Learner Initiative in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom: Implications for the Interactional Development

Jaume BATLLE RODRIGUEZ[*], Isabel MURILLO WILSTERMANN[**]

ABSTRACT: Classroom interaction has been widely studied using the conversation analysis methodology in order to explore and understand interactional practices that enhance language learning. This research has been traditionally focused on the canonical teacher-student classroom interaction, called Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence, composed by a teacher's first turn, a student's response and a third turn performed by the teacher to evaluate or give feedback. Variability within the IRF sequence, regarding the learner's initiative to take the floor, has been investigated and its potential benefits to generate language learning opportunities have been acknowledged. Employing Conversation Analysis, in this article we investigate learner initiatives in teacher-student interactions obtained from 40 hours of video-recorded Spanish as a foreign language lessons in Barcelona, Spain. We aim to explore and characterize students´ initiatives in a meaning-focused round robin sequence and analyze the implications of non-allocated turns for the progressivity of the interaction. The analyses reveal that some initiatives do not alter -but support- the ongoing interaction, while others lead to marked changes and readjustments in the IRF sequence.
Keywords: learner initiative, non-assigned turn, Spanish as a foreign language, IRF sequence, repair

1. INTRODUCTION

In foreign language teaching education, interaction is considered as one of the most significant pedagogical aspects, not only in relation to Second Language Acquisition but also as a key element to establish social relationships in the classroom context (Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015, Van Lier, 1988, i.a.). In this vein, "in order to get access to learning opportunities (...) students not only have to understand the subject logic behind the academic task structure, but also the participation formats intended by the teachers. Learners have to learn how to participate" (Appel, 2010: 214-215).

Students' participation in the classroom is linked to the teacher's decisions. In the IRF sequence teachers have the leading role and students' contributions are subordinated to the teacher's turn. However, the complexity of this kind of interaction, which can be focused on form or on meaning (Seedhouse, 2004), reveals a heterogeneity of students' participation as well as students' willingness to participate. While there are participation schemes where interventions are predetermined, as in round robin sequences (Mortensen & Hazel, 2011), students have the possibility to alter the expected patterns. This participation can have interactional consequences for the progressivity and development, because it moves away from the common and expected participation scheme. We refer to those student turns non-allocated by the teacher and, therefore, not expected by him/her.

The following study attempts to explore students' non-assigned participation in a meaning-focused round robin sequence. For this purpose, eight round robin interactions from a corpus of 40 hours of Spanish as a foreign language classroom will be analyzed employing a conversation analysis perspective. Our main objective is to observe this kind of turns in order to

---
[*] Assistant Teacher, Department of Teaching Language & Literature, University of Barcelona, Spain. e-mail: jaumebatlle@ub.edu (ORCID: 0000-0002-7429-9768)
[**] Spanish Teacher, Romanisches Seminar, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Germany. e-mail: imurillo@romanistik.uni-kiel.de (ORCID: 0000-0003-4400-9237)

characterize them and to reveal their interactional consequences for the progressivity of the interaction. To begin, literature about students' participation will be reviewed, focusing specifically in non-assigned turns.

1.1. Teacher-Student Interaction in the Foreign Language Classroom

Foreign language classroom interaction is characterized as a type of institutional interaction (Bowles & Seedhouse, 2007; Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). As such, it encompasses specific features that distinguish it from ordinary conversation. On the one hand, the institutional roles enacted by the participants within the educational context, and on the other, the asymmetrical relationship among interlocutors, with dissimilar resources, rights and duties (Batlle, 2014; Drew, 1991; Gardner, 2013). In consequence, participation is unequal and this fact is reflected in the most characteristic educational turn-taking system: the IRF sequence (Fasel Lauzon & Berger, 2015; Gardner, 2013; Kääntä, 2015; McHoul, 1978, 1990; Mehan, 1979; Richards, 2006; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Waring, 2009, i.a.).

In the classroom context, the IRF sequence is composed by a complex semiotic system (Kääntä, 2012, 2015). Verbal and non-verbal resources are deployed by the participants in an asymmetrical participation scheme. Usually is the teacher who initiates the sequence with a question, which is responded by a learner or, depending on the type and design of the question, by the whole group (Lerner, 2002). Next to the student's response, the teacher takes the floor to reply to the previous turn in order to evaluate the learner's contribution or, in meaning-focused interactions, to follow up the sequence (Richards, 2006). The teacher is the interlocutor who manages the interaction because he/she has the right to allocate the turn to the students. Accordingly, "the pedagogical dimension of the academic task structure outlines the prospective course of interactional development" (Schwab, 2011:6).

One characteristic of the IRF sequence is that it precludes ordinary conversation actions such as expressing beliefs, disagreement or proposing topic changes (Kapellidi, 2013; Schwab, 2007, cited in Appel, 2010). In this way, the IRF sequence is restricted to its prototypical institutional context: the classroom. From a pedagogical perspective, this sequence is highly complex (Seedhouse, 2004) because it is employed to manage interactional progressivity in the classroom. In this context, the interaction is aimed at obtaining students' responses that display knowledge and comprehension of the teacher's questions (Macbeth, 2011). According to Lee (2007), the characteristics of the teacher's third turn within the IRF sequence provide evidence for the pedagogical objective of his/her initial question. For instance, when the teacher asks the student to display a certain kind of knowledge, the third part of the sequence is evaluative. At the same time, within the IRF sequence students' participation -considered as a key element in the development of foreign language acquisition- is fostered by teachers (Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017).

The interactional mechanism of the IRF sequence is composed by a turn-taking system where the speech rights are distributed in advance (Markee, 2000). However, in meaning-focused teacher-students interaction, the turn-taking system is less rigid than in form-focused interaction (Seedhouse, 2004) because students' responses are spontaneous rather than expected and known by the teacher (Llobera, 2008) and he/she has less control over the students' answers. It can therefore be said that within the general IRF sequence the participation scheme of the interlocutors can vary. This will be illustrated in the following sections as well as in our data.

1.2. Students' Participation

In interactional frameworks where teachers address the whole class, students "have to be regarded as possible interlocutors, whether they are considered as active or passive listeners, ratified or non-ratified participants, bystanders or eavesdroppers" (Schwab, 2011: 7). Generally, students' participation is restricted to the second part of the IRF sequence as a response to the teacher's initiation (Kapellidi, 2013). In this respect, McHoul (1978) identified the following interactional patterns: a) after finalizing his/her own turn, the teacher assigns a student the possibility to participate in the interaction, b) the teacher addresses the whole group waiting for someone to respond. In case nobody takes the floor, the teacher continues with another intervention and c) if a student takes the floor and participates in the interaction, he/she can select the next speaker afterwards, but if this does not happen, the teacher can select him/herself in order to continue.

According to Lerner (2003), in multiparty interaction, teachers can select the next speaker tacitly or using explicit methods. When the teacher does not explicitly assign the turn to the next speaker, students can self-select requesting a turn (Cekaite, 2009; van Lier, 1988), which can be supported by a gesture[1] (Sahlström, 1999, 2002), or provide a choral answer to the teacher (Lerner, 2002). Sahlström (2002) observed that students take part in the interaction using the hand-raising gesture[2] and determined that, generally, the student who has the possibility to participate verbally in the interaction is the one who last raised his/her hand. This non-verbal communication established in the classroom reveals that the teacher does not have the absolute control of the interaction. Participation is rather a multimodal, interactional process between teachers and students (Fasel Lauzon & Berger, 2015; Kääntä, 2015).

1.3. Students' Unsolicited Participation

Learners can take the initiative to participate in interaction (Garton, 2012; Hall, 1998; Jacknick, 2011; Li, 2013; Schwab, 2009) and therefore take more responsibility for their own learning (Waring, 2011). Questions or comments resulting from learner initiatives represent a kind of participation which, basically, is valuable for the generation of learning opportunities in the target language (Waring, 2011). However, interventions that hijack a turn assigned to another participant, are considered as a participation that breaks with the prototypical moral order within interaction (Mortensen & Hazel, 2017). This kind of transgression can have an impact in the social relationship established between the interlocutors in the classroom and can lead to a breakdown of the inherent progressivity of the interaction (Stivers & Robinson, 2006). In this moment a side sequence (Jefferson, 1972) starts, where the teacher indicates who is the one responsible of having caused a rupture in the progressivity. In these cases, often humour and irony are used by teachers to deal with the inappropriate intervention made by the student. According to Schwab (2009), unsolicited learner turns imply additional interactional work, where issues of power and identity of the participants, as well as negotiation of meaning and form have to be clarified. The learning opportunities generated and pursued by learners' unsolicited turns need in turn a cooperative reaction by the teacher (Garton, 2012; Hall, 1998; Li, 2013).

In a study focused on learner initiative in the classroom, Waring (2011), describes this social action as "any learner attempt to make an uninvited contribution to the ongoing classroom

---

[1] In fact, this type of participation may be considered as an unsolicited one because the teacher does not allocate the turn explicitly and the hand raising gesture can be interpreted as a communicative act.
[2] Mortensen (2008) points out that, beside hand gesture, learners perform other movements and manifest respiratory changes. These physical actions help them to be selected as next speakers by the teacher.

talk (...) [and] not providing the expected response when selected" (Waring, 2011: 204). Such initiatives, different regarding turn taking and their place within the interactional sequence, can generate learning opportunities that should not be underestimated. Based on the analysis of 14 classroom hours taught by seven different teachers, Waring (2011) established three types of learner initiative: the first and most common is a self-selection that initiates a sequence (type A), the second one is a self-selection in order to answer a question formulated previously (type B) and the third one constitutes an exploitation of the own turn to initiate a new sequence (type C). In type A students take the initiative to participate and initiate a sequence with or without pre-expansion or with post-expansion in order to display knowledge or to negotiate understanding. In consequence, a more symmetrical relationship between the speakers is established (Batlle, 2014; Marková & Froppa, 1991) as a result of more balanced rights and duties in participation. While type A corresponds to the first part of the IRE sequence, in type B a student self-selects as a response to a question formulated in the previous turn. Waring distinguishes between two practices: first, when a student intervenes on behalf of the group to offer a response, and second, when a student gives a response that had not been requested. Type C is a voluntary intervention where the student initiates a new interactional sequence with the objective of going ahead with his/her own agenda. A way of doing this is either making a longer contribution than necessary in the conversation, or making an unexpected one.

Waring highlights the relevance of learners' initiative for the flexibilization of participation schemes and of learners' identity. Taking the initiative within interaction, learners can stretch their identity, acting as a teacher or as a casual interlocutor. Moreover, learner initiative promotes a more symmetrical relationship regarding participation rights, which can facilitate learning opportunities. In this way, "the learner exploits opportunities of genuine language use unlike those typically handed to them in a language classroom" (Waring, 2011: 212). According to Waring, a task for teachers is to promote students' spontaneous participation within classroom interaction. However, teachers must find the delicate balance between the consecution of learning objectives and the promotion of learners' participation.

In the context of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms, Evnitskaya and Berger[3] (2017) analyze students' willingness to participate (WTP) by means of self-selection in order to provide a relevant second turn in the ongoing interaction. A characteristic of such turns is that they are not assigned by the teacher, but rather show learners' willingness to take the floor. The authors show how learner initiative emerges as a public and social demonstration which makes participation possible in the ongoing action. Hence, WTP is "publicly accounted (and therefore recognized as such by other participants) through their multimodally displayed attention to, understanding of, alignment with and availability to engage in the ongoing classroom activity" (Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017: 88). Unsolicited turns, then, are accepted by all the participants, show that everyone is engaged in the ongoing interaction and reveal the participants deeply understand how action is sequenced. Willingness to communicate is "a social, public demonstration of one's interest (i.e. willingness) to engage in the ongoing pedagogical activity" (Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017: 88).

In this vein, Kapellidi (2015) determined non-canonical models of participation observed when a student takes the initiative to participate or when classroom interaction among students is carried out without the teacher's mediation. Kapellidi distinguished three types of learner non-canonical participation: (1) unsolicited second turn, (2) anticipated completion of the teacher's turn, which are frequently done with overlapping, and (3) turns that can be considered as the first part of the sequence. Concerning the first type, when a learner performs an

---

[3] In this article the authors also analyze the same interactional phenomena within learner-learner interaction. However, this will not be considered here because it is not the focus of our study.

unsolicited turn, he/she could be considered as an active agent within interaction (Schwab, 2011) because he/she was paying attention to the interaction and there was a possibility for self-selection. Schwab (2011) demonstrated that IRF interactions may evolve in multilogical interactions, mainly as a result of unsolicited learner contributions. Although the IRF sequence could be regarded as a dialogical type of interaction, students who are not participating can be seen as active agents within classroom interaction. Multilogical interactions can also take place when the teacher is addressing one of the students. In such cases, the other learners, although unofficially, may also participate (Appel, 2010). This implies that dialogical interaction does not exclude the participation of the rest of the group.

Unsolicited learners' turns, as we have seen, have received attention with regard to their particular features and its management. Moreover, what happens interactionally after this kind of participation has been explored in different language contexts (e.g., Hall, 1998; Li, 2013; Schwab, 2009). Since these turns are not canonical, they can affect the progressivity of the ongoing interaction, changing the way teachers manage turn allocation. For this reason, in the present study we aim at characterizing learner initiative in meaning-focused IRF interactions and also at analyzing its consequences within interaction. Our investigation takes place in the Spanish as a foreign language classroom, a language context where more research is needed. In this respect, two questions will be considered. First, how is learners' unsolicited participation characterized in this specific kind of interaction? Second, what consequences non-allocated turns have for the progressivity of the interaction? By exploring learners' non-assigned participation, we as researchers, teachers and teacher educators may develop a better understanding of communication and learning processes in our language classrooms.

2. METHOD

The data were obtained from 40 hours of video-recorded Spanish as a foreign language lessons at the language school of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Spain) during the Fall Semester of 2012. The sessions were recorded with a video camera placed in the back of the classroom. The analysis is based on learner initiatives in eight round robin (Mortensen & Hazel, 2011) meaning-focused teacher-students interactions with a duration of one hour and 33 minutes. Round robin interactions are highly ritualized IRF sequences where the teacher gives the floor to the students one by one, generally asking the same question or searching for the same sort of information. This kind of sequence is inherent to the classroom and is strongly marked by the IRF characteristics. In our data, round robin sequences are focused on a specific topic: the students' weekend getaways. This ritualized interaction takes around 10 to 15 minutes at the beginning of the lesson. Our data is analyzed employing a conversation analytic perspective (cf. Clift, 2016; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Interactions are transcribed following the Jefferson transcription system and considering the specifications developed by Hepburn & Bolden (2017).

The group of learners consists of 12 undergraduate students from four countries: nine students from the United States, one Korean, one German and one Swedish. Their ages range between 20 and 23 years. They joined a one-semester study abroad program in Barcelona as part of the Erasmus exchange agreement and a cooperation between the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and some North American universities. The Spanish level of the group is A1+ according to the CEFR. The teacher is a native speaker of Spanish with more than 10 years of experience.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, we analyze the students' unsolicited participation based on their position in the IRF sequence. We will observe that, in some cases, these turns affect the structure of the interaction and have specific interactional consequences. In subsection 3.1 we explore learners' initiative in the second pair part of the sequence and in subsection 3.2, non-allocated first pair parts will be analyzed[4].

3.1. Non-assigned Participation as Second Pair Parts

In extract (1), the teacher begins the lesson by asking the students about their activities last weekend. In line 01, the teacher allocates the turn to E7 and she proceeds to describe her experience (line 2). The teacher produces response tokens (Gardner, 2001), which encourage E7 to continue with her turn. As she attempts to do so (line 05), E3 sees in E7's elongated hesitation marker the opportunity to self-select in order to provide precise information about the kind of event they attended together.

```
(1)

JBR_1:1.1,11:50

01  Pr1⁵:     E7, y tú?
                E7, and you?

02  E7:       eh:: mis amigas y yo hemos ido a Sitges, para el zombie
                eh,  my friends and I went to Sitges,   to the zombie

03            heh heh.

04  Pr1:      mhm sí
                mhm yes

05  E7:       [eh:]

06  E3:       [cine] de terror=
                horror film

07  E7:       =el ↑sábado
                =on saturday

08  Pr1:      mhm

09  E7:       mis amigas y yo comimos en el (   ) pero no tenemos camisetas
                my friends and I ate at    (   ) but we don't have shirts

10  E7:       eh:: (   ) es peligroso si no tengo camiseta
                eh::        is dangerous if I don't have a shirt

11  Pr1:      mhm
```

---

[4] The analysis begins with non-assigned second pair parts because this turn normally corresponds to the learner in the IRF sequence.
[5] We use the pseudonym Pr1 for "profesor 1"; 'teacher 1' in Spanish. For the students we use 'E' because it is the first letter of the Spanish word "estudiante".

```
12  E7:        so you can get to change clothes [(   )


13  Pr1:                                        [HAh hah y la experiencia
                                                [HAh hah and the experience

14            cómo:: cómo ha sido? interesante?
              how    how was it?   interesting?

15  E7:        (   )
```

E3 takes part in the interaction between E7 and the teacher with a non-allocated turn. Through this intervention, E3 displays knowledge and widens the participation scheme (Waring, 2011). Her overlapped participation (line 06) can be interpreted as a collaborative other-repair that adds more precise information to the answer provided by her classmate in line 02. Despite E3's supportive information produced with overlapping, E7 continues exercising her right to participate (line 07). In the following lines, E3 neither takes the floor again, nor gets the opportunity to be the teacher's interlocutor. Her turn is isolated, while E7 keeps holding the floor and contributing to the interaction. Therefore, E3's initiative does not have interactional consequences for the ongoing conversation.

Since the students in some cases were travelling together, they might feel able to say something about a classmate's weekend trip. Non-assigned turns may be provided in order to deliver additional information or to help solving a communication problem. This can be seen in excerpt (2), where the teacher assigns E7 the turn to inquire about her activities last weekend (line 1). E7 says that she was in Switzerland, but rather than using the Spanish word for the country, she uses the English term. In this situation the teacher appears to have not understood the learner's contribution and initiates an other-repair sequence repeating the preposition in line 03 with rising intonation. We can assume that this repair sequence is initiated as a result of a hearing problem by the teacher. In line 4, E7 repeats the trouble source, which signalizes that she interpreted the teacher's request as a hearing problem and not as an understanding one. However, the raising intonation shows some degree of uncertainty in her repair work. In line 05 and after a false start, the teacher proposes his hypothesis about the learner's previous utterance. Employing a rising intonation, the teacher marks his uncertainty and requests from E7 a confirmation. But E7 expects the country's Spanish word from the teacher and repeats in line 06 the teacher's previous utterance, asking for his confirmation in a new repair sequence.

```
(2)

JBR_1:11.1,13:10

01  Pr1:     muy bien (.) E7
             very good(.) E7

02  E7:      mis compañeras y yo fuimos a Switzerland
             my classmates and I went to Switzerland

03  Pr1:     a?
             to?

04  E7:      Switzerland?
             Switzerland?

05  Pr1:     a S- (.) a Sutton?
```

```
              to S-    to Sutton?

06  E7:       Sutton?
              Sutton?

07  Pr1:      no (.) no s-=
              no (.) no s-

08  E12:      =Switzerland
              Switzerland

09  E7:       Switzerland?
              Switzerland?

10  Pr1:      ah a  Su- a Suiza: (.)   >vale< es[taba pen-
              ah to Sw- to Switzerland   ok   I was thin-

11  E7:                                        [(   )


12  Pr1:      estaba pensando en Sutton la discoteca::
              I was thinking of Sutton, the disco

13  Sst⁶:     [  heh  heh  hheh. ]

14  Pr1:      [de:: de Barcelo:na] (2.0) a Suiza        ((escribe en la
              [    of Barcelona ]       to Switzerland ((writes on the

15            pizarra el nombre del país))
              whiteboard the name of the country))

16  E7:       [Suiza
              [Switzerland

17  E12:      [Suiza
              [Switzerland

18            (4.0) ((murmullo de los estudiantes))
                    ((students mutter))

19  Pr1:      los países
              the countries

20  E7:       y   fuimos  a: canyon jumping?
              and we went to canyon jumping?
```

In line 07, the teacher signals that he has not understood the word adequately. After a short pause he aims to clarify the trouble source and to initiate another repair. Facing this iterative communication problem, in line 08, E12 volunteers a response in a latched turn displaying knowledge of the trouble source. The learner's unsolicited intervention is assertive and aims to reconsider the original problem. In the following turn, E7 repeats the contribution provided by E12 but with rising intonation to indicate the problem. In this way, E7 (line 09) initiates another repair sequence which is finally properly solved by the teacher in line 10. Here, the teacher displays understanding with a change of state token (Heritage, 1984) followed by the

---

⁶ "Several students".

solicited Spanish word for the country and then continues explaining why he had not been able to solve the problem previously.

Through her unsolicited participation, E12 helps to solve a communication problem that facilitates the progressivity at this part of the interaction. However, E12 does not seize this occasion to continue with her own agenda, nor she gets the opportunity to become the next teacher's interlocutor. In line 20, E7 is the one who still owns the floor to advance with her learning purposes. Despite of E12's significant turn, once the communication problem has been solved the teacher continues to have E7 as his selected interlocutor.

```
(3)

JBR_1:1.1,10:14

01  Pr1:    E10, veo   que  tienes muchas ganas de hablar,
            E10, I see that  you are eager     to talk,


02          qué   has hecho  este fin de semana?
            what did you do   last weekend?

03  E10:    (   ) ah::: E9 y yo fuimos a (   )
                  ah    E9 and I went to

04  Pr1:    mhm

05  E10:    y   a las playas   (   ) y  fui a Monte Carlo?
            and to the beaches (   ) and I went to Monte Carlo?

06  Pr1:    mhm


07  E10:    y (gamble)?
            and (gamble)?
(8 lines omitted)

16  Pr1:    habéis ganado dinero? o:↓no
            have you won money?   or not

17  E10:    SÍ
            YES

18  Pr1:    sí? habéis   ganado dinero?
            yes? have you won money?

19  E10:    sí
            yes

20  E3:     [mucho dinero]
            a lot of money

21  Pr1:    [cuánto dinero?]
            [how much money?
```

```
22  E10:       trente⁷ euros
                thirty euro

23  Pr1:       treinta euros?
                thirty euro?

24  E9:        en slot machines
                in slot machines

25  Pr1:       está ↓bien (.) se llama the slot machines en español se llaman
                allright (.) it is called, slot machines in Spanish are called


26             máquina::s ((escribe en la pizarra)) (2.5) tragaperras mhm?
                machines   ((writes on the whiteboard))    slot mhm?

27             máquinas tragaperras, vale? (.) qué más?  E8 y tú?
                slot machines,         right?    what else? E8 and you?
```

In extract (3), we find another instance of unsolicited learner participation. In lines 01 and 02, the teacher acknowledges E10's WTP and selects her as the next speaker. In lines 03 and 05, E10 provides information about her weekend, which she spent together with E9. The teacher's response tokens (Gardner, 2001) in lines 04 and 06 are interpreted as go-ahead responses (Schegloff, 2007) by E10. In line 16 the teacher asks if the students have won money as a result of gambling. E10 produces an affirmative second pair part with higher volume. In line 16, the teacher repeats the question, which is again answered affirmatively by E10 in line 19. However, E3 may have interpreted the teacher's last intervention as a request for additional information. This could be seen in line 20, where E3 steps in (Waring, 2011) to provide more details about the money they have won and this unsolicited intervention is overlapped with the one made by the teacher in line 21. Indeed, in this line he requests precise information about the money the students have won. In line 22, E10 takes the floor and responds to the teacher's question assuming again the role of the teacher's interlocutor. However, E10 has mispronounced the word "treinta" and this trouble source is repeated and modified by the teacher in line 23 with an indirect corrective strategy known as embedded repair (Jefferson, 1987). The teacher's correction with rising intonation is a confirmation request as well. This TRP is used by E9 in line 24 to participate on her own initiative providing precise information and advancing on her own learning agenda.

Having recognised this learning opportunity, the teacher takes the floor (lines 25-27) and performs a direct correction of E9's utterance translating "slot machines" into Spanish and highlighting it (Mortensen, 2011). The teacher writes the provided translation on the board, which on one hand, reinforces the focus on the Spanish term, and on the other, offers the repair work to the whole class. In this way, he changes the interaction from a dialogue to a multilogue (Schwab, 2011). In line 27 the teacher ends his corrective action with an agreement token with rising intonation followed by a short pause. He still holds the floor and exercises his authority to continue with the interaction (Batlle, 2015) assigning the turn to E8 as the next speaker.

In this extract we could observe how E9's unsolicited participation affected the ongoing interaction in two ways. First, it prompted explicit correction from the teacher, an action that was performed as open class repair. In addition, after the correction the teacher manages the interaction and selects the next speaker to continue with his pedagogical goal. For this reason,

---

⁷ Mispronounced word.

we can affirm that in this case E9's unsolicited intervention induced the termination of E10's turn. In contrast, E3's unsolicited participation in line 20 remains isolated and does not have further interactional consequences.

In excerpt (4), E3 aims to describe his favourite place during his visit to Budapest. E3's unsolicited participation (lines 08 and 09) emerges to initiate a repair sequence where the learner requests the Spanish word for "thermal baths". In line 10, the teacher offers the translation highlighting the word with emphasis on the substantive and writing it on the whiteboard for the benefit of the whole class. In line 11, E3 seeks to verify the one-word Spanish translation "termas" for the English compound noun "thermal bath" through a confirmation request, which is followed by a teacher's affirmative response (line 12). However, after the teacher's confirmation, E8 steps in (Waring, 2011) in line 13 providing an unsolicited alternative answer to E3's question. In lines 14 to 16, learners E3 and E8 interact to clarify the alternative provided by E8, but the teacher needs to intervene in order to provide a word explanation (Mortensen, 2011).

```
(4)

JBR_1:1.1,07:57

01  E3:      gustó mucho. Mi favorito lugar
             liked a lot. My favorite place

02           he    visit- visido?        eh:::=
             I have visit- I have vised?

03  Pr1:     =visitado
             visited

04  E3:      visitado oh:: (cuál) es
             visited  oh   (what) is

05  Pr1:     ha  sido
             has been

06  E3:      ha sido (.) [eh:=
             has been     eh

07  Sst:                 [heh heh

08  E3:      =cómo se dice (.) eh:: (1.0) thermal
              how do you say   eh::        thermal

09           baths?
             baths?

10  Pr1:     las termas     ((escribe en la pizarra))
             thermal baths ((writes on the whiteboard))

11  E3:      las termas? (2.0)
             thermal baths?

12  Pr1:     mhm
             mhm
```

```
13  E8:      baño caliente
             hot   bath

14  E3:      cómo?
             what?

15  E8:      baño caliente
             hot   bath

16  E3:      ba(h)ño ↑ca(h)lien(h)te
             hot        bath

17  Pr1:     sí   pero, el  baño caliente E8 puede
             yes, but   the hot bath       E8 can

18           ser en tu   casa, también
             be  in your place as well

19  Sst:     hah hah hah.

20  Pr1:     ((señalando la pizarra))        (eso) [se llaman] termas=
             ((pointing at the whiteboard)) (this)[is called] thermal baths

21  E3:                                      [termas] es so[lo:::]
                                              just termas

22           ((gesto con las manos))
             ((hand gesture))
23  Pr1:                                                    [=en español].
                                                              in Spanish

24  E3       es    thermal bath?=
             is it thermal bath?

25  Pr1:     =sí
             yes

26  E3:      oh (solo) el  termas.
             oh (just) el termas.

27  Pr1:     las termas
             thermal baths

28  E3:      (   )
(14 lines omitted)

43  Pr1:     ((escribe en la pizarra)) das un baño termal (.) vale? muy
             ((writes on the whiteboard)) you take a thermal bath ok?  very

44           bien (.) ha sido lo que más te ha gustado↓ hacía mucho frío
             good   it was what you liked the most    was it very cold

45           en:::[Budapest]?
             in    Budapest?

46  E3:          [un ↑poco]
                  a little bit
```

E8´s non-assigned participation not only makes necessary the teacher's intervention to offer metalinguistic information based on his epistemic authority (Heritage, 2012; Sert, 2015), but also leads to his classmates' laughter (line 19). Given that E3 is the former teacher's interlocutor and the one who started a self-initiated-other-repair in line 08, he (line 21) takes up the teacher's response from lines 10 and 20 and initiates another repair sequence. In this sequence, E3 asks the teacher to confirm that in Spanish the word "termas" alone corresponds to the English compound noun "thermal bath", thus leaving behind E8's suggestion. In line 25 the teacher validates E3's hypothesis in a latched turn. After this confirmation, E3 (line 26) produces a change of state token (Heritage, 1984) and mentions the Spanish term with the definite article "el", apparently with the objective of making sure that only one word suffices. In line 27, the teacher offers the correct word with its corresponding article in plural, continues with metalinguistic information to differentiate "terma" from "baño caliente" (data not shown) and lastly he allocates the turn again to E3.

In this excerpt we observe that E8's unsolicited contribution has interactional consequences. E8's intervention in line 15 reveals a shift into a teacher's identity (Waring, 2011). If E8's proposed term had been adequate, the teacher, exercising his epistemic authority, could have validated it. However, since E8's suggestion is not appropriate, the teacher has to provide metalinguistic information to explain why the expression "baño caliente" is not right and to clarify any E3's possible doubts. In line 43 the teacher gives an example of use incorporating the compound noun "baño termal". He then closes the explanation sequence and after a short pause (line 44), he picks up the initial topic of discussion summarizing E3's appreciation of his trip to Budapest. After the teacher closes the repair sequence, he manages the interaction in a way that E3's experience is still the topic of discussion.

3.2. Non-assigned Turns as First Pair Parts

In some cases, students' initiatives can lead to a change in the interaction structure. In excerpt 05 (line 01), the teacher continues eliciting information about weekend getaways and allocates the turn to E12. He responds mentioning "Amsterdam", a city well known for its museums and coffee shop culture. This may explain the teacher's reaction in line 03, where he echoes the name of the city with a jockey voice. Through this intervention, the teacher gives feedback to E12 without selecting him/her as the next speaker. Having identified a TRP, E3 seizes the opportunity to take the floor, turning to E12 and giving a positive comment about his/her plans. However, E3's unsolicited turn does not have interactional consequences because the laughter and the teacher's next turn in line 06 can be understood as projected by the preceding intervention (line 03). The teacher continues commenting jokingly about the features of Amsterdam, which triggers laughter from the class and E3. In line 11, the teacher uses the expression "etcétera" twice as a substitution for additional information that may not be worth mentioning. Then he apparently wants to initiate a first pair part with an open question, but is interrupted by E3 (line 12) with an intervention that resembles a casual conversational partner and fosters symmetry within teacher-student interaction (Waring, 2011). E3 elaborates a first pair part of a sequence, requesting a personal opinion from the teacher, who produces the second pair part of the sequence. Consequently, we can not consider this extract as an IRF sequence anymore.

(5)

JBR_1:6.1,12:44

```
01  Pr1:     qué más?   E12 tú qué haces?
             what else? E12 what do you do?
```

```
02  E12:      (yo) voy a Ámsterdam
                I  go to Amsterdam

03  Pr1:      Á(h)mst(h)erda(h)m? vale heh heh
              Amsterdam?         ok   heh heh

04  E3:       ((girándose a E12)) qué chulo
              ((turning to E12))  how cool

05  ( ):      [heh heh]

06  Pr1:      [heh heh] no voy a hacer las preguntas típicas porque
                        I'm not going to ask the typical questions because

07            ya sé que:: (.) el museo de Anna Fra::nk y el museo de Van
              I know that the Anna Frank museum and the Van Gogh museum

08            Go::gh (.) y los coffee shops [y:: ]
              and the coffee shops and...

09  ( ):      [heh heh]

10  E3:       [heh heh]

11  Pr1:      etcétera etcétera [qu-=
              etc.     etc.      w-

12  E3:                         [y tú- te gusta Ámsterdam?
                                [and do you like Amsterdam?

13  Pr1:      (yo-) he estado ((tose)) perdón (.) he estado una vez [en-
               I    have been ((coughs)) sorry     I have been once in-

14  E3:                                                            [una vez
                                                                   [once

15  Pr1:      en Ámsterdam solo (.) un verano con unos amigos y sí(.) me
              in Amsterdam only    a summer with friends      and yes I

16            gustó
              liked it

17  E3:       sí=
              yes

18  Pr1:      =me gustó: bastante no es mi: ciudad favori- de las que
              I liked it quite a lot. It's not my favouri- city that

19            conozco en ↑Europa no es mi ciudad favorita (0.5) pero: sí
              I know in Europe   it is not my favourite city    but yes

20            (.) pero es muy bonita y  es divertida y: hay muchas cosas y::
                 but it is very nice and fun and there are lots of things and

21  Sst:      [heh heh
```

```
22  E11:      [qué- qué-   [qué- qué ciudad es- es tu favorita?
           [what- what- [what what city is- is your favourite?

23  E3:                  [cuál-    cuál
                         [which one- which one

24  Pr1:     mi ciudad favorita?
             my favourite city?

25  E11:     yeah

26  Pr1:     de Ro- de:: de Roma >iba a decir< (.) de:: de Europa
             of Ro- of  of Rome I wanted to say   of   of Europe
```

Learner initiative can open up opportunities for other students to produce unsolicited first pair parts as illustrated in line 22. After being asked about his opinion on Amsterdam, the teacher elaborates a quite extensive answer which is interrupted by students' laughter and E11's unsolicited turn. Interestingly, the epistemic rights (Kapellidi, 2013; Sert, 2015) have been inverted and this may promote further non-assigned turns as first pair parts by the learners. This is what happens in line 23, when E11's question in line 22 is interrupted by E3's unsolicited turn to produce an other-initiated-other-repair. E3's direct correction is performed with an overlapped turn after two false starts from E11, who is struggling to formulate another question to the teacher. E3 adopts a [K+] epistemic stance (Heritage, 2012) towards his classmate and assumes a teacher's identity (Waring, 2011). However, E3's overlapped contribution does not have interactional consequences.

In extract (6) we can observe learner initiative after a repair sequence. The class has been talking about the city of Rome and its convenient size to walk around it. In line 10, the teacher allocates the turn to E11, who has requested the floor rising his hand (data not shown) (Sahlström, 2002). The learner then takes the floor to ask for confirmation about the Spanish word for "cliff". It is necessary to clarify that the term "cliff" had been a trouble source previously (data not shown), when E11 was describing his trip to Ireland to the class. During his explanation, the student was searching for the Spanish word for "cliff", but the teacher confused this place with the name of a city and did not provide an adequate answer. The interaction went on but E11 started searching for the Spanish translation on his own. Once he found the word "acantilado" in the dictionary, he requested the floor (line 11) to ask for confirmation. This turn represented a disruptive sequence for the ongoing interaction, where the topic is the city of Rome. The teacher reacts to E11's question explaining the previous misunderstanding (lines 12 and 13), and confirming (line 20) E11's hypothesis. As seen elsewhere (Batlle, 2015), after a repair sequence the teacher has the responsibility to re-establish the ongoing interaction. However, E8 self-selects (line 21) in order to reintroduce the topic of conversation. This intervention shows that learners can also exercise unsolicited turns in order to re-establish the interaction after a repair sequence and simultaneously to pursue their learning needs (Garton, 2012).

```
(6)

JBR_1:7.2,09:28

01  E10:     es- hh pe(h)queño (puedo) caminar todo heh heh
             is- hh sm(h)all   (I can) walk everything heh heh
```

```
02  Pr1:     sí es peq-
              yes is sm-

03  E10:     heh

04  Pr1:     es ↑pequeño=
              is  small

05  E10:     heh

06  Pr1:     =no sé si es la mejor palabra para Roma >pero<es verdad que:
              I don't know if it's the best word for Rome but it's true that
(3 lines omitted)

10           viendo >pero< (.) Roma pequeña pequeña:: no es (.) E11
              but actually    Rome it is not so so small       E11

11  E11:     la palabra para: (.) cliff es <acantilado>?
              the word   for       cliff is  acantilado?

12  Pr1:     ↑ah porque pensaba que era un ↑lugar (1.0) los- (.) >o sea
              ah  because I thought that it was a place  the-    I mean

13           has ido a ver< (.) los acantilados=
              you went to see    the cliffs
(6 lines omitted)

20  Pr1:     =no? (.)  °eso es°  acantilado (.) sí
              isn't it? that is  cliff           yes
```

21 E8:   pero cuantas habita- habitas- habita- <habitu::-> habitaciones
```
              but  how many ro-  ros-      ro-    ru-       rooms
```

22   e:h no tiene Roma? (.) tiene Roma?
```
              eh doesn't have Rome    has Rome?
```

In extract (7), the group talks about a visit to Budapest (data not shown) and in line 03 the teacher introduces a Spanish expression that he considers adequate to rate this experience. In lines 03 to 05, he highlights this expression (Eng. to be worth) as a learning target (Mortensen, 2011) emphasizing the first syllables, making use of short pauses, repeating the expression and using the whiteboard to make the word visible for the whole group. As all learners are being addressed, E8 starts a repair sequence in line 06 on behalf of the group.

(7)

```
JBR_1:7.2,07:22
01  Pr1:         [en- entonces bien no?
                 [th- then     well right?

02  E3:      sí
              yes

03  Pr1:     merece la pena no? (.) (°en-°) en ↓español decimos
              it is worth right?        in-  in  Spanish we say

04           (0.5) merece la pena
```

```
                 it is worth

05              (12.0) ((escribe en la pizarra la expresión))
                ((writes the expression on the whiteboard))

06  E8:         qué significa?
                what does it mean?

07  Pr1:        merece la pena significa: (.) it's worth (and is it)
                merece la pena means       it's worth (and is it)

08  (E8):       e:h=

09  Pr1:        =vale? merece la pena  ↑i:r
                 ok?   it's worth       going

10              (3.0)

11  E3:         °gracias°
                thanks

12  Pr1:        vale? (1.0) >y qué más< (.) ↑E5 (.) tú (.) este fin de semana
                ok?         and what else    E5     you    this weekend

13              (.) qué has hecho?
                    what did you do?
```

E8's clarification request is also a student-initiated-code-switching that seeks understanding (Waring, 2011) and knowledge. In line 07 and after a short pause, the teacher provides an answer in the lingua franca of the class. In line 08, apparently E8 self selects with a hesitation marker, which is immediately followed by a teacher's latched turn in line 09. After the English translation, the teacher continues with an agreement token with rising intonation and gives an example of use that suits the current topic of discussion. Following a three-second pause probably due to note taking, E3 intervenes (line 11) to thank the teacher for the clarification. We can observe that E3 is the teacher's recipient at the beginning of the sequence and in line 11 E3's last intervention is projected by the previous repair sequence. Therefore, we can understand this gesture of appreciation as a conclusive turn of the side sequence. In lines 12 and 13 the teacher takes the floor to manage the interaction and to allocate the turn to E5.

4. DISCUSSION and RESULTS

Throughout the data analysis we have observed that IRF sequences are not closed systems (e.g. Hall, 1998). The dialogical structure that characterizes this sequence may be altered by learners whose turn has not been allocated. Moreover, although in the round robin participation dynamic the learners' turns are supposed to be pre-allocated, students may self-select to take the floor, which evidences the permeable character of this participation scheme (Mortensen, 2008). In our data, learners' unsolicited participation is produced in the first and in the second pair part of the IRF sequence, leading to different interactional consequences.

With respect to learners' non-allocated turns as first pair parts, we have identified four degrees of influence in the interaction: 1. side comments and other-initiated-peer-repair with no interactional consequences, 2. request for clarification where the teacher responds and uses the same turn to initiate a next IRF selecting another speaker, 3. ungrammatical requests for the

teacher's opinion which are responded by him without correcting the student's utterance. The teacher's turns are extensive and are supported by the learner with follow-ups, and 4. a question that marks the re-establishment of the topic of discussion and closes the prior sequence. We consider that even those learner interventions which appear to remain isolated (extract. 5, lines 04 and 23), contribute to the progressivity of the ongoing interaction and display the students' twofold interest for the current matter of discussion as well as for language learning. The request for clarification (extract 7, line 06) after a TRP is an instance of learner's agency (Jacknick, 2011) which may foster learning opportunities for the rest of the group regarding a language aspect. In addition, learners have also displayed initiative asking (extract 5, lines 12 and 22) for the teacher's personal views in sequences that have resembled a casual conversation. In those cases the teacher has avoided explicit correction and has provided responses, thus allowing the flexibilization of the participation scheme and of learner's identity (Waring, 2011). The last type of learner unsolicited turn (extract 6, lines 21 and 22) attempts to close a side sequence and restore the prior topic of discussion. Taking this kind of initiative, the learner exercises topic management and becomes the teacher's interlocutor.

Regarding learners' unsolicited turns as second pair parts, we have identified three degrees of influence in the interaction: 1. target-like utterances in overlapped turns which provide additional information and have no further interactional consequences, 2. collaborative utterance that repeats the trouble source within a communication problem and facilitates progressivity in interaction, and 3. student initiated code switching or inadequate peer repair which prompt explicit correction from the teacher in a turn that he subsequently uses to restore the management of topic and turn taking system. Learners' unsolicited comments as second pair parts (extract 1, line 06 and extract 3, line 20) may have not affected the subsequent interaction, but do show the students' WTP and that they are attuned with the ongoing discussion. Other instance of WTP is seen in extract 2, line 08, where a learner actively engages in interaction -a social action described by Evnitskaya & Berger (2017)- and eventually helps to solve a communication problem. Some learners' unsolicited contributions in the second position were non-target like (extract 3, line 24 and extract 4, lines 13 and 15) and led to the teacher's explicit correction. Unlike non-target like learner initiatives as first pair parts, which did not elicit correction by the teacher, inadequate peer repair and learner initiated code switching did prompt corrective feedback by the teacher. In both cases the teacher used the same turn to subsequently manage the interaction and take control of the topic. There is a significant difference in the teacher's reaction depending on the learner's unsolicited turn as first or second pair part. Considering that this classroom activity takes place within a meaning and fluency context, the teacher probably seeks to promote non-canonical learner participation. This might be done avoiding explicit correction and responding to the learner's initiative move as in an ordinary conversation. On the contrary, teacher's corrections of some learner's unsolicited second turns, display his focus on language accuracy, especially if the learner's contribution can be used for the benefit of the whole group.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study explored the interactional consequences of students' non-allocated turns in the meaning-focused round robin participation scheme. Two main questions have been considered: a) how is learners' unsolicited participation characterized in this specific kind of interaction and, b) what consequences non-allocated turns have for the progressivity of the interaction. Concerning the first question, we have identified learner unsolicited contributions as first and as second pair parts. As first pair parts, learners perform requests for clarification, peer correction and requests for teacher's opinion, resembling a casual conversation. As second pair part contributions, learners provide additional information and get involved in the solution of communication troubles, showing their involvement and enhancing individual and collective

learning opportunities. Regarding the second question, non-assigned learners turns have diverse interactional consequences. Whereas some initiatives do not alter -but support- the ongoing interaction, others lead to marked changes and readjustments in the IRF sequence. According to Sert (2015: 34) "learning is seen as emerging from participation in interaction". As classroom interaction researchers, we can employ conversation analysis as a tool to explore and better understand the characteristics of learner initiatives within classroom interaction (Li, 2013). As language teachers and teachers educators, understanding how learners participate in teacher-students interaction helps us to develop interactional strategies. Such strategies could be used in order to foster learning opportunities (Hall, 1998) in a participation scheme which is rather flexible (Jacknick, 2011) despite its boundaries.

6. REFERENCES

Appel, J. (2010). Participation and instructed language learning. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics*. (pp. 206-224) Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Batlle, J. (2014). Identidad y gestión del tema en una interacción por turnos entre profesor y alumnos. *Marcoele, 18* [Available online at: http://marcoele.com/identidad-y-gestion-del-tema-en-una-interaccion-por-turnos-entre-profesor-y-alumnos/] Retreived on: 18.08.2017.

Batlle, J. (2015). *La organización secuencial de las reparaciones en interacciones entre profesor y alumnos de español como lengua extranjera centradas en el significado: repercusión en la intersubjetividad y la competencia interaccional de los hablantes*. Doctoral dissertation University of Barcelona [Available online at: http://tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/390950/JBR_TESIS.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y] Retrieved on: 18.08.2017.

Bowles, H. & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes*. Berna: Peter Lang.

Cekaite, A. (2009). Soliciting Teacher Attention in an L2 Classroom: Affect Displays, Classroom Artefacts, and Embodied Action. In *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(1), 26-48.

Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.

Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interaction. In I. Marková & K. Froppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. (pp.29-48) Maryland: Barnes and Noble Books.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: CUP.

Evnitskaya, N. & Berger, E. (2017). Learners' Multimodal Displays of Willingness to Participate in Classroom Interaction in the L2 and CLIL Contexts. In *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(1), 71-94.

Fasel Lauzon, V. & Berger, E. (2015). The multimodal organization of speaker selection in classroom interaction. In *Linguistics and Education*, *31*, 14-29.

Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation Analysis in the Classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. (pp. 593-611) Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Hall, J. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: The construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF. In *Linguistics and Education, 9*(3), 287-311.

Hepburn, A. & Bolden, G. (2017). *Transcribing for social research*. London: SAGE.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. (pp. 299-345) Cambridge: CUP.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1), 30-52.

Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action. Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Oxford: Willey-Blackwell.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). "But this is writing": post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. In *Novitas-ROYAL*, *5*(1), 39-54. [Available online at: http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/jacknick.pdf] Retrieved on: 18.08.2017.

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.) *Studies in social interaction*. (pp.294-338) New York: Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.). *Talk and social organization*. (pp. 86-100) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kapellidi, C. (2013). The organization of talk in school interaction. In *Discourse Studies*, *15*(2), 185-204.

Kapellidi, C. (2015). The interplay between agency and constraint: some departures from the organization of talk in the classroom. In *Text & Talk*, *35*(4), 453-479.

Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers' embodied allocations in instructional interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, *3* (2), 166-186.

Kääntä, L. (2015).The Multimodal Organization of Teacher-Led Classroom Interaction. In C. Jenks & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *International Perspectives on ELT Classroom Interaction*. (pp. 64-83) Baskingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Lee, Y. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. In *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(6), 1204-1230.

Lerner, G. (2002). Turn-sharing. The Choral Co-Production of Talk-in-Interaction. In C. Ford, C., B. Fox & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. (pp. 225-256) Oxford: OUP.

Lerner, G. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context sensitive operation of a context-free organization. In *Language in Society*, *32*(2), 177-201.

Li, H. (2013). Student Initiatives and Missed Learning Opportunities in an IRF Sequence: A Single Case Analysis. In *L2 Journal, 5*(2), 68-92.

Llobera, M. (2008). Discurso y metodología de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. In *Marcoele*, *7* [Available online at: http://marcoele.com/descargas/7/llobera_discurso.pdf] Retrieved on: 18.08.2017.

Macbeth, D. (2011). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 438-451.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Marková, I. & Froppa, K. (1991). *Asymmetries in dialogue*. Maryland: Barnes and Noble Books.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. In *Language in society*, *7*, 183-213.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. In *Language in Society*, *19* (3), 349-378.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons. Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mortensen, K. (2008). Selecting next-speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next-speaker in planned activities. In *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. *5*(1), 55-79.

Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.) *L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-analytic Perspectives*. (pp. 135-163) Honolulu: University of Hawaii-National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Mortensen, K. & Hazel, S. (2011). Initiating round robins in the L2 classroom – preliminary observations. In *NOVITAS-Royal*, *5*(1): 55-70. [Available online at: http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/mortensen_hazel.pdf] Retrieved on: 18.08.2017.

Mortensen, K. & Hazel, S. (2017). Navigating the moral maze. Order and transgression in language classroom participation. In G. Schwab, S. Hoffmann & A. Schön (Eds.) *Interaktion im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Beiträge aus der empirischen Forschung* (pp. 113-132) Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the Teacher': Identity and Classroom Conversation. In *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(1), 51-77.

Sahlström, J. F. (1999). Up the hill backwards. on interactional constraints and affordances for equity-constitution in the classrooms of the Swedish comprehensive school. In *Uppsala Studies in Education*, *85*, University of Uppsala.

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

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.

Schwab, G. (2009). Schülerinitiierte Erklärprozesse im Fremdsprachenunterricht einer Hauptschulklasse. In Janet Spreckels (Ed.) *Erkären im Kontext. Neue Perspektiven aus der Gesprächs- und Unterrichtsforschung* (pp. 49-65) Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.

Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. In *Classroom Discourse*, *2*(1), 3-19.

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

Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds.) (2013). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Willey-Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: OUP.

Stivers, T. & Robinson, J. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. In *Language in Society*, *35*, 367-392.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language learner*. London: Longman.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. In *Language Learning*, *59*(4), 796-824.

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