Exploring teachers' and learners' overlapped turns in the language classroom: Implications for classroom interactional competence

Marco Octavio Cancino Avila
Universidad Andres Bello, Santiago, Chile
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2450-8197
marco.cancino@unab.cl

Abstract

The language choices that teachers make in the language classroom have been found to influence the opportunities for learning given to learners (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2012; Waring, 2009, 2011). The present study expands on research addressing learner-initiated contributions (Garton, 2012; Jacknick, 2011; Waring, Reddington, & Tadic, 2016; Yataganbaba & Yıldırım, 2016) by demonstrating that opportunities for participation and learning can be promoted when teachers allow learners to expand and finish their overlapped turns. Audio recordings of lessons portraying language classroom interaction from three teachers in an adult foreign language classroom (EFL) setting were analyzed and discussed through conversation analysis (CA) methodology. Findings suggest that when teachers are able to navigate overlapping talk in such a way that provides interactional space for learners to complete their contributions, they demonstrate classroom interactional competence (Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006). The present study contributes to the literature by addressing interactional features that increase interactional space, and an approach to teacher and learner talk that highlights CA's methodological advantages in capturing the interactional nuances of classroom discourse.

Keywords: conversation analysis; classroom discourse; classroom interactional competence; teacher-learner overlap

1. Introduction

Over the last 30 years, the relevance of approaches to classroom interaction that emphasize social aspects of learning has become apparent (Kumaravadivelu, 1993, 1999; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015, 2017; van Lier, 1988; Walsh, 2006, 2013). In the same way, perspectives that include interaction as a crucial component of second language acquisition (SLA), such as conversation analysis (CA; Kasper & Wagner, 2011), have informed second language (L2) and related pedagogy. This recent empirical and methodological shift has led researchers to focus on the interactional aspects of classroom discourse. Furthermore, the sociocultural view of "learning as participation" has been gaining relevance within this context as it regards participation as an essential component of classroom interaction (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; He, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek, 2004). From this perspective, learning is regarded as a culturally embedded process that takes place by means of social interaction, where learners depend on their repeated participation in activities with more competent interlocutors in order to succeed in language learning (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). A key element here is the idea that participation, either with peers or with a more competent target language user, is pivotal to L2 learning. This perspective regards learning as "doing," rather than just as "having" (Sfard, 1998); that is, learning is seen as a social process fueled by participation, and not as a static product in learners' minds.

A construct that is particularly relevant to the language classroom and teacher practice is *classroom interactional competence* (CIC; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006, 2011), which refers to "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh, 2006, p. 158). This concept derives from interactional competence, a term first posited by Kramsch (1986), who called for a focus on the ability of learners to communicate meanings and reach joint understandings as a measure of performance, rather than assessing learners' fluency and accuracy against a native-like standard. According to Markee (2008), interactional competence is developed by learning the formal features of a language without disregarding turn-taking, repair and sequence organization systems, as well as paralinguistic features (i.e., gaze, body movement, etc.). In order to develop interactional competence learners must deploy those resources "to co-construct with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2" (p. 406).

The notion of CIC is also highlighted by van Lier's (2000) ecological view of language learning as it stresses the importance of the context and the relevance of the verbal and non-verbal interaction carried out by teachers and learners, and by learners and other learners. From an ecological perspective, learning is not found inside the learner's head; rather, it lies in the gradual development

of mechanisms employed to deal with the meanings embedded in the world. If participants become aware of their environment, they will be able to discern which features that are part of that environment are likely to be useful for the learning process. Van Lier utilizes the term *affordance* taken from psychological research to label the relationship between active learners and these features, and regards interaction as a crucial element of the process. This view of learning has implications for pedagogy because learners' activities in the classroom must be structured in such a way that access to interaction and participation is available and encouraged (van Lier, 2000). Within this perspective that highlights learning as participation, the present study sought to examine aspects of interaction in the context of the adult English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom. Analysis was focused on techniques by means of which teachers orient to learner overlapped and latched utterances. The former refer to simultaneous talk between teacher and learners, while the latter take place when a learner's utterance immediately follows the teacher's contribution. These techniques can create interactional space and promote opportunities for participation and learning in the researched context. Furthermore, it is argued that being sensitive to learners' attempts to develop and finish their contributions can promote opportunities for participation and learning within a CIC framework. The co-constructed behaviors of teachers and students illustrated in the present study were analyzed by means of CA, a data-driven, empirical approach to the analysis of social interaction which seeks to discover systematic features present in the sequencing organization of talk (Lazaraton, 2004), and understand how people engage in social activities by means of such features (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). CA's empirical interest in the identification and analysis of systematic features of interaction has been found to inform an approach to classroom discourse that seeks to detail interactional practices that facilitate or hinder opportunities for participation in the language classroom (Walsh, 2002; Waring, Reddington, & Tadic, 2016). Even though the extent to which the observation and analysis of socially shared cognition can count as hard evidence for learning is still a contentious issue (Kasper, 2009), work has been done to conceptualize cognition as being publicly available through interaction (Markee, 2008, 2015; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Sert, 2017). Researchers have suggested that as learners engage in learning, it becomes possible to analyze their co-constructed social activities, have access to cognitive processes by focusing on the details of social interaction (such as repair, hesitation, repetition, gaze and gesture), and even document changes through time that go beyond the adaptation to a particular interactional context. This highlights the idea that a conversation analytic approach to language learning can illuminate how meanings are being articulated in the moment-by-moment interaction and show how opportunities for participation and learning

can be maximized by allowing learners to articulate those meanings through the "methods" (Pekarek Doehler, 2010) they have at their disposal to accomplish intersubjectivity and maintain social order. Thus, a conversation analytic approach was utilized in the present study to illustrate the way in which EFL teachers orient to learner overlapped and latched utterances, and how their moment-by-moment decisions in this respect can facilitate or hinder opportunities for learning and participation.

2. Literature review

2.1. Increasing interactional space

Creating and nurturing interactional space is a critical aspect of CIC as learners are given the opportunity to make contributions to the conversation and to receive feedback on them (Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2012). This can be done by increasing wait-time and planning time, by reducing the amount of times teachers fill classroom silence (by means of reducing teacher echo and turn completion), by providing them with feedback that is convergent with the classroom agenda, and by allowing learners to produce extended turns (Walsh, 2006, 2013). Particularly, allowing learners to produce extended contributions is central to promoting participation and engagement in the classroom. This has been researched in a number of environments and with an emphasis on specific interactional features. For example, Cancino (2015) investigated the use of back-channeling tokens such as *uh-huh* and *okay,* and found that participation is more likely to emerge when these features are used at specific moments in the interaction as a means of giving confidence to learners as they attempt to develop a topic. However, teachers must be sensitive to the negotiation of meaning sequences prompted by learners in their discourse. As Cancino suggested, when teachers decide to fill up space with back-channel tokens instead of producing clarification requests or confirmation checks when intersubjectivity, that is, the maintenance of the overall coherence of talk and mutual understanding, is at stake, potentially meaningful exchanges are lost. This is in line with Waring (2008), who found that explicit positive assessment, that is, teacher utterances that contain positive feedback terms such as *good*, *very good*, *excellent*, and *perfect*, can hinder learning in certain contexts by discouraging further discussion about valid alternatives.

2.2. Research on learner-initiated contributions

Research on learner-initiated contributions has addressed the way in which teachers' management of particular episodes can promote or hinder learner

participation and engagement. For example, Waring (2009) demonstrated how Mi-yuki, a Japanese learner of English as a second language, was able to step outside a traditional initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence during a routine homework checking activity and engage in successful learner-initiated negotiation. This nego-tiation, according to Waring, is more critically accomplished during teacher-whole class interactions rather than in pair work or group work, as the shift from the IRF sequence to a more engaged participation pattern was coordinated by the teacher. Expanding on the idea of learner initiation as a source for promoting L2 learning (Waring, 2009) and learner agency (Donato, 2000; van Lier, 1988), Waring (2011) looked into learner initiative and how teachers can encourage those instances. She developed a typology of learner initiative by analyzing 14 hours of audio and video recordings of adult ESL classroom interactions with different levels of proficiency and cultural backgrounds. She found three types of learner initiative: "learner self-selects to initiate a sequence," "learner self-selects to volunteer a response," and "learner exploits an assigned turn to initiate a sequence." These initiations were found to prompt instances of knowledge display and contribute to more symmet-rical teacher-student talk (van Lier, 1996). As Waring suggests, it is likely that the frequency and types of initiatives taken by learners are affected by the classroom context (e.g., English as a second or foreign language, communication-oriented-lan-guage-oriented) and the pedagogical focus at the time. Similarly, Garton (2012) ex-plored learner initiative and how learners can direct the interaction in teacher-fronted exchanges. She analyzed audio recordings of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners at different proficiency levels attending evening classes. She found that, by taking control of the turn-taking, learners were able to engage in complex interactional work. However, instances portraying learner initiative were more prominent in pedagogical contexts that did not promote learner fluency and mean-ing making (e.g., accuracy-focused contexts), which suggests that learners are less willing to initiate a turn when it requires them to convey opinions and ideas. Also focusing on learner initiative, Sert (2017) characterized a prediction activity as an important site for language learning and meaningful exchanges as EFL teachers at a secondary school in Turkey displayed a number of interactional resources to man-age learner initiative and promote learner participation in such instances. The re-sources included embedded correction and the addition of para-linguistic features, that is, gestures, in the handling of learner initiative. Sert argues that the type of CIC enacted through such interactional resources could potentially promote L2 learning as learners were found to use newly learned items in subsequent interactions in the classroom. Finally, Jacknick (2011) examined how ESL learners are able to challenge teacher-initiated activity transitions and go back to a previous topic by redirecting talk. By analyzing several instances portraying teacher shifts between and within activities, Jacknick found that learners can use activity transitions to their advantage

by negotiating interactional space with their teachers when none is provided by them. This highlights the co-constructed nature of teacher talk and the importance of the teacher in this process, as she will be required to "cede conversational space to students even when she has not allotted it to them" (p. 34).

The present study expands on the current research on learner-initiated contributions by focusing on empirical data portraying how teachers navigate instances where learners pursue their own interactional goals which may be in contrast with the teacher's own goals at a particular moment. Thus, the focus is placed on episodes where there is no shift in the pedagogical goal at a particular interactional juncture, that is, where the goal of eliciting participation in a given classroom context remains intact, and where the overlapped/latched contribution produced by the learner may or may not attempt to trigger a topic shift, as the pedagogical goal of eliciting participation will be upheld in both cases. Throughout the analysis, it will be argued that letting learners develop and finish their contributions can promote opportunities for participation, which can potentially lead to learning. Within this pedagogical context, the analysis will also address the effect that learner-initiated talk can have on teachers' verbal behavior when these utterances are produced as meaningful contributions that overlap a teacher's turn or are immediately latched onto one another. Building upon CIC, it will be argued that an appropriate reaction to such interactional events (i.e., a reaction that promotes participation and learning) requires a great deal of sensitivity towards such instances, which must be accompanied by a willingness to give up the floor. The manner in which the teacher manages a contribution initiated by a learner (whether it is in overlap with the teacher's utterance or latched onto it) can create opportunities for learning, and this will depend on the interactional strategies utilized by the teachers and the way they accomplish their rights and obligations in a goal-oriented setting such as the language classroom.

2.3. Concepts relevant to the analysis

A relevant feature of CA, and one that will inform the analysis, is the notion of turn constructional unit (TCU; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Turns at talk are made up of TCUs which are highly dependent on the sequential context in which a given interaction is embedded. These units can consist of a range of linguistic units such as sentences, clauses or lexical constructions, or can be made up of non-verbal elements such as silence, laughter, or body movements.[1]

---

[1] In the example given Liddicoat (2011), the lexical unit *at* is recognized as a TCU by the mother. The dependence of TCUs on context can be clearly seen in how the mother is able to regard that single lexical unit as a meaningful turn:

TCUs usually end with points of possible completion. These points tell interlocutors when a turn is finished or is about to be finished, and speaker change becomes possible as a next action; that is to say, they allow potential speaker change in a way that is not disruptive to the conversation. Such points are labelled *transition relevance places* (TRP; Sacks et al., 1974).

In the present study, overlap is regarded as a superordinate concept that refers simply to simultaneous talk (Schegloff, 2000); that is, it refers to where a second speaker produces an utterance while the first speaker's utterance is still ongoing. More specifically, the focus in the extracts is placed on instances where a learner contribution overlaps the teacher's TCU. In addition, the focus is placed on latched utterances that immediately follow an incomplete teacher TCU (i.e., when the teacher's utterance has not reached a TRP). In the analysis, the segments containing episodes portraying teacher-learner overlap and latched utterances belong to a specific lesson stage identified by Walsh (2006), namely, the *classroom context mode* (CCM). This mode shares similarities with the *meaning and fluency context* identified by Seedhouse (2004) as both are characterized by opportunities for interaction provided by teachers. In the CCM, learners are encouraged to talk about their feelings, emotions, experiences and attitudes that are embedded in their own cultural backgrounds. Extended learner turns are managed mostly by the learners themselves, with the teacher producing short turns that will usually take the form of direct repair (to fix a breakdown in communication), content feedback (feedback on meaning, as opposed to feedback on form), and backchannel feedback. A mode that allows meaningful communication such as the CCM is relevant to classroom research because it is a facet of classroom interaction whose intricacies are usually left aside in teacher training courses even though it is a crucial stage where learners must be prompted to engage in conversation and make meaningful contributions (Cancino, 2017). Thus, the research questions that will be answered in the present study are:

1. How do EFL teachers manage overlapping learner talk?
2. How do EFL teachers' interactional decisions regarding overlapping learner talk hinder/facilitate opportunities for participation and learning?

1		Ther:	What kind of work do you do?
2		Mother:	Food service
3	→	Ther:	At?
4		Mother:	(A) / (uh) post office cafeteria downtown main post office on Redwood
5		Ther:	°okay°

(Liddicoat, 2011, p. 55)

3. Methodology

3.1. Context of the study and participants

The data analyzed in the present paper come from three teachers and their students in an adult EFL classroom at a language institute in Santiago, Chile. The participants were audio-recorded in six lessons delivered as part of a 10-week course. The teachers had at least one year of experience teaching in those courses and were teaching elementary and upper-intermediate level classes. The students were adult professionals who sought to advance their language proficiency to gain access to international scholarships and enhance their job prospects. The number of participants in each group varied between 10 and 12.

From the interactions, which amounted to 180 minutes of transcribed data in the CCM, five extracts that were representative of the collection were selected, transcribed and analyzed for the purpose of the present study. The selection of the five extracts was done taking into account a number of aspects. The data in the extracts contained teacher-fronted interaction and activities aimed mainly at developing oral fluency, as the focus of the analysis was placed on generating learning opportunities in a CCM. Thus, the specific learning objective in each of the extracts was not learning formal features of the language, but rather, developing fluency and communication. Moreover, the five selected extracts portray instances of teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances that lend themselves to analysis as part of opportunities for L2 learning. Thus, the main aspect of classroom interaction that was targeted in the present study was the way in which teachers can hinder/facilitate opportunities for learning through their management of teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances.

Audio recording was chosen over video recording because administrators at the institution advised against the latter. They explained that some teachers might be reluctant to be video recorded on the grounds that it is a more invasive technique which could disrupt the normal progression of the lessons. Certainly, the absence of non-vocal aspects such as gestures and gaze may have prevented the researcher from accessing relevant details about these teachers' and learners' interactional behaviors. However, a clear advantage of using audio recording in the L2 classroom is that it is less noticeable by teachers and learners and thus may produce interaction that is more valid ecologically.

3.2. Method of data analysis

CA methodology was applied to the data to illustrate the ways in which teachers manage teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances, and the impact it has

on opportunities for learning and participation. The CA transcription system utilized was adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984) to meet the needs of the present study (see the Appendix).

The analysis of the extracts was informed by Ellis and Barkhuizen's (2005) set of guidelines for the analysis of data under a CA approach as it presents methodological steps that are well-suited to tackling the interactional characteristics of institutional talk, given its goal-oriented nature. This set of procedures guided the researcher in the identification of "conversational practice" and the knowledge deployed by the participants which underlie that practice (Lazaraton, 2004). The procedures include the selection of a sequence, the characterization of the actions and the understandings displayed by participants in the sequence, and the roles assumed by the interactants. Emphasis was placed on the way that timing and turn-taking were instantiated in the interaction (i.e., how a speaker obtained a turn) and how overlapping talk and latched utterances were delivered and managed by the participants. The turn-taking practices utilized by teachers and learners were explored as well as the way in which teacher talk shaped those patterns and the production of TCUs in order to reveal the structural organization of the interaction (Heritage, 1997). Thus, the application of the guidelines allowed the researcher to select the extracts for analysis and understand, from the perspective of the interactants, how the creation of interactional space is shaped by the management of teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances.

4. Results and discussion

As has been stated, one of the ways in which CIC manifests itself is by means of maximizing interactional space. This can be done, among other things, by allowing learners to produce extended turns (Walsh, 2006). The analysis below will present the interactional behavior that these teachers adopted towards the creation (or reduction) of interactional space; namely, the management of teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances. When the teacher's potential TCU is overlapped by, or latched onto a learner's utterance, the TRP has not been reached yet. The teacher can then choose whether to complete his TCU and disregard the learner's contribution or abandon the floor and allow the learner to make his or her contribution. As will be seen below, teachers who are sensitive to those instances and allow learners to express their ideas even when their turn at talk is being jeopardized can maximize interaction and participation when the pedagogical goal is to promote fluency and communication.[2] The following

---

[2] Although the main pedagogical goal in the extracts is to promote fluency and communication, there are a number of "side sequences" in the data, which are defined by Walsh (2006)

set of extracts will present a number of topics of conversation that include CCM interaction. Extract 1 is part of an elementary lesson where the class is discussing trip experiences. The teacher (T1) is prompting students to ask questions from a handout. In this extract, L2 is asking L7 a question about the last time L7 had been on a trip to a new location.

Extract 1: T1, trip

```
1      T1: eh: ((addressing L2)) please, question number five
2      L2: eh::=
3      T1: =to ((NAME L7))
4      L2: ((addressing L7)) when was the last time? (0.3) you (.)          [tok]
5      T1:                                                                  [took]
6      L2: took (.) ( ) you took (.) a trip to somewhere new (1.2)
7      L7: eh:: the last time (.) I:: took a trip to somewhere new?
8          was the:: (0.4) summer of the last year. (0.4) I went
9          to:: (.) Aysen Coyhaique, and I knew all the::
10         Patagonia? from (.) >in Chile?< a:nd (Arge-) Argentina
11         (0.4)
12     T1: in Argentina.
13     L7: in Argentina, yes (Argentina.)
14     T1: >what    [did you think about it<]
15→    L2:          [through- through       ] Balmaceda?
16         (1.3)
17     L7: °what?°
18     L2: through Balmaceda? (.)
19     L7: eh: yes
20         (1.7)
21     L1: ( )=
22     L7: =yes (.) on a:: (0.5)
23     T1: boat?=
24     L7: =I don't know- no.
25     T1: no?=
26     L3: =boat?
27         (0.5)
28     L7: on a: truck? (.) and then (.) eh- after? (0.5) to:: (0.7)
29         come back of- to the north? (.) of Chile? (.) eh:: was in
30         a:: (.) transfer (.)
31     T1: okay so you went on a truck=
32     L7: =yes=
33     T1: =and then you came back
34     L7: yes
```

as "the brief departure from one mode to another and back again" (p. 65). Side sequences are representative of teacher talk and must be short to be considered as such.

```
35        (0.4)
36    T1: [because sn-]
37→   L7: [oh- eh: ]:: (0.7) I:: hm: (0.7) I was? (.) eh:: (1) do-
38        doing I don't know how to say? eh:        mochileando
39                                                   backpacking
40        (0.4)
41    T1: alright?
42        (0.5)
43    L7: s[o:]
44    T1:  [so] you were a backpacker
45    L7: yes (0.5)
```

In Line 4, L2 initiates the FPP[3] in an adjacency pair by asking L7 the question *When was the last time you took a trip to somewhere new?*, which includes a repair sequence that is other-initiated and self-repaired (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) in Lines 5 and 6, respectively. L7 completes the SPP with an extended turn (Lines 7-10). In Line 12, T1 asks a question in the form of teacher-learner echo (Walsh, 2013), that is, T1 repeats part of L7's contribution with an emphasis (*in Argentina*). This type of repetition in a context that nurtures fluency and communication seeks to elicit further talk from learners (Park, 2014). As L7 elaborates on her answer in Line 13, T1 asks a fast-paced follow-up content question (>*what did you think about it?<*) in Line 14 that seeks to elicit new meanings from L7. Before T1 can finish this TCU, L2 produces the utterance *through- through Balmaceda?* (Line 15), which overlaps with the teacher's turn (Line 14). This type of overlap is labelled *transitional* as it is produced at a point where a TRP is in place (Jefferson, 1984). Here, the TRP occurred at the end of L7's turn in Line 13. This TRP prompted overlapped further talk by both L2 and T1. The utterance in the form of a content question delivered by L2 in Line 15 seeks to clarify the way in which L7 entered Argentina. What is relevant to the provision of opportunities for learning here is that L2's question in Line 15 is followed by a 1.3-second pause, which is not used by T1 to regain the floor and orient to her own question. Instead, T1 cedes the floor to L2 and allows the interaction to continue, even though her question, a FPP that requires a specific SPP, has not been resolved because she has surrendered the floor and has allowed learners to pursue their own interactional choices. The 1.3-second pause allowed by T1 in Line 16 has given L7 enough time to produce a clarification request in Line 17, and L2 is being given enough interactional space to reformulate

---

[3] In conversation, turns that are closely related to others, that is, question-answer sequences, are known as adjacency pairs (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The first pair part (FPP; the first utterance in the pair) initiates the action and makes a next action relevant, while the second pair part (SPP; the second utterance in the pair) completes the initiated action.

her question to L7 about the way in which she reached Argentina (Line 18). Then, in Line 19, L7 addresses L2's question instead of focusing on T1's question (Line 14), eliciting her opinion about the trip. T1 does not insist on her overlapped question in the interaction and instead, allows L7 to negotiate L2's overlapped question (Lines 17-24). Thus, T1 is providing interactional space by acknowledging that her utterance was overlapped and by orienting to her pedagogical goal (promoting participation and meaningful exchanges) rather than to her will to gain the floor and convey meaning, which she had earned by taking the turn first (Line 14). The unresolved FPP produced by T1 in Line 13 is handled in such a way that she allows learners to navigate and develop their own interactional choices, provides enough time for L7 to clarify meanings and aligns with the ongoing talk generated by L2 and L7 by means of clarification requests (Lines 23 and 25).

In the same extract, T1 is once again able to manage learner overlap and allow them to successfully contribute to the interaction. After a pair of confirmation checks produced by T1, which referred to the type of transport utilized by L7 to travel to Argentina (Lines 31-34), T1 initiates a TCU by using the conjunction *because* (Line 36). However, transitional overlap takes place as T1's unfinished TCU and L7's utterance (which adds to L7's account of the trip in Lines 37-38) are produced at the same time. T1 is again sensitive to learner overlap and stops in the middle of her TCU to give L7 enough interactional space to continue with her turn. T1 gives up the floor in the middle of L7's elongated hesitation token (*eh:::*), which may have alerted her that L7 was preparing to make a contribution. L7's turn following the overlap orients to the fact that she was backpacking, and T1 in turn aligns with this by producing a confirmation check in the form of an embedded correction in Line 44. It is important to notice the resourceful manner in which T1 has managed to steer the interaction by acknowledging learner overlap, refraining from gaining the floor, and allowing L7 to continue with her initiated turns, which yielded further meaningful interaction that could not have taken place otherwise.

Extract 2 below illustrates another instance of effective management of learner talk, but this time delivered as part of an upper-intermediate level lesson. In this sequence, the teacher (T2) is prompting learners to give opinions on the veracity of a Chilean talk show called *La jueza* ("the judge").

Extract 2: T2, TV show

```
1       L1: hmm: (.) people say (.) is: eh (0.3) eh:: the
2           program:, (.) is a (f::ate)
3       T2: a fake=
4       L4: =a fake
5           (0.4)
```

```
6       L1: a fa[ke]
7       T2: [I] (once) ( ) heard so      [me pe]ople=
8       L1:                              [hmm    ]
9→      L4: =I like the program
10          (0.4)
11      T2: do you   [like it?  ]
12      L4:          [I- I      ] like La jueza (.) I li- I love=
13      L3: =La jueza=
14      L4: =I like because they have some: (.) somethi:ng (.)
15          troubles, problems? tha:t we know? .hhh and will learn
16          about (0.5) something we need, maybe w- (.) with
17          the:: hmm (.) the rent, (.)
18      T2: ah:: okay?=
19      L4: =so the- [the: the: hmm (.) ] the issues of the: paper that
20      L1:          [(°I- I don't like °)]
21      L4: you nee:d, what do you (.) can (.) what you can do: (.)
22          what you- ca:n't,=
23      L1:
24      T2: =so it's kind of in:formative          [pro]gram.
25      L4:                                        [is-] (.) for me is
26          informative (0.5) when they started to: overreacting I: don't
27          like (.) too much (0.3)      [or:      ] when they started to fight, (.)
28      T2:                              [hmm-hmm]
28      L4 or: (0.8)actually they- (0.6) she: (.) give the:: (.) the
31          opportunity? (.) to: discuss? and fight.
```

In Line 1, L1 produces a TCU containing the idea that the TV show (sun) may not portray real stories. L1's utterance is followed by a repair of the word *fake* prompted by both T2 and L4 (other initiated, other repaired) in Lines 3 and 4, respectively. In Line 7, T2 attempts to produce an account of a story related to the show (which later is completed as an opinion on the show's veracity). Before T2's utterance *I (once) ( ) heard some people* reaches a TRP, it is overlapped by L1's token *hmm*, which could have been produced as a continuer (Line 8). In Line 9, L4's utterance *I like the program* is latched onto T2's incomplete TCU. After a 0.4-second pause, T2 acknowledges L4's latched utterance and does not pursue the completion of her turn. From a CIC perspective, it can be argued that T2 demonstrated CIC here as she acknowledges L4's self-selection and allows her to expand and finish her contribution by asking *Do you like it?* in Line 11, a closed referential question that prompted an extended learner turn by L4 (Lines 12-17). By giving up the floor and orienting to L4's self-selection with a referential question, L4 has been allowed to produce extended learner turns in Lines 14-17, 19-22, and 25-31. An important aspect when handling learners' latched utterances that do not take place in TRPs is to be sensitive to the particular moments where learner agency

is being exercised by learners and act upon such instances in appropriate ways. As Jacknick (2011) states, students demonstrate agency when they claim inter-actional space where it is not being afforded, and it is the teacher who can le-gitimize that claim by orienting to it. Thus, allowing learners to expand and finish their contributions (as has been seen in the two extracts analyzed) is one of the ways in which teachers can demonstrate CIC and transform a learner contribu-tion into an opportunity for participation and ultimately learning (Sert, 2017; Garton, 2012; Walsh, 2006).

Interestingly, T2 exhibits a rather contrasting approach to managing learner overlap in Extract 3 below. Here, T2's pedagogical goal is to engage learners in conversation by having them answer general knowledge questions and discuss the possible options. One of the questions was *Who was the second person to walk on the moon?*

Extract 3: T2, moon

```
1      L2: (well) we're not really sure about that.
2      T2: oh! well (0.3)      [yeah]
3      L1:                     [the] second      [(one:)]
4      L2:                                       [some ] people °say° that's a
5         fake (.)
6      T2: yeah. (.) this, this [ah:: was]
7→     L3:                      [oh::    ] yes::
8      L2: some people said [that's a fake      ]
9      T2:                  [the arrival of man to] the moon was a [fake]
10     L1:                                                        [it ]
11        was a fake ( )
12     T2: and what do you believe. (.) what- what do you think.
13     L2: I mean (.) no hhh ((chuckles)) (I don't know) what to
14        be[lieve]
15     T2:  [not ] sure about it? (.) but- but no i[dea who] was the
16→    L1:                                         [but eh-]
17     T2: [se ]cond person?=
18→    L1: [but-]
19→    L1: =(but) (.) if you:: watch the:: video no:w (0.3) you can
20        see: eh hmm: (0.6) a fake eh:-
21     T2: really?
22     L1: ye::s .hhh black and °white° .hhh eh: ((laughs))=
23     L2: =the fla:g is: ((waving arms))
24     L1: there is [( )]
25     T2:         [ah ][::: ye]::s! it's waving
26     L2:              [( )]
27     L3: ye:[::ah]
28     L2:    [yeah]
```

```
29    L1: yes=
30    L2: =it's not supposed to:: (.) to wave? (.) [right? ]
31    L3:                                          [ah: huh]
32    T2: ye[s?]
33    L2:   [it] has (.) the (.) there's no air (.) in the moon?
```

In Lines 4-5, L2 develops the subtopic started in Line 1 about the man landing on the moon (*some people °say° that's a fake*). In Line 6, T2 addresses L2's utterance but her repetition of words and the elongated hesitation token suggests that she was in the middle of an unsuccessful word search for moon landing or a similar concept. Thus, her TCU is left incomplete and is overlapped by L3's *oh::: yes::* in Line 7. In Line 8, L2 repeats her utterance produced in lines 4-5. This TCU is overlapped by T2 in Line 9 as she seemed to have found a suitable expression for moon landing (*the arrival of man to the moon*). In this exchange, T2 seems to be orienting more to her word search than to L3' and L2's utterances in Lines 7 and 8, respectively. L1's recognitional overlap (Jefferson, 1984) in Line 10 echoes the end of T2's TCU. Then, T2 elicits learners' opinions in Line 12 by means of an open referential question, but after L2's hesitation in providing an answer (Lines 13-14), she produces an epistemic check (*not sure about it?*; Sert, 2013) in Line 15 and then goes back to eliciting an answer to the question that was posed before L2's subtopic initiation in Line 4. It can be seen that T2 attempts to steer the interaction towards answering the original question about the second person to walk on the moon (*no idea who was the second person?*) in Lines 15 and 17. What is interesting here is that this utterance is overlapped by L1's contrastive token *but* on two occasions (Lines 16 and 18), which portrays L1's initiative to compete for the floor with T2. When T2's TCU is completed, L1's turn is latched onto T2's turn in Line 19, once more, by means of the same contrastive token. As L1 takes the floor in Line 19, she is able to involve herself and other participants in addressing particular rumors surrounding the moon landing and the flag waving on the moon. T2 orients to L1's subtopic by providing confirmation checks (Lines 21, 32) and content feedback (Line 30). Also, L1 provides meaningful turns in Lines 19-20 and 22, which suggests that her insistence on gaining the floor prompted participation and interaction that would have been lost had she not oriented to the completion of her idea over the teacher's. Although conversational structures can be powerful resources for teachers in order to shape learners' performance and participation (He, 2004), L1's insistence on gaining the floor and successfully producing a turn that steered the conversation back to a previous relevant topic reveals that learners can also manipulate turn-taking in order to procure interactional space when teachers are not giving it. Nevertheless, L1's display of CIC in Extract 3 is more conceivable at higher proficiency levels, where learners are more proficient and are more self-

confident to interrupt teachers, insisting on gaining and keeping the floor even if their contributions are not being acknowledged from the outset.

Learners at lower proficiency levels lack the interactional features displayed by L1 in Extract 3, so teachers at these levels need to be more sensitive to instances where learner talk overlaps theirs. Extract 4 below is an example illustrating the careful handling of an incomplete utterance produced by a learner at an elementary proficiency level. In this extract, the teacher (T1) and her learners are discussing experiences in different countries and her pedagogical goal is to elicit learners' answers and ensure their participation.

Extract 4: T1, Spain

```
1     T1: ((addressing L1)) can you mention (.) a
2         place that you've been to?
3         (2.1)
4     L1: a place (.) eh:: (.) where I've been? (0.8) I've been to::
5         (.) Barcelona? (0.7) hmm:::: (.) the south of Spain
6     T1: uh-huh? (.)      [so:             ]
7→    L4:                  [(this city)     ]
8         (0.7)
9     T1: huh?
10    L4: (no) eh: describe (.) this city (.)
11    L1: eh[:::     ] I:: lived in Malaga for one month (.) the last
12    T1:   [((chuckles))]
13    L1: year with ((NAME L6)) (0.6) and (.) from Malaga?
14        we:: went to:: (.) Sevilla? (0.5) Cordoba? (.) Granada?
15        (.)a::nd (Tangier) in:: (.) Morocco
16    T1: Morocco?
17    L1: yes
18    T1: I imagine that's (.) a very beautiful place isn't it?
19    L1: yes
```

In Lines 1 and 2, T1 initiates the FPP in the adjacency pair by asking L1 about a place she has visited. This prompts L1's SPP in Lines 4 and 5, which addresses the question posed by T1 but can also prompt further questions in relation to a potential sub-topic (the south of Spain). In Line 6, T1 acknowledges L1's contribution with an acceptance token (*uh-huh?*). After a micropause, T1 initiates a new TCU by using the conjunction *so*, which is a token that yields further talk by the speaker when there is no rising intonation contour. At the same time, this token is overlapped by L4's incomplete TCU *this city* (Line 7). This transitional overlap (Jefferson, 1984) is followed by a 0.7-second pause, which is not utilized by T1 to keep the floor and elaborate on her TCU. Instead, T1 notices L4's incomplete utterance and asks L4 for clarification (Line 9), without locating the

specific trouble source. Only then is L4 able to reformulate his TCU, where he prompts L1 to describe Barcelona, the city L1 had just mentioned. Although L1 does not provide a full response to this question, she takes a relatively long turn describing her trip schedule in that area. T1 seems to align with the topic of the question produced by L4 when she provides content feedback in Line 18 (*I imagine that's a very beautiful place isn't it*). L4 does not participate further in this exchange, but he is able to exert learner initiative in Line 7, which was carefully acknowledged and managed by T1. This voluntary shift in terms of the IRF roles taken by the participants allows the interaction in Lines 7-12 to be described in the following terms. First, L4 initiates an incomplete FPP (Line 6); then, T1 and L4 produce an "insert expansion" sequence (Schegloff, 2007), where T1 seeks to clarify the FPP (Line 9) and L4 reformulates it (Line 10); finally, L1 is able to produce the SPP (Lines 11-15). The analysis of this sequence suggests that interactional space was provided by T1 when she encouraged L4 to take the floor and develop her contribution. Thus, at elementary proficiency levels, teachers can increase interactional space when they are able to notice incipient learner initiative. This can be done by either discontinuing their own turns or by giving the floor to a learner at the expense of having their own ideas and opinions placed on hold or dismissed altogether.

Even though more proficient learners may be able to exercise CIC in a more successful manner when competing for the floor (e.g., L1 in Extract 3), teachers who are not sensitive to learners' interactional efforts in this respect will likely fail to provide opportunities for L2 learning. This is what transpires in Extract 5, which is derived from an upper-intermediate level lesson where the teacher (T3) and the learners are discussing the problems that young popular celebrities face in their careers.

Extract 5: T3, bad influence

```
1      T3: what problems (.) can they (.) face (.) if they're (.) so
2          popular (0.6) what problems (0.3)
3      L6: drugs?
4      T3: drugs, (.) yes? (0.6)
5      L6: depression?
6          (1)
7      T3: the pressure. (.) ye[ah: the ] pressure of you know
8→     L6:                     [depression?]
9      T3: being famous so young (0.3) okay?
10         (0.6)
11     L4: they have access: (.) to different things that they
12         shouldn't even know (0.3)
13     T3: yeah: (.) for example? (.) dru[gs] (.) <yeah>
```

After T3 asks the question about celebrities and their problems in Line 1, L6 produces a short response in Line 3 (*drugs?*), which is echoed by T3 in the next line and followed by an acknowledgement token with rising intonation (*yes?*). L6 then produces another single-word token in Line 5 (*depression?*) with rising intonation in order to answer T3's question. In Line 7, T3 mishears L6's utterance as he orients to a different idea (*the pressure*). More importantly, T3 maintains the floor by producing an extended turn describing how pressure can affect famous people (Lines 7 and 9). L6 then attempts to regain the floor in Line 8 so as to repair T3's mishearing of the word. This is done by repeating the utterance that caused the interactional impasse, which overlaps the TCU generated by T3. L6's overlapping utterance in Line 8 is delivered with a rising contour, at a normal speech rate and volume; yet, T3 does not acknowledge it in the exchange. Access to T3's gaze at this time would have provided more insight regarding the status of L6's overlapped contribution. Nonetheless, analysis of the audio sequence suggests that T3 dismissed L6's chance to gain the floor to either expand his contribution or clarify the misheard word. This may have prevented L6 from participating further as his unsuccessful attempt to gain the floor in Line 8 makes him withdraw from the interaction in subsequent turns (not shown). The reason for L6's interactional behavior can be found in the nature of the turns in the exchange. The FPP produced by T3 in Line 1 is followed by short SPPs in the form of a single word by L6 in three occasions (Lines 3, 5, 8). As Solem (2016) argues, learners use different types of devices (e.g., grammar structures, sentence formats, tags, and hedges) to display "epistemic status," that is, to position themselves as being more or less knowledgeable in relation to a topic or learning objective. In this case, L6 has acknowledged this epistemic asymmetry by delivering single token words with a rising intonation, which confers prevalent epistemic status to the teacher as the one with the right and the authority to complete L6's contribution. This interaction pattern provided by T3 and followed by L6 has caused the learner to orient to a particular role in the sequence, one that does not require keeping the floor and is constrained by the institutional rules embedded in the IRF pattern. Thus, L6's disregarded overlapped contribution, along with T3's and L6's epistemic status orientation in the exchange, have caused T3 to manage the turn-taking pattern in the interaction in such a way that L6 was not given the chance to gain the floor and repair the misheard item, which prevented him from elaborating on his ideas.

5. Concluding remarks

On the basis of the discussion, a number of concluding observations can be made. The manner in which teachers navigate the instances where learners' utterances

overlap or are latched onto theirs was found to affect learner participation. Teachers who are more sensitive to their learners' overlapping or latched talk and are able to stop contributing to the interaction by giving up the floor when a learner is attempting to gain it were found to nurture interactional space (see Extracts 1, 2 and 4). These interactional strategies have been found to elicit further meaningful interaction from learners that may most likely not have been possible otherwise. The teachers demonstrated CIC in the episodes because they oriented to the pedagogical goals of the moment, eliciting answers and interaction from learners, rather than their will to keep the floor and convey meanings. By being sensitive to their learners' overlapped contributions, teachers are engendering agency in their students, which provides further support to the finding that teachers are the ones who can manage learner-initiated contributions and turn them into learning opportunities (Garton, 2012; Jacknick, 2011; Sert, 2017). The analysis of Extract 1 also suggests that low-proficiency learners are able to actively initiate turns and negotiate space for participation, despite their limited linguistic resources, which is in line with Tai and Brandt's (2018) results. However, learners at higher proficiency levels may be linguistically better equipped to hold the floor by insisting on delivering their utterances when the teacher is not providing interactional space and is not orienting to the development of learners' contributions (see Extract 3). More proficient learners are able to insist on securing interactional space when teachers fail to do so. Learners at lower proficiency levels may be more prone to producing short and incomplete overlaps (see Extract 4), which suggests that teachers need to be more sensitive to such instances in the classroom context mode (CCM) so as to allow learners to expand and complete their contributions, thus providing interactional space. However, even at higher proficiency levels, learners who attempt to compete for the floor to get their meanings across may be unsuccessful when teachers simply dismiss their learners' interactional efforts and students are forced to orient to their own turns as short "response move" tokens that establish epistemic asymmetry in the language classroom (Solem, 2016; see Extract 5). This provides further support to the idea that teachers must be able to demonstrate CIC when learners attempt to initiate and maintain interaction, and that learner proficiency may not be enough to secure the provision of interactional space. Thus, in the same way that teacher interruption and limited wait-time have been found to reduce interactional space (Yataganbaba & Yıldırım, 2016), data from the analyzed extracts suggest that failure to acknowledge learners' overlapped talk can have the same detrimental effect, which results in reduced opportunities for learning.

The analysis also indicates that teachers may display fluctuating behavior regarding the management of learners' contributions. The same teacher was found to have rather different approaches to learner overlap and their latched

utterances (T2 in Extracts 2 and 3). This suggests that teachers may not be aware of the role that this interactional feature can have in providing interactional space and may lack a strategic approach in this respect. A lack of sensitivity towards locally generated opportunities for interactional space may then result in inconsistent language use displayed by teachers, which demonstrates inadequate CIC. In this respect, a reflective approach to language teaching can increase teachers' "interactional awareness" (Walsh, 2006) regarding their own language use and their learners' contributions. Interactional awareness implies an understanding of what is taking place at a particular moment in the interaction and displaying sensitivity in the strategic decisions taken based on the ongoing pedagogical agenda and learners' contextualized talk. A major goal in any type of reflective practice, as Nakamura (2008) writes, "should lead us to ask ourselves whether the way and the ways we talk to students help or hinder them from expressing themselves" (p. 278).

The analysis in the present study has been done particularly with a focus on what the teacher does when exposed to learner initiative that is demonstrated by means of teacher-learner overlapped and latched utterances that seek to expand on and finish a contribution. This focus on the teacher's verbal behavior is not unwarranted. The teacher is seen as the one who "orchestrates the interaction" (Breen, 1998, p. 119). In other words, he or she is the one who can facilitate or disrupt opportunities for learning and participation. While the importance of the role of learners as enablers of CIC by means of taking cues, identifying and understanding what is required of them, completing the required tasks, and managing their own turn-taking has been acknowledged (Walsh, 2012), these actions will be accomplished to the extent the teacher provides the necessary space for learners. In EFL settings, the teacher is arguably in a critical position to use interactional strategies that can have a direct impact on participation, and make changes that will enhance L2 learning, as learners mainly make progress thanks to the interaction that takes place in the language classroom (Cancino, 2017; Cross, 2010). Teachers may benefit from being aware of the sociocultural idea that learning takes place when learners participate (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Donato, 2000) and that the very action of making learners engage in the interaction embodies learning. As van Lier (2000) states, interactional features that create opportunities for learning "do not just facilitate learning, they *are* learning in a fundamental way" (p. 246), that is, they *are* learning because learning originates within them.

Teachers would benefit from letting learners take initiative and seize their turns at talk as this can prompt learners to elaborate turns that have a freer range in terms of order, size and sequence, and to adopt features of ordinary conversation in their talk. Indeed, interactions that will likely expose learners to linguistic and interactional resources that support learning should portray a "jagged profile" (Walsh, 2006). Allowing learners to be active agents in co-constructing

meanings by having teachers react appropriately to their attempts to initiate contributions and maintain the floor will likely expose learners to linguistic and interactional resources that support learning. Learners usually abide by the unspoken rules of classroom discourse and regard their participation as assigned by the teacher by means of particular turn-taking and sequence organization patterns they must learn and follow in such a way that the interactional outcomes are closely linked to the teacher's decisions (Rodriguez & Wilstermann, 2018). This may greatly reduce the opportunities for meaning negotiation and involvement that are available in the exchanges and may hinder the role of the teacher as a "facilitator" who can grant greater participation rights (Lee & Ng, 2010). By being sensitive to their learners' contributions and by allowing them to gain the floor and bypass their own contributions, teachers can achieve their pedagogical agendas and at the same time provide learners with interactional space, a crucial step towards generating opportunities for learning in the language classroom.

References

Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M. (1998). Navigating the discourse: On what is learned in the language classroom. In W. Renandys & G. Jacobs (Eds.), *Learners and language learning* (pp. 72-88). Singapore: SAMEO, Regional Language Centre.

Brouwer, C., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal Of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 1*(1), 29-47.

Cancino, M. (2015). Assessing learning opportunities in EFL classroom interaction: What can conversation analysis tell us? *RELC Journal, 46*(2), 115-129.

Cancino, M. (2017). Shaping learner contributions in the EFL language classroom: A conversation analytic perspective. *Lenguas Modernas, 49*(1), 53-76.

Cross, R. (2010). Language teaching as sociocultural activity: Rethinking language teacher practice. *Modern Language Journal, 94*(3), 434-452.

Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(1), 29-45.

Hall, J., & Verplaetse, L. (2000). Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction. In J. K. H. A. L. S. Verplaetse (Ed.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

He, A. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 568-582.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversational analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 161-182). London: Sage.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.

Jacknick, C. (2011). Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 20-38.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discoure analysis and natural rhetoric* (pp. 11-38). Padova, Italy: Cleup Editore.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*, 11-36.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117-142). New York: Taylor & Francis.

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

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 12-21.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453-484.

Lazaraton, A. (2004). Conversation analysis and the nonnative English speaking ESL teacher: A case study. In D. Boxer & A. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 49-57). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lee, W., & Ng, S. (2010). Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy. *ELT Journal, 64*(3), 302-313.

Liddicoat, A. (2011). *An introduction to conversation analysis.* London: Continuum.

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(3), 404-427.

Markee, N. (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (Vol. 115). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 501-518.

Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how "repair" displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 265-283.

Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 145-167.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising "learning" in applied linguistics* (pp. 105-126). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rodriguez, J., & Wilstermann, I. (2018). Learner initiative in the Spanish as a foreign language classroom: Implications for the interactional development. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 33*, 113-133.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

Schegloff, E. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29, 1-63.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2013). "Epistemic status check" as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 45*(1), 13-28.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity. *System, 70*, 14-25.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher, 27*(2), 4-13.

Solem, M. S. (2016). Displaying knowledge through interrogatives in student-initiated sequences. *Classroom Discourse, 7*(1), 18-35.

Tai, K. W., & Brandt, A. (2018). Creating an imaginary context: Teacher's use of embodied enactments in addressing learner initiatives in a beginner-level adult ESOL classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(3), 244-266.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. New York: Longman.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Recent advances* (pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

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

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 6*(1), 1-14.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Waring, H. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(4), 577-594.

Waring, H. (2009). Moving out of IRF (initiation-response-feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning, 59*(4), 796-824.

Waring, H. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(2), 201-218.

Waring, H., Reddington, E., & Tadic, N. (2016). Responding artfully to student-initiated departures in the adult ESL classroom. *Linguistics and Educati*on, 33, 28-39.

Yataganbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2016). Teacher interruptions and limited wait time in EFL young learner classrooms. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *232*, 689-695.

APPENDIX

Transcription conventions (adapted from Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

T:	Teacher
L1:	Identified learner (e.g., Learner 1)
NAME:	A specific learner is being nominated in the interaction (e.g., NAME L1).
[ ]	Overlapping utterances. Overlap onset: ([ ). Overlap termination: ( ]).
=	An equal sign is inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and at the beginning of the next speaker's turn to show that there is no gap between the turns.
(0.4)	Periods of silence, timed in tenths of a second between utterances. Micropauses, that is, pauses lasting less than 0.3 seconds, are symbolized '(.)'; longer pauses appear as time within parentheses: (0.5) is five tenths of a second.
:	Sound extension of a word (more colons demonstrate longer stretches).
.	Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence).
,	Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses).
-	An abrupt stop in articulation.
?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question).
!	Words ending with emphasis.
°	They surround talk that is quieter.
↑ ↓	Indication of sharply higher or lower pitch in the utterance followed by the arrow.
hhh	Audible in-breath. The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
.hhh	Audible out-breath. The more h's, the longer the out-breath.
> <	They surround talk that is spoken faster than neighboring talk.
< >	They surround talk that is spoken slower than neighboring talk.
(( ))	Analyst's notes. Non-vocal action. Details of scene.
( )	Approximations of what is heard. Words within parentheses are uncertain.
<u>word</u>	Underlined letters or words indicate marked stress.
italics.	English translation, immediately after the original word(s).
→	Feature of special interest.