (p. 256). Tang and John (1999) earlier explored writers' identity in student academic writing through the use of first person.

It may be a given that self-representation of the students and teachers in online classes may be the same with the traditional mode of ESL teaching-learning interactions. Nonetheless, the obvious absence of physical interaction (cf. Keegan, 1980) between the students and the teachers in an online mode, arguably, has necessitated this present linguistic inquiry. In fact, there is paucity of research on self-representation in general, and the use of "I" in particular in spoken and synchronous ESL online classes, especially in the parochial context of the Philippines. Online classes between Filipino teachers and Korean learners of English have not been figured prominently in studies. Neglect of studies of these ESL classes has sparked our interests. It should be worth noting that the dearth of empirical research on teacher-talk and student-talk delivered online between Filipino teachers and Korean students of English may be attributed to the challenge of securing the recorded online classes, the arduous part of the transcription processes, and the time that the analysis takes. The research lacuna may be also pinpointed to the issues in securing the available audio or video recordings due to the inherent ethical qualms. In case there have been studies of this kind beyond our knowledge, this study still bears a scholarly merit. Texts are never produced in the same spatio-temporal, cultural locations (Hasan, 2004), just as people generating the language systematically differ from one another (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). In this present study, the teachers are Filipinos while the students are Koreans.

Teacher talk has been well studied (e.g., Alexander, 2008; Diffily & Sassman, 2006; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Sinclair & Brazil, 1985; Teo, 2016; Wallace, Sung, & Williams, 2014; Walsh, 2011). Yet little has been known about teacher-talk and student-talk at the same time in online ESL classrooms. Thus, our paper was an attempt to map out these unchartered macro- and micro-features of teacher-talk and student-talk in online classes between Filipino teachers and Korean students of English. For this study, we focused on self-representation with the use of the first person (1PP) I-pronoun. Even with the meager corpus due to the labor of transcribing and the difficulty of securing the recordings, our study has attempted to answer these goals in mind:

1. What transitivity processes do Filipino teachers and Korean students of English use when self-representing?
2. What does the overall pattern of self-representation say about both interlocutors' relationship and communicative space online?

Significance of the study

Understanding the use of transitivity processes such as material, mental, relational and verbal processes via Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is important. We argue that the kind of self-representation employed by the teachers and the students in an online ESL context can plausibly serve as a source of understanding to tap the ESL students' lived experiences when engaged in an online dialogue, including the linguistic options that they prefer when sharing their personal lived experiences. A better understanding of teachers' and students' self representation in online classes can thus contribute to a more complete understanding of how online classes are maintained amid the physical absence. It can raise our awareness of self-representations of both teachers and students, which will further offer another way of looking at an enhanced dialogic conversational value in the online teaching of ESL/EFL.

Moreover, understanding the teachers' and students' self-representation may give us a useful way of describing the creative linguistic tension between the interlocutors, thereby giving insights into the decisions that ESL managers, administrators and trainers must make about improving the quality of the ESL conversations and classes. Admittedly, good teaching performance is tied with the economic, massification, commodification, and marketization of online classes (cf. Keegan, 1980; Tait, 2000).

English teaching to Korean students of EFL in the Philippine context

Before moving on, a specific term needs a little ink of clarification. The use of the term "online classes" is purposeful for consistency. We are aware of the other related terms such as e-

learning, virtual education/virtual schooling/virtual classes, on-line learning/on-line education, Web/technology-based or mediated education (cf. ACL/ADB, 1999; Simonson, Smaldino, & Zvacek, 2005, p. 33). 'Online Classes' is rather a common term in the Philippines.

English became a mandatory school subject in Korea in 1997 (Fouser, 2011). Consequently, many Korean students go to different countries to study English in native and in second language environments. The Philippines has become one of the leading non-native English-speaking countries of choice among the Koreans. Reasons include affordable tuition fee and the Filipino teachers' good pedagogical skills. This claim is supported by data. In 2018 alone, the Bureau of Immigration (2018) reported that South Korea has 11,909 students with special study permit in the Philippines. Munalim (2019a) also reported that more Chinese students enrolled in a local university in Manila than any of the other Asian nationalities.

With the advent of technology (Christakis & Fowler, 2011; Clark, Hergenrader & Rein, 2015; Ferris, 2009; Porter, 2008; Watson, 2009), many Korean students need not study in the Philippines by batch, which is called 'Winter Camp', usually between December to February, a winter season in South Korea. In online classes, most Korean students enroll in online classes for one good reason: to practice English to attain fluency, not accuracy. Most of them enroll in free conversation classes, or classes with very limited use of textbooks and references. These students do not enjoy rich communicative experiences, as English is considered to be a foreign language in their contexts.

Before teaching at the university level, I (the primary author) had taught Korean students for 5 years at 8 online academies, and I had served as an online curriculum developer and operations manager in two online academies in Metro Manila, Philippines. Continuing to date, teachers are advised to observe 80% student talking time, relegating the teachers to a limited 20% talking time. As a result, the teachers and students are expected to engage in a conversation that gears towards a specific communicative purpose with relevant identities (Drew & Heritage, 1992). We argue, however, that this institutional discourse does not seem to affect how the

teachers and students may represent themselves, noting that both have identified themselves as audience-addressed (cf. Ede & Lunsford, 1984). People naturally interact with one another with a multitude of lived experiences (Salas, Fitchett, & Mercado, 2013) to share.

Interaction and transactional distance in online classes

An important question, by now, is the question of the choice to capitalize on the study of self-representation using I-saying from the corpus of ESL online classes. We will couch our argument within the concept of interaction and transactional distance (Moore, 1997). We argue that effective use of self-representation online is a first step toward creating a much closer connection between the teachers and the students amid physical distance.

In online classes, interaction has been recognized as critical (cf. Hirumi, 2013; Juler, 1990; Moore, 1989; Rhode; 2009) because there is a separation of the teachers and students (Keegan, 1980). When teacher-student interaction is not observed and sustained, Moore (1997) warns of the possibility of a psychological and communications space called 'transactional distance.' He further claims that "with separation, there is a psychological and communications space to be crossed, a space of potential misunderstanding between the inputs of instructor and those of the learner" (p. 22). Teachers have to heighten not only the cognitive and the teaching presences, but also the social presence (Anderson, 2003).

Audio-captured ESL classes formed the corpus of this present study. Audio is less interactive than video conferencing and teleconferencing, given the mediating effect of technology without teachers and students seeing each other (cf. Anderson, 2003; Anderson & Dron, 2011). Consequently, the dialogues between parties may not be as interactive as compared to some other forms of advanced technology. The reciprocity and interactivity may be affected (Wagner, 1994). Therefore, amid the physical absence, it remains axiomatic to claim that teachers and students have to establish and sustain a real-time human connection during the allotted teaching-learning time. Wagner (1994) believes that

"reciprocal events require at least two objects and two actions. Interactions occur when these objects and events mutually influence one another" (p. 8). At the linguistic side, both teachers and students have to exhaust the possibility of self-representation. This is rather possible because as Battersby (2006) assures, people have all different narratives in life to share with one another. Teachers and students in an ESL online setting are not an exception in using the first-person pronoun "I" in telling their lived experiences.

At heart, we argue that the teachers' and students' self-representation in an ESL online classes can say about how the two interlocutors manage to maintain both a sense of connection and partnership within a particular institutional discourse (cf. Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). An institutional discourse is hastened by different local conditions such as the purpose of talk, constraints, 'tilted participation rights', roles, rules, cultural, social restrictions, and other task-based and role-based activities (Arminen, 2000; Drew & Sorjonen, 1997; Gardner, 2004; O'Sullivan, 2010). In an online set-up where physical presence is absent (Keegan, 1980), participants get to heighten fluid teacher-student interaction (Taylor, 2001) to mitigate transactional distance (Moore, 1997), thereby inducing face-like encounters. How is self-representation operationalized linguistically?

Linguistic grounding of this study

To achieve the purpose of unpacking the social actors' act of self-representation in ESL online classes, an analytical framework of transitivity from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) was employed. SFL can analyze language into systems of options in the creation of meanings of the texts (Eggins, 2004; Halliday, 2014; Lin & Peng, 2006; Widdowson, 2004). From the touching points of discourse analysis, Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart (2009) believe that "social actors constitute objects of knowledge, situations and social roles as well as identities and interpersonal relations between different social groups and those who interact with them" (p. 8). For this present study, we banked on Halliday's (1985) ideational function of the language, which is part of the

three-fold meta-functions, including the textual and interpersonal system. Used to express content and communication information, ideational language represents reality through transitivity. Transitivity operates in the clause, and is considered to be the most significant grammatical unit in analyzing representation through the processes of material, mental, relational and existential processes (Halliday, 1985). Even if Filipino teachers and Korean students belong to different world Englishes, the paradigmatic resources of the different transitivity processes at their disposal are the same.

Material processes describe the process of doing. They can be simplified into a traditional sentence pattern of Subject + Verb + Object. From the semantic lens, the verb as in 'I teach English' can be nominalized as a 'teacher.' Mental processes, on the one hand, involve the processes of sensing, feelings, thoughts, perceptions, desires, etc. The senser of the process considers a phenomenon, which is what is thought of, felt, perceived, or desired. Relational processes are those processes that characterize and identify things. Verbal processes are the processes of saying, where the participant role is always the sayer. Meanwhile, the existential processes were rather excluded in the analysis because it was not likely that the speakers will say, "There was **I**." The following samples delineate what these transitivity processes represent using the transitivity concordancing (Thompson, 2008) of "I" below, where the social actor "I" is capable of foregrounding participant roles and social actions:

- Material: **I** teach English.   → doer (what **I** does/is doing)
- Mental: **I** love teaching.   → senser (what **I** senses)
- Relational: **I** have online classes. → possesser (what **I** possesses)
- Relational: **I** am an ESL teacher. → 'being' (what **I** is)
- Verbal: **I** said that she has three books. → sayer (what **I** says)

Wooffitt (2005) assures that "in principle, language can reveal the workings of the mind while taking account of the various ways in which those processes might be obscured or distorted" (p. 115). We argue that just as skilled conversationalists employ a wide range of conversational strategies in building connections with the other interlocutors, so do they employ different transitivity

processes, which enable them to portray themselves in an ongoing talk-in-interaction in an online modality.

Method

Research design

The study is quantitative in nature using the corpus of transcriptions from the recordings, which are considered natural interaction in order to fully and faithfully catch the essence of the conversation (Have, 1999). Descriptive statistics was used for simple frequency counting and percentage. Inferential statistics were employed in order to seek significant difference between the hits of the different processes, both for teachers and the students, and as a whole. We also applied a descriptive analytic analysis of the patterns of quantitative data.

Participants from the recorded online classes

The Korean students of English in the recordings attained an identical proficiency level of the English language. Their levels were based on the official student evaluation form determined during the level assessment. Students in the intermediate to advanced levels were the target of this small-scaled study because they were able to initiate and sustain a wide variety of communicative tasks in lengthy connected discourse and even abstract topics (ACTFL, 2012). The Korean manager, unfortunately, did not grant us the permission to secure the students' profiles. The only sets of profiles made known in this study include their first names and the level of speaking proficiency. The other sets of students' information may not have some confounding effect on the objectives of this present study. Likewise, the Filipino teachers of EFL had an average age of 30. They were composed of 3 male and 7 female who had been teaching for an average of 5.90 years. Only 4 of them were graduates of BS-Education with a major in English. The rest came from other undergraduate courses such as AB-Psychology, BS-Management Accountancy, BS-Medical Technology, BS-Nursing, BS-Psychology, and BS Foreign Service. None of them have attained any master's degree or doctorate. All of these teachers are bilinguals and trilinguals (cf. Munalim, 2019b; Munalim & Lintao, 2017).

Corpus and corpus collection

Five 20-minute web-based ESL class recordings were secured from one prestigious online learning center in Ortigas City, Metro Manila, Philippines. The total running time is 1 hour and 40 minutes. Duncan (1972) and Cohen, Mancon, and Morrison (2005) assure that the size of conversations to be transcribed would depend upon one's perspective. And because this type of research is laborious and requires a considerable investment of time (Cervantes & Olson, 2013; Duncan, 1972), 5 sets of 20-minute classes from five different ESL/EFL teachers were personally considered to be enough as the correct sample size. The recordings were considered natural occurring, and non-experimental episodes (Have,1999), and were considered most felicitous corpus for studying the interaction (Drummond & Hopper, 1991), between Filipino teachers and Korean students of English.

Data analysis

Permission was sought from a Korean manager in the Philippines, with a consent form patterned from Susan M. Ervin-Tripp, Psychology Department, University of California at Berkeley. We were provided with the mp3 files of the said class recordings, following all the stipulated ethical considerations. Five 20-minute class recordings were then transcribed in whole by a commissioned transcriptionist. Because the transcriptions were not solely for pure Conversation Analysis, extra linguistic resources in the corpus were excluded. All transcriptions with any possible mentioning of names were modified in order to maintain the anonymity of the students involved in the conversation for data presentation.

Transcriptions per student's and teacher's cluster were then winnowed using transitivity concordancing of "I," using AntConc (Anthony,2014). In corpus linguistics, transitivity concordancing is performed by collecting the "clauses in which each entity or group of entities in the text is represented in a particular participant role" (Thompson, 2008, p. 18). Accordingly, it is capable of highlighting the key patterns of the predetermined term or lexis under investigation. For this present study, we focused on the social actor "I", which refers to the teacher and the student.

The polished concordancing lines were then fed into the UAM Corpus Tool (O'Donnell, 2015) for automatic segregation of all processes such as material, mental, relational, and verbal. Behavioral processes which are part of the built-in UAM Corpus Tool processes were excluded. Behavioral processes behave like material processes. All hits of the different processes were subject to descriptive statistics such as frequency counting, mean, and standard deviation. Z test on two samples was used to see the significant differences of the hits of transitivity processes with the aid of SPSS. Meanwhile, there were no inter-raters invited because the data were rather manageable, and the three of us could manage the analysis with the help of the UAM Corpus Tool.

Results

This current study is an attempt to investigate the transitivity processes that the Filipino teachers and Korean students of English use when self-representing in the online classes. These patterns of transitivity processes will be used to explain about both of the interlocutors' relationship and communicative spaces online.

Transitivity processes used by Filipino teachers and Korean students of English when self-representing

"Language equips us not only to construct our experiences of the physical world but also to describe the internal states of thoughts and emotions for ourselves and others" (Stedmon & Dallos, 2009, p. 35). From this premise, Table 1 discloses that the Korean students of English used more cases of the mental process (42.26%) than the rest of the processes such as material (39.33%), relational (17.57%) and verbal processes (0.84%) when self-representing. The same pattern was cascaded into the Filipino teachers' cluster.

Table 1. Hits of transitivity processes from both clusters

Processes	Student Cluster		Teacher Cluster		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Mental	101	42.26	89	44.06	190	43.08
Material	94	39.33	62	30.69	156	35.37
Relational	42	17.57	39	19.31	81	18.37
Verbal	2	0.84	12	5.94	14	3.17
Total	239	100.00	202	100.00	441	100.00

From both clusters, mental processes have perched at the top (43.08%). The percentage of 35.37% of the material processes comes in at second. These results can be considered intuitively interesting. As a proponent of transitivity processes via SFL, Halliday (1985) maintains that the material processes are a default process. He also moves to say that relational processes are more frequent than mental processes. In this study, both the teachers and the students showed the proclivity to use the material processes, a process that is "partly a kind of replay of the outer, recording it, reacting to it, reflecting on it, and partly a separate awareness of our states of being" (Halliday, 1985, p. 214).

Table 2. Hits of mental processes

Material		Mental		Relational		Verbal	
Students	**Teachers**	**Students**	**Teachers**	**Students**	**Teachers**	**Students**	**Teachers**
go (25)	go (10)	think (36)	think (25)	am (28)	am (27)	explain	ask (4)
eat (10)	do (9)	see (15)	see (12)	have (13)	have (12)	(2)	say (4)
do (6)	get (7)	know (12)	mean (11)				

Table 2 shows the top verbal groups under each of the processes. From the material processes, the students were more of a "goer,' 'eater,' and 'doer,' while the teachers were more of a 'goer,' 'doer,' and 'getter.' From the mental processes, the students were more of a 'thinker', 'seer,' and 'knower,' while the teachers were more of a 'thinker,' 'seer,' and 'meaner.' From the relational processes, the students and the teachers both represented themselves as more of individuals and social actors who had attributes, rather than entities who possessed something. Lastly,

from the verbal processes, the students were the 'explainer,' while the teachers were more of the 'asker.'

Specifically, looking at the mental processes, which dominated in the corpus, it turned out that both the teachers and the students used 'think,' a higher cognitive mental sensing; followed by 'see,' which is within the lower perceptive sensing. The teachers also employed 'mean,' which is considered a lower emotive mental sensing. Overall, from the mental processes, the students used more cases of higher mental processes based upon these top three mental processes.

Table 3. Significant differences of the hits of processes from the student cluster

Pairwise Comparison		Student Cluster		Teacher Cluster		Overall	
		t	p value	t	p value	t	p value
Material	Mental	-2.93	0.5150	-13.37	0.0055	-7.71	0.0191
	Relational	21.76	0.0001	11.39	0.0083	17.01	0.0001
	Verbal	38.49	0.0001	24.75	0.0001	32.20	0.0001
Mental	Relational	24.69	0.0001	24.75	0.0001	24.72	0.0001
	Verbal	41.42	0.0001	38.12	0.0001	39.91	0.0001
Relational	Verbal	16.74	0.0001	13.37	0.0001	15.19	0.0001

From the student cluster, Table 3 shows that the percentage of occurrence of material is not significantly different to mental, as their difference of 2.93% is considered too small (p=.5150). In Table 1, the material percentage of 39.33% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational percentage (17.57%) and verbal (0.84%). Likewise, the mental percentage of 42.26% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational and verbal. Lastly, the relational percentage of 17.57% turns out to be significantly higher than verbal. From the teacher cluster, the percentage of occurrence of the material processes is significantly lower than mental, as their difference of -13.37% is considered to be big enough (p=.0055). On the other hand, the material percentage of 30.69% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational percentage (19.31%) and verbal (5.94%). Mental percentage of 44.06% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational and verbal. Lastly, the relational percentage of 19.31% turns out to be significantly higher

than the verbal. Overall, results reveal that the percentage of occurrences of the material processes is significantly lower than the mental processes, as their difference of -7.71% is considered to be big enough (p=.0191). On the other hand, the material percentage of 35.37% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational percentage (18.37%) and verbal (3.17%). Likewise, the mental percentage of 43.086% turns out to be significantly higher than the relational and verbal. Lastly, the relational percentage of 18.37% turns out to be significantly higher than the verbal.

What the Overall Pattern of Self-Representation Says about Speakers' Connection amid Physical Absence

Each of the transitivity processes was compared by cluster. Understandably, the teachers and the students have different lived experiences. It was expected that they would demonstrate different ways of representing themselves, as "each context is constituted by a distinct discourse" (Lund, 2006, p. 182). However, results in Table 4 show that no significant difference exist between teachers and students in terms of the occurrence of materials (p=.0589), mental (p=.7040), or relational (p=.6386). On the other hand, the occurrence of the verbal turns out to be significantly higher among teachers (5.94%) as compared to only 0.84% among students. The overall pattern may convey that neither the teachers nor the students tend to represent themselves more materially, mentally and relationally. By contrast, when self-representing, the teachers showed the propensity to be more verbal than the students.

Table 4. Differences of processes between clusters

Processes	Students		Teachers		p value	Conclusion
	n	%	n	%		
Material	94	39.33	62	30.69	0.0589	Not Significant
Mental	101	42.26	89	44.06	0.7040	Not Significant
Relational	42	17.57	39	19.31	0.6386	Not Significant
Verbal	2	0.84	12	5.94	0.0024	Significant

Considering that no one was more material, mental, or relational in terms of self-representation, it can be surmised that

during the ESL online classes, both the teachers and the students who are considered social actors (cf. Fairclough, 2003) were on the same common ground of sharing their lived experiences, among others. From the results, it is clear that the speakers built solidarity with the known audience-addressed (Ede & Lunsford, 1984), although they have fluid and shifting roles in the production of the utterances (cf. Cherry, 1988; Ede & Lunsford, 1984).

Discussion

By and large, the results show that the teachers and the students dominantly used mental processes when self-representing. The results do not echo the default use of material processes. In fact, conscious human beings naturally explore first the superficial and outside phenomena before the inner worlds are infiltrated. As Halliday states, one cannot go mentally without passing materially. Munalim (2017) echoes Halliday's position when he found that the teachers in a writing class reflected on their lived experiences materially and relationally. Similarly, Lean, Don, and Fernandez (2013) also found that the dailies headlines used dominant material processes that involved political and spiritual leaders, police, emergency services, victims and people in general affected by terrorism.

At a comparative level, they tended to share the same means of self-representing at the level of material, mental and relational process, but different in terms of verbal processes. We may also argue that they are building a kind of solidarity and membership in situ. We bank this assertion on what Myers (1989) maintained, that the first-person plural pronouns can be used to stress solidarity with readers. Viewed collectively, there might be recurrent levels of talk that can be gleaned from the analysis. We will anchor our analysis on Mercer's (1995) levels of talk such as linguistic and psychological. At the linguistic level, it is clear that the both the teachers and the students made use of the material processes. At the psychological level, on the one hand, it capitalizes on the "an analysis of the talk as thought and action" (p. 105). Within the concept of interaction and interactional distance (Moore, 1997), we argue that the "I" representation used by both teachers and

students in online ESL classes has constructed individual personas in relation and association with one another, thereby mitigating the psychological and communications spaces (Moore, 1997) in their midst. The teachers and the students were able able to share the same linguistic resources in order to further navigate much more complex points of discussion online.

Because the students used different verbal processes when self-representing, ESL and EFL teachers should take full responsibility of making their students aware of the different linguistic options at their disposal. "When teachers are more aware of how they co-create meaning with their students..." (Cervantes & Olson, 2013, p. 92), they are better positioned to induce an enhanced sense of reciprocity of interaction between social actors (Wagner, 1994) in an online ESL education, where the human connection amid teacher-student separation (Keegan, 1980) may have been compromised. Greater awareness of Filipino teachers' and Korean learners' of self-representation in an obvious physical absence can help us understand how the interlocutors attempt to mitigate transactional distance (Moore, 1997).

Similarly in this respect, more fundamental to the ESL online classes is the ability of both interlocutors to constantly monitor their linguistic resources and options, which will have an impact on their individual self-representations. As Sivasubramaniam (2015) puts it, "fostering of agency, voice and inter-subjectivity would then entail encouraging students to propose and present their knowledge through a personalized use of language instead of a depersonalized one" (p. 82). Voice and self-representation should also be fostered by the teachers themselves. Chapman (2010) underscores that the "teachers could also reflect on the kind of selves they invite in their teaching and the kind of selves they dismiss, their personal contexts/experiences that are complexly wound into the selves they represent" (p. 294).

It was not entirely impossible that the different processes differ between the Filipino teachers and Korean students. Even if they both use the same common language, their individual way of representing their thoughts differs significantly from cultural points (cf. Vygostsky, 1962; Sapir-Whorf's hypothesis). The cultural aspect of teacher-talk and student-talk is far from being clarified in this

present study. Likewise, it is worthwhile to investigate inter alia: Does language proficiency and accuracy account for the differences of the act of self-representation? Do native English teachers (NES) and non-native English teachers (NNET) differ in self-representation? Does self-representation improve the quality of teacher talk and student talk? Should self-representation be part of what counts as a good ESL teacher? Can self-representation be embedded within the framework of quality ESL online teaching?

It will also be useful to compare the teachers' and students' self-representation in an online modality with face-to-face ESL classes because as Liu (2012) reminds, self is continuous in time. At the methodological aspect, amid the arduous process of transcribing online classes, our study is rather limited in corpus. Nonetheless, we hope that our humble study has sparked the interest of other researchers to investigate more of the macro- and micro-features and dynamics of online ESL classes in great depth and detail. These are only a few of the good questions that we pose, as we move a step closer to a much more enhanced understanding of the provision of online ESL classes. All of these limitations should be addressed to better understand how self-representations change and can affect the different contexts and conditions in online ESL teaching-learning. Recommendations for teacher training for linguistic competency and establishing closer connections with the students should be put forth as the beacon for teachers to mitigate transactional distance (Moore, 1997).

Conclusion

The use of I-representation in online ESL classes has allowed us to understand the wide range of roles that the teachers and students portray online. This study has shown how the practices in online classes in terms of self-representation of the teachers and the students emerge from mental processes. The domination of the material processes seems to be a compelling result because the material and relational processes are the default processes (Halliday, 1985; Munalim, 2017). Such an enriched conception of the teachers' and students' push and pull of self-representation helps us better understand the fluid act of online synchronous ESL

conversations. Under this construal, stands the idea that the kind of self-representations and transitivity processes used in online dialogues richly indicates how both interlocutors capture each other's attention. This 'voice' reflects how they both value a healthy dialogic discourse in a purposeful way, as their voices flow and ebb and as their good conversations unfold real-time. Results also "display membership within a particular social group or social network" (Gee, 1996, p. 128).

It is ideal to distill from the findings that it is not just the complexity of self-representations that matters the most from the dialogues. What matters the most is how both the teachers and the students manage to self-represent in their attempt to mitigate transactional distance (Moore, 1997), thereby allowing them to forge a face-like teacher-student academic interaction. What also matters is on how self-representation was achieved regardless of their conversational and linguistic fluency, accuracy and conversational constraints. In culmination, it is entirely through these exchanges of self-representation that a healthy, collaborative and participatory dialogic online conversation can emerge with the potential to bridge intercultural understanding in an online modality. This is not to say that the (online) relationship between Filipino teachers and Korean students of English has not been forged for the better. We always aim for the best!

Acknowledgement

The Conflict of Interest Statement

We hereby declare that we had no conflicting interests regarding any parties of this study. The study was done without support from any funding agency.

About the Authors

Dr. Munalim obtained a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Philippine Normal University-Manila. He is associated with *Journal of English as an International Language* and other SCOPUS-indexed journals. He is a holder of a Graduate Certificate in Distance Education from the University of the Philippines - Open University. He is the Dean of the Philippine Women's University - School of Arts and Sciences, and Director for Research of the same university.

Dr. Tuttle obtained a PhD in Language Education with specialization in English from De La Salle University-Dasmariñas. She is the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Communication of the same university.

Dr. Genuino holds the degree of Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from De La Salle University, Manila. Her research interests include sociolinguistics, syntax, discourse analysis, language policy and planning, and language teaching. She has published in SCOPUS-indexed journals. She mentored the other two authors in their dissertations.

References

"The Commonwealth of Learning and Asian Development Bank" (ACL/ADB). (1999). *An overview of open and distance learning: Training toolkit.* Canada/Philippines: The Commonwealth of Learning.

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (2012). *Speaking level.* Retrieved November 2, 2012 Available from http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org/

Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th ed.). York: Dialogos.

Anderson, T. (2003). Getting the mix right again: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 4*(2), 1492-3831.

Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). Three generations of distance education pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 12*(3), 80-97.

Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc* (Version 3.4.4w) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Retrieved from http://www.laurenceanthony.net.

Arminen, I. (2000). On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction. Discourse and Society,11(4), 435-458.

Battersby, J.L. (2006). Narrativity, self, and self-representation. *Narrative, 14*(1), 27-44.

Bhat, D.N.S. (2004). *Pronouns.* London: Oxford University Press.

Bureau of Immigration. (2018). *Statistics of foreign students in the Philippines.* Retrieved from www.foi.gov.ph/requests/aglzfmVmb2ktcGhyHAsSB0NvbnRl bnQiD0JJLTE0MDA2OTEwNDYxNQw.

Cervantes, S. E., & Olson, R. C. (2013). Using applied conversation analysis for professional development. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT2012 Conference Proceedings.* Tokyo: JALT.

Chapman, O. (2010). Teachers' self-representations in teaching mathematics. *Journal of Math Teacher Education,* 13, 289-294.

Cherry, R.D. (1988). Ethos versus persona: Self-representation in written discourse. *Written Communication, 5*(3), 251-276.

Christakis, N.A., & Fowler, J. H. (2011). *Connected: The surprising power of our social networks and how they shape our lives— How your friends' friends' friends affect everything you feel, think, and do.* NY: Back Bay Books/Little, Brown and Company.

Clark, M.C., Hergenrader, T., & Rein, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Creative writing in the digital age: Theory, practice, and pedagogy.* USA: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Cohen, L., Mancon, L., & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research methods in education.* NY: Routledge Falmer.

Cramer, R.M., & Schuman, H. (1975). We and they: pronouns as measures of political identification and estrangement. *Social Science Research*, 4, 231-240.

Diffily, D., & Sassman, C. (2006). *Positive teacher talk for better classroom management*. New York: Scholastic.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional setting* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Sorjonen, M.L. (1997). Institutional dialogue. In T.A. van Dijk, *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 92-118). London: Sage Publications.

Drummond, K., & Hopper, R. (1991). Misunderstanding and its remedies: Telephone Miscommunication. In N. Coupland, G. Howard, & J.M. Wiemann (Eds.), *"Miscommunication" and problematic talk* (pp. 301-317). New Delhi: Sage.

Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23*(2), 283-292.

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. College Composition and Communication, 35(2), 155-171.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. New York: Continuum.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Ferris, S.P. (2009). Millenials, social networking and social responsibility. In Zheng, R. (Ed.). *Adolescent online social communication and behaviour: Relationship Formation on the global internet* (pp. 167-201). USA: IGI Global.

Fouser, R. J. (2011, May 23). English educating approach. *The Korea Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2014/01/
314_87508.html

Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation analysis. In Davies, A., & Elder,
C. (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 262-284).
Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Idealogy in
discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar.*
London: E. Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd
ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Hasan, R. (2004). Analysing discursive variation. In L. Young & C.
Harrison (Eds.), *Systemic functional linguistics and critical
discourse analysis: Studies in social change* (pp. 15-52).
London: Continuum.

Have, P.T. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide.*
New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional
character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews.
In D. Boden & D.H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social
structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation
analysis* (pp. 93-137). Cambridge, Polity Press.

Hirumi, A. (2013). Three levels of planned elearning interactions: A
framework for grounding research and the design of
elearning programs. *The Quarterly Review of Distance
Education, 14*(1), 1-16.

Juler, P. (1990). Promoting interaction; maintaining independence:
Swallowing the mixture. *Open Learning, 5*(2), 24–33.

Keegan, D.J. (1980). On defining distance education. *Distance
Education, 1*(1), 13-36.

Lean, M.L., Don, Z.M., & Fernandez, P.R. 2013. 'Polarization in
the media representation of terrorism crises: Transitivity and
lexical choices in Malaysia's leading English dailies.' In A. De
Rycker & Z.M. Don (eds.), *Discourse and crisis: Critical*

perspectives (pp. 435-461). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Ling, F.Y., & Peng, A.X. (2006). Systemic functional grammar and construction grammar. *Presented during the 33rd International Systemic Functional Congress*, 331-347. Retrieved from http://www.pucsp.br/isfc/proceedings/Artigos%20pdf/16th_lin_peng_331a347.pdf

Liu, J. (2012). Introduction. In J. Liu & J. Perry (Eds.), *Consciousness and the self: New essays* (pp. i-xxiv). London: Cambridge University Press.

Lund, A. (2006). The multiple contexts of online language teaching. *Language Teaching Research, 10*(2), 181-204.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and students*. London: Multingual Matters.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. New York: Routledge.

Moore, M. (1989). Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 3*(2), 1–6.

Moore, M.G. (1997). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 22-38). London: Routledge.

Munalim, L.O. (2017). Mental processes in teachers' reflection papers: A transitivity analysis in Systemic Functional Linguistics. *3L-Language, Linguistics, and Literature: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 23*(2), 154-166.

Munalim, L.O. (2019a). Micro and macro practices of multicultural education in a Philippine university: Is it global integration ready? *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 29, 441-454. DOI: 10.1007/s40299-019-00497-7

Munalim, L.O. (2019b). Subject-auxiliary inversion in embedded questions in spoken professional discourses: A comparison of

Philippine English between 1999 and 2016-2019. *Journal of English as an International Language, 14*(1), 40-57.

Munalim, L.O., & Lintao, R.B. (2017). Accuracy of past tense in four tasks: Does translation facilitate narrative writing. *Association of Southeast Asian Teacher Education Network (AsTEN): Journal of Teacher Education, 2*(1), 10-26.

Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics 10*(1), 1-35.

Newen, A., & Vogeley, K. (2003). Self-representation: Searching for a neutral signature of self-consciousness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 12, 529-543.

O'Donnell, M. (2015). UAM corpus tool (Version 3.2j) [Computer Software]. Available on http://www.wagsoft.com/CorpusTool

O'Sullivan, T. (2010). More than words? Conversation analysis in arts marketing research. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 4*(1), 20-32.

Porter, J. (2008). *Designing for the social web*. CA: New Riders.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

Rhode, J. (2009). Interaction equivalency in self-paced online learning environments: An exploration of learner preferences. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 10*(1). doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i1.603

Salas, S., Fitchett, P.G., & Mercado, L. (2013). Talking to learn across classrooms and communities. *English Language Forum*, 1, 18-25.

Sheldon, E. (2009). From one I to another: Discursive construction of self-representation in English and Castilian Spanish research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 251-265.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. (2015). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education* (6th ed.). North Carolina, USA: Information Age Publishing.

Sinclair, J., & Brazil, D. (1985). *Teacher talk*. London: Oxford University Press.

Sivasubramaniam, S. (2015). Maximizing EIL competence through students' Agency, Voice and Inter-subjectivity. *English Scholarship Beyond Borders, 1*(1), 74–108.

Stedmon, J. & Dallos, R. (2009). Biological and development foundations of reflections. In Stedmon, J. & R. Dallos (Eds.), *Reflective practice in psychotherapy and counselling* (pp. 23-42). New York. McGrawHill, Open University Press.

Tait, A. (2000). Planning student support for open and distance learning. *Open Learning, 15*(3), 287-299.

Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person. *English for Specific Purposes,* 18, S23–S39.

Taylor, J.C. (2001). Fifth generation distance education. *Instructional Science and Technology, 4*(1), 1-14.

Teo, P. (2016). Exploring the dialogic space in teaching: A study of teacher talk in the pre-university classroom in Singapore. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 56, 47-60.

Thompson, G. (2008). From process to pattern: Methodological considerations in analyzing transitivity in text. In E. Ventola & C. Jones (Eds.), *New developments in the study of ideational meaning: From language to multimodality* (pp. 17-33). London: Equinox.

Van Leeuwen, K. (1995). Representing social action. *Discourse & Society,* 1, 81-106.

Vogeley, K., & Fink, G. (2003). Neural correlates of first-person-perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Science,* 7, 38–42.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wagner, E.D. (1994). In support of a functional definition of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 8*(2), 6 – 26.

Wallace, T. L., Sung, H. C., & Williams, J. D. (2014). The defining features of teacher talk within autonomy-supportive classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 42, 34-46.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. New York: Routledge.

Watson, T. (2009). *Causewired: Plugging in, getting involved, changing the world*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Widdowson, H.G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. MA: Blackwell.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.). UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis & discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage Publications.