Journal of Applied Linguistics

JAL (PRINT) ISSN 1479-7887
JAL (ONLINE) ISSN 1743-1743

Article

Selecting next speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next speaker in planned activities

Kristian Mortensen

Abstract

This article analyses how second language teachers and students interactionally negotiate turn-allocation in the classroom. Relying on Conversation Analysis (CA), I analyse how teachers find and select a next speaker (i.e. a student) in what Gourlay (2005) describes as checking episodes, i.e., 'episodes structured around the outcomes of previously enacted activities, in which teacher and students go through the outcomes of activities in whole-class mode' (Gourlay 2005: 407). The article describes how this is done on the basis of detailed interactional work between teacher and students. The article thus describes a specific social practice in the second language classroom and the intrinsic relation between the classroom organization and the emerging social practices that are made relevant through the unfolding interaction.

KEYWORDS: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS; CLASSROOM INTERACTION; SECOND LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY; TURN-TAKING ORGANIZATION; PLANNING-IN-INTERACTION

Affiliations

Kristian Mortensen: LCMI – Unit for Socio-cultural Research on Learning and Development, University of Luxembourg, Route de Diekirch, L-7220 Walferdange, Luxembourg
email: kristian.mortensen@uni.lu

JAL VOL 5.1 2008 55–79 doi : 10.1558/japl.v5i1.55

1 Introduction

During the course of a lesson second language teachers are faced with how to get a lesson done according to its pedagogical aims. On the one hand, teachers may have an idea of how the lesson is 'intended' to proceed for instance via preparing activities prior to the lesson, under the restrictions of institutional factors such as the curriculum, syllabus, political/educational requirements, and pedagogical and theoretical assumptions about language and (language) learning. On the other hand, the actual lesson, at least in cases where it is not conducted as a formalized lecture (although see Varonesi, 2007), is accomplished in the presence of, and in collaboration with, students. In this way, teachers are confronted with both *planning* the lesson as well as *managing* it during the strict time requirements of the single lesson.

In this article, I show how the teacher's embodied enactment of his/her planning and management of a lesson is intimately related to the ways in which students participate. I will focus on cases in which the ongoing pedagogical activity is made visible to the students, and where turn-allocation is locally managed. In this sequential environment, I will show how the teacher's selection of a next-speaking student is interactively organized. Whereas previous studies have shown how hand-raising provides a resource for students to take part in the way turn-allocation is organized (Sahlström, 1999, 2002), this article shows how gaze is systematically used to display willingness to be selected as a next speaker. The present study thus adds to the description of the coordination of verbal and visual aspects in and for social (face-to-face) interaction (e.g., Goodwin, 2000a, 2003), in particular within (formalized) educational settings (e.g., Carroll, 2004; Mori and Hayashi, 2006; Mortensen, 2009; Kääntа, 2010).

2 Data material

The data material used for this study consists of approximately 25 hours of video recordings from several Danish L2 classrooms for adult learners. The data were collected as part of the cross-institutional research project *Learning and Integration – Adults and Danish as a Second Language*. The students represent the heterogeneous group of adult migrants in Denmark in terms of geographical, educational and social background, as well as different proficiency levels within each classroom. The recordings were made in the period 2005–2006 in three different language learning centres in Denmark. For the video recordings I used two separate cameras, placed on tripods since I was not present during the recordings. One of the cameras was attached to a flat table microphone, and another 2–3 external hard disc recorders were placed on different tables around the room. Later, the movie and sound files were

synchronized to facilitate transcription and analysis. All names have been anonymized. Transcription is done according to Jefferson's notation (see e.g., Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: vi–vii). Transcription of visual information, in particular gaze, is adopted from Mondada (2007) (see appendix for symbols for transcribing the visual aspects).

3 Planning in interaction

Organizing and carrying out a lesson is based on the teacher's planning as well as the local management of how the lesson proceeds. In relation to the planning of the lesson, the teacher may prepare the activities that the class should go through and the time to be spent on each activity (e.g., Jensen, 2001). This may include correcting homework, organizing group activities, etc., and is constrained by, among other factors, the curriculum and pedagogical assumptions and beliefs. On the other hand, the order of turns may also in some way be planned prior to the lesson. For instance, a teacher may decide that a given task should be organized in such a way that the students take a turn-at-talk one after the other, such as in a Round Robin (cf. Sacks, 2004). This may be part of the teacher's aim of giving all students a change to 'participate actively' in the lesson.

Since the 1980s, task-based learning/teaching has gained terrain in the second language classroom as a continuation of the so-called communicative approach to language learning (e.g., Nunan, 1989; Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The underlying theoretical assumption is that students engage in certain goal-oriented activities that are assumed to lead to (or to be) learning, and that the teacher can prepare these activities prior to the lesson. Tasks are then described for instance in terms of its cognitive complexity (e.g., Robinson, 2001; Skehan, 2003) based on the *intended* student-student interaction. However, even when an activity is prepared prior to the lesson it nonetheless has to be carried out during the course of the lesson and in this way the planning is enacted in and through interaction with the students. To quote Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004: 51): 'tasks are accomplished in a locally contingent and socially distributed way through the actions of the participants involved and through their ongoing interpretations of the instructional setting'. The teacher's intention of how the lesson is to proceed is in this way treated as a members' problem (Garfinkel, 1967) *in situ* rather than as a cognitive concept (see also Duranti, 1993; Jones and Zimmerman, 2003). Following this line of research, a growing number of studies, primarily conducted from a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, has shown how students engage in *task-occasioned interactions* (Hellermann, 2008) in ways that might be fundamentally different from what the teacher intended (Mori, 2002). In this way, the focus

has shifted towards the task-accomplishment as a situated interaction in its own right, including managing the task itself (Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, 2004) and negotiating task-beginning (Hellermann, 2007) and task-closings (Hellermann and Cole, 2009). This line of research is embedded within a socially oriented re-conceptualization of second language acquisition conducted within CA (Firth and Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hellermann, 2008; Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2010) with the aim of approaching (second language) learning from an *emic*, i.e. participant oriented, perspective (Hougaard, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Mori and Hasegawa, 2009).

On the other hand, the (teacher's) planning can be made available to the participants during the lesson itself for instance via a list of questions in the textbook. In this regard, Suchman (2007) uses the notion of *situated action* and states that '[r]ather than attempt to abstract action away from its circumstances and represent it as a rational plan, the approach [i.e. "situated action"] is to study how people *use* their circumstances to achieve intelligent action' (Suchman, 2007: 70, emphasis added). The (planned) activity can in this way be made available to the class as part of the unfolding on the classroom interaction. For instance, the teacher can organize or present an activity as a list of activities, and this provides a framework for how it is to be accomplished. Planning is in this way made *interactionally visible* for the participants in and through interaction. In making the planning visible *for* the participants *in* interaction, textbooks, lists and other kinds of written material provide a strong resource for the interaction that surrounds it. A large amount of research has shown how participants rely on written material as part of the social interaction they are engaged in, and thus how written material structure the social actions that participants perform (e.g., Heath and Luff, 1992; Goodwin, 2000a, 2000b; Mondada, 2006, 2007). For instance, when going through a pronunciation task in the textbook which is interactionally organized as a Round Robin, the students cannot only project the next relevant action (i.e. the next item to be read aloud/discussed), but the first student to answer the first question sets up a framework, on the basis of which the other students react:

Example 1 [O625U1 – 49:25]

1	**Mi:**	**Apotek°et°**
		°The° pharmacy
2	**Ps:**	**(0.4)**
3	**Te:**	**A[:**
		A:
4->	**Mi:**	**[tek**
		[tek

5 **Ps:** **(.)**

6 **Te:** **Apoteket**
The pharmacy

7 **Ps:** **(.)**

8 **Mi:** **tek**
tek

9 **Ps:** **(0.6)**

10 **Te:** **Husk å ha bestemt form apote:ket**
Remember the definite form the pharmacy

11 **Ps:** **(0.2)**

12 **Mi:** **Apotek°et°**
The pharmacy

13 **Te:** **Jaer (.) det rigtig (.) der er**
Yeah (.) that's right (.) there is

14 **Te:** **kun (.) ehh tr[yk på te (.) jaer**
only (.) ehh stress on te (.) yeah

15 **Mi:** **[Te**
[Te

16 **Ps:** **(1.1)**

17 **Wu:** **Eh[hh]hh tablet?**
Ehhhhh tablet

18 **Te:** **[Wu]**
[Wu]

19 **Ps:** **(0.7)**

20-> **Wu:** **Ehh på let**
Ehh on let

21 **Te:** **Jaer å husk flertal tabletter**
Yeah and remember the plural tablets

In Example 1, the class is going through a pronunciation task. In line 1, Michael reads the first word aloud. This is followed by a 0.4 second pause in which the teacher *could* have taken a turn-at-talk e.g. by evaluating Michael's pronunciation. In line 4, Michael repeats the stressed part of the word. He thus orients to this as a relevant thing to do after reading the word aloud. Similarly, when Wu reads the second word in line 17 aloud he explicitly addresses where the stress lies – *på let* 'on let' in line 20. Following his reading of the second word,

the teacher does not respond immediately, resulting in a pause in line 19, and he then emphasizes the stressed syllable. In this way, he uses the format that was previously initiated by Michael during the first word.

The ways in which activities are organized provide the students with specific structural and socio-interactional jobs (Jones and Thornborrow, 2004; 2008), and the task design and its sequentially unfolding negotiation and accomplishment provide relevant ways of participation of the students (e.g., Ohta, 2001; Mortensen, 2008). For instance, when the ongoing activity and turn-allocation have been specified in advance, such as for instance correcting homework in a Round Robin, the teacher has a high degree of control over who is doing what. This organization form does not only constrain the action(s) of the current-speaking student, but also his/her classmates since they have to monitor the progression of the activity in order to follow who is the next speaker since eventually it will be their turn. However, even though the order of speakers and the relevant activity they should perform have been specified in advance it has not been specified *when* the next speaker will initiate his/her turn-at-talk.

Example 2, fragment [O625U1 – 49:25]

13 Te: **Jaer (.) det rigtig (.) der er**
Yeah (.) that's right (.) there is

14 Te: **kun (.) ehh tr[yk på te (.) jaer**
only (.) ehh stress on te (.) yeah

15 Mi: **[Te**
[Te

16 Ps: **(1.1)**

17-> Wu: **Eh[hh]hh tablet?**
Ehhhhh tablet

18 Te: **[Wu]**
[Wu]

19 Ps: **(0.7)**

Returning to Example 1, I noted that the teacher frames the turn-allocation as a Round Robin. Michael's answer, which is the first answer in this activity, leads to a comment by the teacher regarding the pedagogical focus of the task – pronunciation (see lines 13–14). The evaluation ends with the acknowledgement token, *jaer* 'yeah', followed by a (1.1) second pause. The closing of the sequence marks a closing of the prior activity and the student's turn-at-talk. At the same time, it projects a progression of the task, and a format for how it is produced, as well as a transition to the next speaker. Here the student sitting

next to Michael, Wu, self-selects and initiates a turn – the next task element. Note that this is done *before* the teacher selects him as the next speaker in line 18. In this way, the position of the turn-allocation is negotiated between several participants on a turn-by-turn basis even when the order of speakers has been pre-allocated.

4 Turn-taking organization

One of the traditional findings in the classroom literature is that students' access to plenary interaction is limited since students are only allowed to speak when nominated by the teacher (e.g., McHoul, 1978; Markee, 2000). This way of allocating turns has been criticized for not providing students with the opportunity to negotiate turn-taking locally, and hence for not providing students opportunities to practise 'conversation-like' techniques in the classroom (e.g., Lörscher, 1982). The way in which turn-allocation is accomplished is thus intrinsically tied to students' (access to) participation in the classroom interaction. Paoletti and Fele (2004: 78) describe the teacher's balance managing turn-taking and maintaining order as follows:

> [o]n the one hand, teacher control over turn taking restricts students' participation [...]. On the other hand, the teacher has the duty to guarantee equal participation by all students and the orderly development of classroom activities.

However, we still know very little about how teachers' turn-allocation influences students' participation. Nor do we know whether and how allowing students to manage or take part in turn-allocation provides opportunities for participation (although see Emanuelsson and Sahlström, 2008; Mortensen, 2009). Although it seems uncontroversial that the teacher is *managing* turn-allocation during plenary classroom interaction[1] it is less clear how this is accomplished and what kind of participation it facilitates.

In his seminal article *The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom*, McHoul (1978: 201) notes that in questions where all students would 'expectably know' the answer the teacher 'has to find a *knowing-and-willing-answerer*'. The teacher is thus faced with the job of finding someone to produce an answer.

Example 3 [O620U1 – 57:15]

1 ->	**Te:**	**#+Å den s:::::::::::#::sids+te (0.5) #Mia (0.2) Fik**
		And the last one (0.5) Mia (0.2) Did
	Te:	*#gaze towards board #gaze to Mia #gaze into book*
	Mi:	*+gaze to teacher +-->> gaze into book*

2 -> **Te:** **du fat i <hvordan bet#jentene var>**
you get how the officers were
Te: *#gaze to Mia*

3 **Ps:** **(1.0)**

4 **Mi:** **Ehrm#::::: ene den ene va:::r sø+d**
Ehrm one of them was nice
Te: *#gaze into book*
Mi: *+-->>gaze to teacher*

5 **Mi:** **å #den anden var det ik#ke**
and the other one was not
Te: *#moves to board* *#gaze towards board*

6 **Ps:** **(0.5)**

7 **Te:** **Den ene #var sød jaer**
One of them was nice yeah
Te *#writes on board*

In order to find a 'willing' student, the teacher orients to whether students display themselves as willing to produce the next-action. In this example, the teacher is facing the blackboard when the first pair-part is initiated in line 1. However, she delays the possible completion of the turn-constructional unit (TCU) and the possible speaker selection by prolonging the initial phoneme of the word *sidste* 'last'. During the prolongation, she turns towards the class and engages in mutual gaze with Mia and subsequently selects her to answer the first pair-part. In this way, the teacher displays an orientation to *monitoring* the students' display of willingness to answer the first pair-part as a relevant interactional job *prior to* the speaker selection. In these cases, as this article will show and as the teacher in Example 2 shows, selecting a next speaker is a members' problem (Garfinkel, 1967). In the remainder of this article, I will show: (i) that teachers orient to finding a student who displays availability to be selected as next speaker; (ii) that students display whether or not they are willing to be selected as next speaker; and (iii) that this is an intrinsic aspect of the way in which the lesson is socially organized. The article thus shows that although the teacher *manages* who is selected as next speaker, it is based on interactional work between teacher and students. The selection of an available student is described as a social norm (Garfinkel, 1967) in this particular context. I will focus on activities where the task is made available to the students as part of the ongoing lesson. This includes activities such as checking homework, going through peer/group work in plenary interaction, etc. A relevant aspect in this organization is that the students can *project* a relevant next action. For instance following the discussion of sub-task number

3, a relevant next-action is to proceed to sub-task number 4 (I will return to this in a later section).

5 How do students display willingness to be selected as next speaker?

In Example 2, we saw that the teacher gazed towards the students *before* selecting a next speaker, and that the selection was done *after* moving into mutual gaze with the selected student. In this way, it was argued, the teacher orients to the students' display of willingness to be selected. Sahlström (1999, 2002) analyses the social practice of hand-raising for *displaying participation* in the official lesson and as a way of displaying willingness to be selected as next speaker. He finds that hand-raising often occurs in transition relevance positions (TRPs) (Sacks *et al.*, 1974) following teacher's first pair-parts. In this way, the students display an orientation to the sequential environment as a position where transition to another speaker, i.e. a student, is relevant or even expectable. Gazing towards the teacher is another way of displaying that the student is willing to be selected as next speaker. In Example 2, Mia was already gazing towards the teacher as she turned the gaze towards her. Thus, when the teacher's gaze reached Mia she found a gazing co-participant. Goffman (1963) notes that mutual gaze may be a first step of moving into focused interaction (see also Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 1996). In this example, the student's gaze towards the teacher when a new activity has been initiated, is displaying the student's willingness to be selected as next speaker, and thus to take up the primary role of 'speaker', or more correctly 'answerer', in the projected participation framework (Goffman, 1981). As indicated previously, whereas the task in the analysed sequential environment has been specified in advance, the selection of a next speaker to answer the next task item has to be negotiated locally on a turn-by-turn basis. When a new activity has been initiated, a relevant action by the students is to display whether they are willing to be selected as next speaker or not. This can be done by turning the gaze towards the teacher before (s)he selects a next speaker:

Example 4 [O619 – 13:30]

1 -> Te: Godt å den +næste der læ +ser op ehrm::::::::#::::
Good and the next one to read aloud ehrm::::::::
Ca: *+gaze to teacher +gaze towards book*
Te: *#gaze to Catherine*

2 -> Te: +(0.6) hvem #vi- det ka du gøre Ca#the#rine
(0.6) who wan- you can do that Catherine
Ca: *+gaze to teacher*

Te: *#raises hand* *#points at Catherine*
Te: *#gaze into book*

3 **Ps:** **(0.4)**

4 **Te:** **Du ta´r Hanne og Per**
You can take Hanne and Per

In Example 3, the teacher initiates the next-activity, i.e. reading aloud, and projects next-speaker selection with *og den næste der læser op* 'and the next one to read aloud' in line 1. However, she delays the actual speaker-selection with a hesitation and a pause while she scans the room, and thus uses verbal as well as visual resources during the instruction (see Käänta, 2010). During the (0.6) second gap, Catherine moves the gaze towards the teacher who is already looking towards that side of the room, and they move into mutual gaze before the teacher selects her as a next speaker. Gazing towards the teacher in this sequential specific position, i.e. when the next activity has been initiated or projected and where selection of a new speaker is a relevant next-action, performs the social action of displaying that the gazing student is willing to be selected as next speaker. By gazing towards the teacher, the student and teacher may move into an engagement framework (Goodwin, 1981; Robinson, 1998) out of which the speaker-selection can occur. In environments where a first pair-part has been initiated, gazing towards the teacher does not only display an orientation towards willingness to be selected as next speaker, but also towards willingness to produce the specific second pair-part. Gazing towards the teacher when the next task item has been enacted is a social norm of displaying that the gazing student is willing to be selected to answer the first pair-part. This is also visible when students display that they do not want to be selected by the teacher:

Example 5: [F521 – 9:23]

1 **Te:** **#Eh:::: (.) er der noen af jer #α andre her i klas#+sen**
Eh:::: (.) is there anybody else here in the class
Te: *#gaze to Win* *#gaze to Nadia* *#gaze to Pierre*
Te: *#points towards students*
Wi: α-->gaze towards teacher
Pi: *+gaze to teacher*

2 **Te:** **(0.6) γ <der har> #noen ideer +hva- hva kun+ne**
(0.6) who have any ideas wha- what could
Te: *#gaze to M&F*
Na: *γgaze towards teacher*
Pi: *+gaze into book +gaze up*

3 **Ps:** **β(1.4) ((background noice))**
Ba: *βgaze towards teacher*

4 **Te:** **#Hvis je nu: ikke gav dem fri: nu å sa'e jam' i ska fortsætte**
If I didn't let them go now and said well you must continue
Te: *#gaze towards Nadia*

5 **Te:** **#i ska ysnakke om me#re**
you must keep talking
Te: *#gaze towards M&F #gaze towards Nadia*
Na: *γ-->gaze into book*

6 **Ps:** **(0.6)**

7 **Te:** **#Hva kunne: (.) #hva kunne de: spør' hinanden #om**
What could (.) what could they ask each other about
Te: *#gaze Barbara #gaze M&F #gaze Win*

8 -> **Ps:** **---α--#-β----|---#-------|----- ((2.5))**
Te: *#gaze Barbara #gaze towards Pierre*
Wi: *αgaze into book*
Ba: *βgaze into book*

9 **Pi:** **#.mth Je αγ syns β (0.9) ah::: (1.1)**
.mth I think (0.9) eh:: (1.1)
Te: *#-->>gaze reaches Pierre*
Wi: *α-->>gaze towards Pierre*
Na: *γ-->>gaze towards Pierre*
Ba: *β-->>gaze towards Pierre*

10 **Pi:** **eh:: (0.3) ikke +s:ejle (0.8) °eh ( )° de:: ro:r**
eh:: (0.3) not sail (0.8) eh ( ) they row
Pi: *+gaze towards teacher*

Prior to this example, two students, Maria and Fattouma (in the transcript noted M and F), have performed a task in front of their classmates. The task consisted, among other things, of asking each other questions about two people on a picture on the handout. They have just finished when this extract begins, and the teacher now asks the other students for more questions that could be talked about in relation to the picture while she scans around the classroom and several students turn their gazes towards her. In the pause following the teacher's question, line 8, she gazes towards the class. In this position a relevant next action is for a student to display willingness to be selected by, as we have seen, turning the gaze towards the teacher. However, as her gaze reaches Win he withdraws the gaze by looking down into the textbook on the table in front of him. The teacher then turns towards Barbara, who also withdraws the gaze as the teacher's gaze reaches her. In this way, they both avoid entering

mutual gaze with the teacher and by that entering an engagement framework, which can potentially lead to the teacher selecting one of them as next speaker (cf. Heidtmann and Föh, 2007). Rather than disengaging from the activity (cf. Markee, 2005; Koole, 2007), this is an integrated part of finding a next speaker. When the teacher's gaze arrives at Win and he withdraws his gaze from her, the teacher 'moves on' to another student and thus orients to their returning gaze, or lack of gaze, as *relevant* in this position. By not entering an engagement framework they display that they are not willing to be selected to answer the teacher's question. On the other hand, Pierre initiates a second pair-part when the teacher's gaze reaches him. In this way, he orients to the teacher's gaze as searching for a student who is willing to respond to the first pair-part, and that none of the classmates have done that so far. In this way, students display different levels of engagement in the ongoing activity. Rather than 'understanding' and 'participating' in the activity in the same way, Ohta notes that '[e]ven for learners in the same classroom, tasks are implemented under different conditions. The "same task" is never really "the same", even for learners who are sitting side by side. Students come to class with different levels of preparation, *exhibit different levels of engagement*, and have different understandings of the tasks' (Ohta, 2001: 232, emphasis added). Working through a task in plenary lessons involves that the students display different levels of engagement. This is an important part of the social organization, and is crucial for the teacher's (interactional) job of finding a willing next speaker.

6 Orientation to relevant next action

As mentioned previously, the task around which the participants structure their (inter)action(s) is visible for the participants. This means that students are able to follow the progression of the task and project the relevant next-action. When a class is going through a task that includes several task items the participants continuously have to demonstrate whether they are engaged in the task and how the task progresses (Szymanski, 1999; Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2004; Koole, 2007). For instance, Koole (2007) argues that even though students engage in parallel activities they maintain an orientation towards the teacher and the (central) activity (s)he is engaged in. Initiating a new activity within the overall task involves establishing new participation roles. The transition from one activity to another is therefore a relevant position for a student to display willingness to be selected as next speaker. In this way, a student can display willingness to be selected as next speaker even before a transition to the next action has been initiated.

Example 6 [O620U1 – 17:20]

1 Te: Jaer <sikkerheds: sele>
Yeah safety belt

2 Ps: (0.4)

3 Mi: Sikkerhedssele
Safety belt

4 Te: Der to esser ka i ikk se det +der to esser
There are two esses can't you see that there are two esses
Ca: +-->gaze down into book

5 Ps: (0.3)

6 Te: Sikkerheds: det et genitiv (.) es: (.) å så s:ele
Safety it is a genitive (.) ess (.) and then belt

7 -> Ps: (1.0) α----------|#--+--------|-((3.1)) ((students say safety belt))
Mi: α-->gaze down into book
Te: #gaze down into book
Ca: +-->gaze towards teacher

8 Al: °Sik#kerhedssele°
Safety belt
Te: #gaze towards Ali

9 -> Ps: --α-# (1.7) ((2.0))
Te: *#--> gaze towards Cathy*
Mi: αgaze towards teacher

10 Te: Ca#thy den sidste sætaning
Cathy the last sentence
Te: #gaze into book
Mi: α-->> gaze into book

11 Ps: (1.7)

12 Ca: +.tsk (0.2) ehh Politiken den #enogtyvende november
.tsk (0.2) ehh ((name of Danish newspaper)) twentyfirst of November
Ca: +gaze into book
Te: #gaze to board

13 Ca: #nittenhundrede syvoghalvfems
nineteenhundred ninetyseven
Te: #writes on board

14 Ps: (0.4)

15 Te: Nit+tenhundredesyvoghalvfems (.) jaer
Nineteenhundred ninetyseven (.) yeah
Ca: +gaze towards teacher

The prior task item, and the interaction that derived from it, included the word *sikkerhedssele* 'safety belt' and led to a linguistic comment by the teacher (how to spell and pronounce the word). The end of line 6 is a possible end not just of the TCU, but also of the prior sequence. In line 7, Mia withdraws the gaze from the teacher and orients to, and participates in, closing the prior sequence by disengaging from the displayed participation in the plenary activity. However, Cathy turns the gaze towards the teacher during the same pause, and is selected as next speaker by the teacher. In this way she projects a relevant next activity – the next task item – and displays that she is willing to be selected as the next speaker.

7 The teacher manages who is selected as next speaker

So far we have seen: (i) how students display whether they are willing or unwilling to be selected as next speaker; (ii) how the teacher orients to these displays as *relevant* prior to the speaker selection; and (iii) how students display an orientation towards the progression of the task and the relevant next action. In this way, the speaker selection by the teacher is done on the basis of an interactionally constructed context in which the students play an important part. Despite the interactional context, the teacher is the manager of who is selected as next speaker. (S)he selects the next speaker and may select a student who does not display willingness to be selected:

Example 7 [O620U1 – 47:25]

1 -> Te: **#+αβJa:**
Yes
Te: *#gaze into book*
Pa: *+-->gaze into book*
Ca: *agaze into book*
Po: *βgaze towards teacher*

2 Ps: **(1.0) α (1.0) β ((1.9))**
Ca: *α-->gaze towards teacher*
Po: *βgaze towards classmates*

3 Te: **#Ehrm#::**
Ehrm::
Te: *#gaze to Patricia #gaze to Cathy*

4 -> Ps: **β (1.0) # (1.0) # (2.2) ((5.2))**
Te: *#gaze to Patricia #gaze into book*
Po: *βgaze towards teacher*

5 -> **Te:** **Patricia? αβ (0.8) Fik du β fat i hvorfor Lisbeth**
Patricia (0.8) Did you get why Lisbeth
Ca: *a gaze into book*
Po: *β gaze to Patricia βgaze into book*

6 -> **Te:** **kom α for # sent**
was late
Te: *#gaze to board*
Ca: *a gaze to Patricia*

7 **Ps:** **(1.0)**

8 **Pa:** **Eh#rm: (0.2) fordi hu:βn eh: (0.5) .tsk ha::r**
Ehrm (0.2) because she eh (0.5) .tsk has
Te: *# writes on board*
Po: *β-->> gaze to Patricia*

9 **Pa:** **α cykel punk+tere**
bike puncture
Pa: *+ gaze to teacher*
Ca: *a gaze into book*

10 **Ps:** **(0.5)**

11 **Te:** **Jaaer**
Yeah
Ca: *a gaze towards teacher*

Even though several students, represented in the transcript by Cathy and Poh, are gazing toward the teacher as she projects a transition to the next activity (lines 1–3) she selects another student, Patricia, to answer the question. The teacher engages in mutual gaze with Cathy at the end of line 3, but withdraws the gaze and turns towards Patricia before selecting her as next speaker. Patricia does not display that she is willing to answer the question. She does not turn the gaze towards the teacher after the teacher's summons. She does not turn the gaze towards the teacher until the end of the answer, and thus orients to the teacher as the main recipient of her talk as well as projecting an evaluation from the teacher in the next turn. In this way, even though the teacher orients to Cathy as being willing to be selected as next speaker, she ignores this display and is thus in charge of the speaker selection. Even though she acknowledges the interactional context, she does not select a student according to their displayed willingness, but manages how the order of turns is organized. The selection of a student who does not display willingness to be selected as next speaker can also be 'pedagogically' motivated. In the above, I described the students' unavailability as an integrated part of finding a willing next speaker – a student who is unavailable is in this way *not* disengaging from the ongoing

activity and is not sanctioned by the teacher. In other sequential environments the selection of a non-gazing student may be a way of re-engaging him/her in the (pedagogical) activity:

Example 8 [F509U2 – 16:15]

1	Te:	**For li´e nu er der mange barrierer (.) fordi båndene**
		Because right now there are many barriers (.) because the tapes
2	Te:	**er væk materia#lerne er væk**
		are gone the material is gone
	Te:	*# gaze towards Pierre*
3	Ps:	**+(1.9)**
	Ya:	*+ gaze towards classmate on his right*
4	Ya:	**°°°([ )°°°**
5	Te:	**[Så du li´e ka fortælle det**
		[So if you could just say that
6	Pi:	**Ja [okay**
		Yeah okay
7	Te:	**[#(ikk oss)**
		[right
	Te:	*#-->> gaze towards Yang*
8	Ps:	**(0.2)**
9	Ya:	**Hvem er din**
		Who is your
10	Te:	**Khh**
11	Ps:	**(0.6)**
12	Ya:	**([ )**
13->	Te	**[.tsk Yang +hvem- h:vem +ska inviteres.**
		[.tsk Yang who who should we invite
	Ya:	*+ gaze towards teacher +-->> gaze reaches teacher*
14	Te:	**Ska der inviteres noen personer fra Bolettes klasse**
		Should we invite some people from Bolette's class
15	Ps:	**(1.7)**
16	Ya:	**Ja det ska je nok (.) sørge (.) °ja°**
		Yeah I will take care of that yeah

In this example, Yang is not displaying engagement in the *central* part of the lesson, but rather in a *parallel activity* (Koole, 2007) by talking to another classmate. In line 13, the teacher selects Yang as the next speaker, and requests his gaze with a turn-initial summons (Schegloff, 1968), i.e. an address term. However, Yang is not gazing towards the teacher at this point, but is engaged in an activity that is not treated as part of the official lesson by the participants (cf. Robinson 1998): The teacher restarts the turn-beginning as Yang has initiated reorienting his gaze towards the teacher, and in this way the teacher constructs the turn-beginning so as to request the gaze of a non-gazing recipient (Goodwin, 1980, 1981; Heath, 1984, 1986; Carroll, 2004). Selecting Yang as the next speaker thus requires interactional work due to Yang's engagement in a parallel activity. In this example, the teacher is already gazing towards Yang in line 7, i.e. before selecting him as next speaker. The teacher is thus orienting to Yang's engagement in a parallel activity, and in this way the selection of him in line 13 can be seen as a way of re-engaging him in the official part of the lesson (cf. Egbert, 1997).

A student who does not display willingness is selected. The teacher overrules the social norm of the students displaying whether they are available for engaging in focused interaction with the teacher, and this can have sequential consequences. The activity from which the next example is taken includes a written text with empty fields where the students are to fill in numbers they hear from the reading aloud of the text. Here they are going through the text, and the selected student is supposed to read one sentence of the text aloud.

Example 9 [O620U1 – 15:38]

1 **Ps:** **#+αβγ (2.4)**
Te: *#gaze around in the class*
Mi: *+-->> gaze into book*
Ca: *a gaze to teacher and flicks the pen in front of her*
An: *β--> gaze to teacher*
Ay: *γ --> gaze to teacher*

2 **Te:** **Ja**
Yes

3 **Ps:** **(1.4)**

4 **Te:** **#Den næste:ɑ=ehr#m: Miβa**
The next one ehrm Mia
Te: *#gaze to book* *# gaze to Mia*
Ca: *a gaze into book*
An: *β gaze to Mia*

5 **Ps:** **#γ (1.4)**
Te: *#--> gaze into book*
Ay: *γ-->> gaze into book*

6 -> **Mi:** **βEh: fra desuden?**
Eh from moreover
An: *β-->> gaze into book*

7 **Ps:** **(0.3)**

8 **Te:** **Ja (.) ta[k**
es (.) please

9 **Mi:** **[Desuden blev=ehrm femogfyrre? # (0.7)**
[Moreover were ehrm forty five (0.7)
Te: *#turns to board*

10 **Mi:** **ehrm:#:: (1.3) bagsædepassagerer snuppet uden sele**
ehrm (1.3) back seat passengers caught without a safety belt
Te: *#writes on board*

In Example 8, the teacher does not select one of the students who are displaying willingness to be selected as next speaker, but a student who is looking into her own book on the table in front of her. She does not specify which task Mia is supposed to answer, but frames the first pair-part in relation to the previous activity by *den næste* 'the next one'. Thus for Mia to be able to answer the first pair-part requires that she 'remembers' which was the last task item and thereby that she orients to the progression of the activity. When Mia is selected as next speaker she does not provide the second pair-part. Instead, she initiates an insertion sequence (Schegloff, 1968; 2007: Ch. 6) that requests for confirmation which activity to produce (reading aloud) by proposing a specific position of where to start reading aloud, and marks it as a hesitant proposal. After the teacher's confirmation that this is indeed the activity she is supposed to produce and the right place to do it, Mia starts reading aloud from the text. Selecting a student who does not display willingness to be selected as next speaker can have sequential consequences, and this reveals the social norm of the engagement displayed by gazing towards the teacher in these sequential environments.

8 Discussion

In this article, I have described how the organization of pedagogical tasks provides students with different interactional jobs in relation to establishing the new participation roles. The focus of the article concerned activities where the task was made available to the students, but where turn-allocation was managed

on a locally turn-by-turn basis. In these cases, a relevant interactional job for teachers is to find a willing answerer to provide the second pair-part. Similarly, students orient to the progression of the task and the transition between task items as relevant positions for displaying whether or not they are willing to be selected as next speaker. In this concluding section, I would like to point out a few consequences that derive from this empirical study.

First, the results of this study, in this specific activity, confirms a traditional view of the teacher as the manager of how turns-at-talk are (officially) distributed among the students. However, it shows that this is done on the basis of interactional work between teacher and students. In this way, it documents the kind of interactional work that is done in relation to, but *prior* to turn-allocation. This finding adds to previous studies of interactional work in pre-TCU positions such as gestures and facial expressions (e.g., Streeck and Hartge, 1992; Mondada, 2007; Mortensen, 2009), which describe how multimodal or visual aspects are crucial in setting up a new participation framework out of which the incipient talk can emerge.

Second, the study did not deal with pedagogical issues in relation to this way of organizing activities. However, it was found that both teacher and students orient to students' display of willingness to be selected as next speaker as *relevant* in this specific context. This does not (necessarily) mean that the teacher selects a student who is willing to be selected as next speaker as the teacher may have pedagogical reasons for choosing another student. However, this violates the social norm of how turn-allocation is accomplished in this sequential environment, and may have sequential consequences (see Example 8). Teacher and students do not necessarily act in relation to the same frames of reference (Johnson, 1995). Whereas the teacher acts *partially* based on professional knowledge of (second) language learning and pedagogy, the students rely overwhelmingly on *common sense knowledge* (Garfinkel, 1967), i.e., the social norms they know from ordinary conversation in everyday life. The organization of the ongoing activity constitutes a framework, which requires certain kinds of participation by the students. Awareness of what kinds of interactional jobs an activity provides the students with is of utmost importance for teachers in particular as well as researchers in classroom studies. Teachers' first pair-parts in plenary activities do not only make a specific second pair-part conditionally relevant (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), but do also influence the interactional work in relation to initiating and producing the second pair-part. These interactional jobs may complicate the pedagogical aim of the task, and should be taken into consideration when organizing how tasks are organized during the lesson. If for instance the pedagogical goal is to include all students in the classroom by giving them (approximately) the same opportunities for participating in the ongoing activity the teacher may run the

risk of selecting a student who does not display willingness to be selected as next speaker, and who may not be in an (immediate) position to answer the teacher's question. The lack of an immediate response from the student may in this situation be understood as a (cognitive) problem of not knowing the answer rather than as a socio-interactive aspect of the ongoing participation framework.

This study raises a few questions concerning comparison of the results. For instance, is the practice described in this study specific to (formalized) classroom interaction or recurrent in 'ordinary conversation' as well? Does gaze in the described sequential context perform the same social action, i.e. a display of willingness to be selected as next-speaker, across social and cultural contexts? Can other (visual) resources (e.g., gesture, body orientation, etc.) in the same sequential context perform the same social action? A systematic study of these questions will provide crucial information about second language students' interactional competence and the pedagogical challenges that it embeds.

[A]Appendix – Transcription symbols of visual aspects

The following symbols show the position of the visual aspect in relation to the verbal turn-at-talk, and are specified on subsequent individual lines below. The symbols are adopted from Mondada (2007).

#	refers to the teacher's gaze and other visual aspects (as notes in transcript)
+	refers to the (primary) student's gaze and other visual aspects
α, β, γ	refers to other students' gaze and other visual aspects

Each participant holds an individual line below transcript of the verbal turn (and translation).

-->	marks that gaze direction (or other visual aspects) are maintained through subsequent lines
-->>	marks that gaze direction (or other visual aspects) are maintained until (or after) the end of the example

Pauses are timed in seconds and tenth of seconds. Whenever visual aspects are described during gaps and pauses, the 'silence' is either divided into (1.0) second fragments or tenth of second represented with '- -' with each '-' marking a tenth of a second. One full second is marked by '|'. Whenever a silence is broken into smaller segments, the entire length of the silence is marked at the end of the line in double parenthesis, e.g., '((5.0))'.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Catherine E. Brouwer for extensive discussions during prior versions of this article, as well as to three anonymous reviewers for their critical and constructive comments. I alone take responsibility for any remaining problems.

Note

1. Turn-taking during other classroom organizations has been shown to differ from plenary interaction in numerous ways (see e.g., Seedhouse 2004) leading Markee and Kasper's (2004) special issue introduction to talk about classroom talks. In this article, however, I deal exclusively with plenary classroom organization.

About the author

Kristian Mortensen received his PhD in applied linguistics from the University of Southern Denmark, Odense and is currently a postdoctoral researcher in the University of Luxembourg. His research interests include classroom interaction, second language learning, multimodality and conversation analysis. Address for correspondence: LCMI – Unit for Socio-cultural Research on Learning and Development, University of Luxembourg, Route de Diekirch, L-7220 Walferdange, Luxembourg. Email: kristian.mortensen@uni.lu

References

Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds) *Second Language Conversations*, 201–220. London: Continuum.

Duranti, A. (1993). Truth and intentionality: An ethnographic critique. *Cultural Anthropology* 8 (2): 214–245. doi:10.1525/can.1993.8.2.02a00050

Egbert, M. (1997). Schisming: The transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 30 (1): 1–51. doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi3001_1

Emanuelsson, J. and Sahlström, F. (2008). The price of participation – Teacher control versus student participation in classroom interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 52 (2): 205–223. doi:10.1080/00313830801915853

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal* 81 (3): 285–300. doi:10.2307/329302

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (5): 800–819.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In E. Goffman *Forms of Talk*, 124–159. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3–4): 272–302. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682X.1980.tb00023.x

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (2000a). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (10): 1489–1522. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X

Goodwin, C. (2000b). Practices of color classification. *Mind, Culture and Activity* 7 (1–2): 19–36. doi:10.1207/S15327884MCA0701&2_03

Goodwin, C. (2003). The body in action. In J. Coupland and R. Gwyn (eds) *Discourse, the Body, and Identity*, 19–42. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gourlay, L. (2005). OK, who's got number one? Permeable triadic dialogue, covert participation and the co-construction of checking episodes. *Language Teaching Research* 9 (4): 403–422. doi:10.1191/1362168805lr175oa

Heath, C. (1984). Talk and recipiency: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 247–265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, C. (1986). *Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511628221

Heath, C. and Luff, P. (1992). Collaboration and control: Crisis management and multimedia technology in London Underground Line Control Rooms. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 1 (1): 24–48. doi:10.1007/BF00752451

Heidtmann, D. and Föh, M.-J. (2007). Verbale abstinenz als form interaktiver beteiligung. In R. Schmitt (ed.) *Koordination: Analysen zur Multimodalen Interaktion*, 263–292. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus in task openings. *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (1): 83–96. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00503.x

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. and Cole, E. (2009). Practices for social interaction in language learning classrooms: Disengagement from dyadic task interaction. *Applied Linguistics* 30: 186–215. doi:10.1093/applin/amn032

Hougaard, G. R. (2009). Legitimate peripheral participation as a framework for conversation analytic work in second language learning. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 10 (2): Art. 4.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis. Principles, Practices and Applications.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jensen, L. (2001). Planning lessons. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.) *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 403–408. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, R. and Thornborrow, J. (2004). Floors, talk and the organization of classroom activities. *Language in Society* 33 (3): 399–423. doi:10.1017/S0047404504043040

Jones, S. E. and Zimmerman, D. H. (2003). A child's point and the achievement of intentionality. *Gesture 3* (2): 155–185. doi:10.1075/gest.3.2.03jon

Käänta, L. (2010). *Teacher Turn-Allocation and Repair Practices in Classroom Interaction: A Multisemiotic Perspective.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 47 (1): 11–36. doi:10.1515/iral.2009.002

Koole, T. (2007). Parallel activities in the classroom. *Language and Education* 21 (6): 487–501.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lörscher, W. (1982). Konversationanalyse und Fremdsprachenunterricht. *Neusprachliche Mitteilungen auf Wissenschaft und Praxis* 35 (4): 211–218.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2005). The organization of off-task talk in Second Language classrooms. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds) *Applying Conversation Analysis*, 187–213. London: Palgrave.

Markee, N. (2008). Towards a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics* 29 (3): 404–427. doi:10.1093/applin/amm052

Markee, N. and Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 491–500. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-14-.x

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society* 7: 183–213. doi:10.1017/S0047404500005522

Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: Projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies* 8 (1): 117–129. doi:10.1177/1461445606059561

Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies* 9 (2): 194–225. doi:10.1177/1461445607075346

Mondada, L. and Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 501–518. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-15-.x

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (3): 323–347. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.323

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 536–550. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-17-.x

Mori, J. and Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 47 (1): 65–94. doi:10.1515/iral.2009.004

Mori, J. and Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2): 195–219. doi:10.1093/applin/aml014

Mortensen, K. (2008). *Instructions and Participation in the Second Language Classroom.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Southern Denmark, Odense.

Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing recipiency in pre-beginning position in the second language Classroom. *Discourse Processes* 46 (5): 491–515. doi:10.1080/01638530902959463

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge Language Teaching Library.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition Processes In The Classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Paoletti, I. and Fele, G. (2004). Order and disorder in the classroom. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (1): 69–85.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, C. Jenks and S. Walsh (eds) *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*, 105–120. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667305

Robinson, J. D. (1998). Getting down to business: Talk, gaze, and body orientation during openings of doctor-patient consultations. *Human Communication Research* 25 (1): 97–123. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1998.tb00438.x

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive resources and second language syllabus design: A triadic theory of task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (ed.) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 285-317. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (2004). An initial characterization of the organization of speaker turn-taking in conversation. In G. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies From the First Generation*, 35–42. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50 (4): 696–735. doi:10.2307/412243

Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the Hill Backwards*. Uppsala: Uppsala Studies in Education.

Sahlström, F. (2002). The interactional organization of hand raising in classroom interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction* 37 (2): 47–57.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70 (6): 1075–1095. doi:10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8 (4): 289–327. doi:10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching* 36: 1–14. doi:10.1017/S026144480200188X

Streeck, J. and Hartge, U. (1992). Previews: Gestures at the transition place. In P. Auer and A. D. Luzio (eds) *The Contextualization of Language*, 135–157. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Suchman, L. A. (2007). *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Szymanski, M. H. (1999). Re-engaging and dis-engaging talk in activity. *Language in Society* 28 (1): 1–23. doi:10.1017/S0047404599001013

Varonesi, D. (2007). Movimento nello spazio, prossemica e risorse interazionali: Un'analisi preliminare del rapporto tra modalià in contesti didattici accademici. *VALS/ASLA* 85 (3): 107–129.