

SHAPING LEARNER CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE EFL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM: A CONVERSATION ANALYTIC PERSPECTIVE

MARCO CANCINO*
Universidad Andrés Bello
Universidad Bernardo O'Higgins

ABSTRACT: The present study sought to demonstrate the importance that the shaping of learner contributions has in the provision of opportunities for participation and learning in the EFL classroom. A particular set of interactional features that can shape learners' utterances were examined: scaffolding, requests for clarification and confirmation checks. These features have been found to promote language participation and learning from a classroom discourse perspective (Walsh, 2002; Walsh and Li, 2013; Can Daşkın, 2014). The study was also informed by the socio-cultural concept of learning as a social affair that is achieved through participation (Lantolf, 2000; Donato, 2000; Mondada & Pekarek, 2004). A Conversation Analysis (CA) methodology was used to analyse two extracts collected in EFL classrooms at a language institute in Santiago, Chile. Findings suggested that when teachers shape their learners' contributions by means of scaffolding, clarification requests and confirmation checks in a pedagogical environment that promotes conversation, participation and learning will likely be enhanced.

KEYWORDS: conversation analysis, language classroom discourse, learning opportunities

FORMANDO LAS CONTRIBUCIONES DEL APRENDIENTE EN EL AULA DE IDIOMA EXTRANJERO: UNA PERSPECTIVA DESDE EL ANÁLISIS DE CONVERSACIÓN

RESUMEN: El presente estudio intentó demostrar la importancia que la forma de las contribuciones lingüísticas tiene en la provisión de oportunidades de participación y en el aprendizaje en el aula. Se examinó un conjunto particular de características interaccionales que pueden dar forma a los enunciados de los alumnos: andamiaje lingüístico, solicitudes de aclaración y comprobaciones de confirmación. Se ha demostrado que estos rasgos interaccionales promueven la participación y el

* Para correspondencia dirigirse a Marco Cancino (marcocancinoavila@gmail.com)

aprendizaje desde una perspectiva de discurso en el aula (Walsh, 2002; Walsh y Li, 2013; Can Daşkın, 2014). El estudio utilizó el concepto sociocultural del aprendizaje como un logro social conseguido a través de la participación (Lantolf, 2000; Donato, 2000; Mondada & Pekarek, 2004). Se utilizó una metodología de Análisis de Conversación (CA) para examinar dos extractos recogidos en aulas de inglés como lengua extranjera en un instituto de idiomas en Santiago de Chile. El análisis sugirió que si los profesores forman las contribuciones de sus alumnos adecuadamente y en un ambiente pedagógico que busque desarrollar fluidez, la participación y el aprendizaje serán facilitados.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Análisis de conversación, discurso del aula de idioma, oportunidades de aprendizaje

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last 25 years, approaches to classroom interaction that emphasise social aspects of learning have gained relevance in the literature (Kumaravadivelu, 1999; Seedhouse, 2004; van Lier, 1988; Walsh, 2006, 2013). Following Firth and Wagner's (1997) plea for an expansion of studies in SLA and the inclusion of methodologies that could account for contextual and interactional aspects of learning, the idea of learning as a social accomplishment has been fuelled by socially oriented SLA theories such as Conversation Analysis for second language acquisition (CA-for-SLA) (Kasper & Wagner, 2011) and Sociocultural Theory applied to second language learning (Lantolf, 2000). The empirical focus of Conversation Analysis on the identification and analysis of systematic features of interaction can inform an approach to classroom discourse that seeks to detail interactional practices that facilitate or hinder opportunities for participation and learning in the language classroom. These interactional features can range from appropriate use of wait time to displaying a range of elicitation strategies (Walsh, 2006, 2013). It is argued that the opportunities for participation provided by teachers through these interactional features are a necessary step for learning to occur because they generate participation that can potentially 'become' learning. In order to place interaction as an essential component of teaching and learning, Walsh (2006) put forward the notion of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). This concept refers to 'teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning' (p. 158). Teachers develop CIC by means of matching pedagogical goals with language use, creating interactional space, shaping learners' contributions and eliciting responses.

The present study focused on a particular aspect of CIC; that is, shaping learners' contributions. A crucial characteristic of language classroom discourse refers to what teachers do with their learners' contributions. Participation and potential learning development can be facilitated or impeded by the way in which teachers react to learners' utterances. Previous research has suggested that an interactional feature such as backchannel feedback (short verbal responses such as 'uh-huh' produced by the teacher as a reaction to a learner's utterance) has a role in nurturing participation when it is produced to keep channels open and maintain the flow of the interaction

(Walsh, 2002; Cancino, 2015). However, the use of these particles is not sufficient by itself to prompt learners to fully express their ideas. Teachers must be able to *shape* their learners' discourse, that is, to acknowledge a learner's contribution and improve it by means of scaffolding, seeking clarification, and repairing learner input (Walsh, 2013, p. 58). As Walsh states, this process of shaping can be compared to recasting, where the teacher takes a response and improves it in some way before 'handing it back' to the learners. An important aspect of shaping learners' contributions is that it is triggered when teachers do not automatically accept learners' first attempt at creating an utterance and, by means of their language use, 'push' learners to produce more complete answers (Walsh, 2006).

The sociocultural approach initiated by Vygotsky (1978) and continued in SLA by James Lantolf (2000) informs the present study in a number of ways. Learning under this perspective is seen as a culturally embedded process that takes place by means of social interaction. The way in which mental processes are formed is invariably influenced by the social world, and the social world is in turn influenced by the shaping of those mental processes (Lantolf, 2000). This dialectic relationship between the mental and the social realm highlights the idea that learners depend on their repeated participation in activities with more competent interlocutors in order to achieve language learning (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). This more proficient interlocutor usually takes the form of a teacher, and learning will be the product of the supportive interaction that takes place between the learner and this 'expert' (Lantolf & Appel, 1994). Also, social interaction is shaped in the moment-by-moment decisions that are made by the interactants and can affect the final outcome of an activity and define what will be learned. From a social point of view, then, participation is an indispensable component of learning and therefore it should be methodically observed and analysed (Schwab, 2011).

Therefore, the present study will make use of a Conversation Analysis methodology and will be informed by the sociocultural approach to language learning (SCT) in order to demonstrate the importance of teacher CIC in the shaping of learner contributions. Also, it will be argued that the teacher plays a crucial role in managing successful interaction in the classroom. The role of the teacher in the provision of opportunities for participation and learning should be reassessed – particularly in an EFL context – by placing its focus on the quality of the interaction that they promote and the opportunities for learning and participation that are provided to learners by means of their interactional decisions.

2. CONVERSATION ANALYSIS AS A VALID APPROACH TO CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Walsh (2006) posited that Interaction Analysis approaches such as Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) (Frölich, Spada, & Allen, 1985) are considered reliable tools to the extent that they provide a quantitative analysis of classroom interaction. However, he argued that a disadvantage of such approaches is related to the way in which the information is coded in the instrument utilised to

gather the data. The COLT instrument comprised seventy-three categories assessing the communicative methodologies used by teachers in different L2 classrooms. This approach implies that everything the researcher sees has to be matched to pre-existing categories included in the instrument. Similarly, Discourse Analysis approaches such as Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) list of 22 classroom speech acts do not provide a complete account of what takes place in the classroom because they only focus on basic types of interaction in primary classrooms (such as the Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence). Walsh acknowledges that these two approaches rely on functional categories that cannot be maintained when it is acknowledged that classroom interaction includes a number of complex relationships established in longer stretches of discourse. The variations in the pedagogical focus that lessons display, as well as the variations in the features of interaction used by teachers, are reflected in the sequencing of contributions made by the participants, and an approach such as Conversation Analysis is better equipped to take account of those variations.

Conversation analysis (henceforth CA) is a data-driven, empirical approach to the analysis of oral interaction which seeks to discover systematic features present in the sequencing organisation of talk (Lazaraton, 2004), and understand how people engage in social activities by means of such features (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). CA has traditionally utilised naturally occurring conversation in order to uncover systematic features of oral discourse. It makes an assumption about the range of competences that co-participants in a conversation must share so that they can analyse the interlocutor's utterance and in turn display their reaction to that utterance (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Under a CA perspective, functions of language are regarded as a means for social interaction (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), and social contexts are seen as dynamic processes that are constantly shaped by how participants utilise turn-taking resources. The context-bound meanings that these actions represent are central to understanding locally managed interaction. CA researchers utilise the competences at their disposal to make sense of that interaction. As Seedhouse (2004) points out, when CA analysts ask the question 'Why this now?', they are making use of the same competences that interactants in a conversation apply to make sense of the interaction.

3. SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY: SOME INSIGHTS INTO VYGOTSKIAN CONCEPTS APPLIED TO SLA

The concept of learning as a product of the co-constructed interaction between the teacher and the learners has its roots in socio-cultural theory applied to SLA, work that has been advanced by James Lantolf and associates. Their approach stems from the work of Vygotsky (1978), who saw learning as a culturally embedded process that occurs by means of social interaction. Learning, then, is the product of a dialectic relationship between the mental and the social realm; rather than being two separate constructs, mental activities shape the social world and the social world determines how we shape our mental processes (Lantolf, 2000). Learning is seen as a dynamic process that is *mediated* by symbolic tools that embody social processes of interaction

such as language, gestures and technologies (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994). The notion of mediation is a basic tenet in sociocultural theory, and distinguishes it from other SLA approaches. Through this process of mediation, L2 learners use the new language to regulate their mental and communicative activity (Lantolf, 2011). The idea of language as the main symbolic tool is also central to the theory, as it has an interdependent relationship with cognition, and allows people to conceptualise themselves in the world, give names to experiences, and organise features of the environment (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; van Lier, 1996).

Lantolf's (2000) definition of the zone of proximal development as 'the collaborative construction of opportunities [...] for individuals to develop their mental abilities' (p. 17) is a relevant one for the present study because these opportunities are seen as being created through the way in which teachers and learners jointly construct meaning in the language classroom. Thus, under this perspective, interactional context is seen as central to the interaction between the novice and the more proficient individual. An important point can be made here about the mediator's ability to recognise what can be achieved by the learner and how to approach the mediation process. As Donato (2000) points out, the ZPD states that learning will not occur if too much assistance is given to the learner or if the task at hand is too easy. In line with this, Lantolf (2011) reasons that 'it is important to appreciate that the mediator needs to be aware of or discover those capacities that are in the ZPD of the other' (p. 29). Furthermore, the ZPD rejects the existence of an internal syllabus for interlanguage development common to all learners (Lantolf, 2011). Rather, development in the ZPD 'differs for different learners depending on the quality of mediation negotiated with others' (p. 30). This suggests that social interaction has a crucial role in shaping the final outcome of an activity, defining what is to be learned, and providing opportunities for participation. As Mondada and Pekarek (2004) state, 'the ongoing and reflexive redefinition of the task affects the potentialities and the objects of learning as well as the understanding of what learning is' (p. 515).

Under a socio-cultural perspective, the co-construction of meaning in the ZPD will need to be assisted by a tutor, through a process of linguistic support that will shape tasks that are both challenging (by advancing knowledge and maintaining learner involvement) and attainable (by providing the necessary support so as to ensure understanding) (van Lier, 1996). The concept of scaffolding is central in the successful achievement of such process. Bruner (1983) defines scaffolding as 'a process of 'setting up' the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it' (p. 60). This action is characterised by the segmentation and repeated occurrences of complex actions, so that the learner can master the task. The elements in the task can be modified, changed or deleted by the expert, who judges how well the learner reacts to them. Once the learner has shown an understanding of the task and shows signs of being ready to 'take over', the scaffolds are removed. The learner then internalises the task and reflects on it (van Lier, 1996). As Walsh (2006) points out, the amount of scaffolded support received by the L2 learner will depend on the teacher's 'expert' judgement of what the 'novice' requires.

4. CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE (CIC) AND SHAPING LEARNER CONTRIBUTIONS

The conceptualisation of learning as participation in sociocultural theory provides the basis for an approach that makes use of the ‘empirical power of CA to detail the interactional practices that either create or inhibit the opportunities for participation and, by extension, the opportunities for learning’ (Waring, 2009, p. 798). In order to include the interactional practices identified by such an approach as part of a set of interactional behaviours that constituted ‘good practice’, Walsh (2006) coined the term ‘classroom interactional competence’ (CIC). It refers to ‘teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning’ (p. 158). He argues that by treating interaction as an essential component of teaching and learning and by developing CIC in teachers and learners, classroom discourse will be positively affected in terms of the opportunities for learning provided. The development of CIC is manifested in four main ways. First, teachers demonstrate CIC when they adjust their linguistic and interactional patterns not only to the particular existing micro-context of the classroom, but also to the specific pedagogical goal of the moment (Walsh, 2012, Seedhouse 2004). Second, CIC manifests itself by creating and nurturing interactional space. This is done by providing learners with opportunities to make contributions to the conversation and to receive feedback on them (Walsh, 2012). The third component of CIC is the way in which teachers ‘shape’ their learners’ contributions so that learners can say what they really want to say. Shaping a contribution involves ‘doing something with it rather than simply accepting it’ (Walsh 2012, p 6). This is done by scaffolding, paraphrasing, summarising, re-iterating, modelling and negotiating the meanings in learners’ contributions. Finally, teachers demonstrate CIC when they use questions as strategies to elicit answers from their learners and understand that they serve particular functions in the classroom according to the particular pedagogical goals being set.

The aspect of CIC being examined in the present study is the shaping of learner contributions. Therefore, a brief review of the way in which teachers demonstrate CIC through this aspect will be presented. First, the use of scaffolding helps learners by means of providing them with ‘cognitive support through dialogue as they engage in tasks that may lie outside their capabilities’ (Walsh, 2006, p. 120). This form of support is a preeminent feature of language classroom interaction, as language breakdowns can occur when learners struggle to find the right word or expression in the flow of communication. This is avoided when teachers feed in the missing language by means of scaffolding. Walsh also states that the decisions made by teachers in terms of how much scaffolding should be given to learners are not easy to make because in order for scaffolding to be successful they must know when to intervene and when to leave the interaction to the learners. He identifies three types of scaffolding techniques: reformulation, where a learner’s contribution is rephrased in order to make it more linguistically accurate; modelling, where the teacher reiterates a learner’s contribution with appropriate prosody (pronunciation,

stress and intonation); and extension, where a learner's utterance is extended by the teacher in order to provide more information or to make it more comprehensible to other students. The purpose underlying these techniques is to 'shape' a learner's contribution by making it more acceptable in its grammar, lexis, prosody and pragmatic meaning, and then 'hand it back' to the learner.

Another way in which teachers modify their speech to maximise learners' involvement and learning is by clarifying and confirming meaning. Asking learners for clarification – instead of accepting their first contribution – promotes opportunities for learning because learners are 'compelled' to rephrase or paraphrase their ideas (Walsh, 2013, p. 33). Confirmation checks ensure that understandings are reached by the teacher and the learners. They can be produced in order to clarify learners' contributions or ideas and also as a way of making those contributions clearer for the rest of the class. This can keep the discourse meaningful for all participants, which can consequently encourage responses from other learners to join the conversation because the input they receive is being made more understandable (Walsh, 2006). Thus, clarification requests and confirmation checks are meant to help learners in the face of a communication breakdown, and give them the opportunity to clarify their meanings by using language that is more accurate (p. 136). These adjustments to the interaction have been deemed crucial for learning development in traditional SLA research (Long, 1983, 1996). The importance of interaction with a native speaker or a more competent interlocutor has also been underscored from this perspective because this type of interaction can address learners' input, feedback and output needs through negotiation of meaning in a more appropriate way (Long, 1996; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996). Furthermore, Walsh (2013) states that even though some tasks can promote modified interaction, 'it is the teacher who is arguably better placed to seek clarification and get a reformulated response' (p. 80).

Some studies have looked into the specific effects of shaping learner contributions on participation and learning. Walsh (2002) found that by checking for confirmation, seeking clarification and scaffolding, teachers were able to promote opportunities for learning. In other instances where the teacher did not make good use of scaffolding techniques (for example, by completing a learner's turn), opportunities for participation and shaping were missed and learning was obstructed. Walsh and Li (2013) analysed data from two English language classes recorded in China and showed that teachers who demonstrate CIC are more able to create 'space for learning' by means of scaffolding, expanding, clarifying and summarising. Finally, Can Daşkın (2014) examined the nature of the shaping of contributions that is done in classroom modes where accuracy is favoured, and where meaning and fluency are promoted. He found that teachers provide learning opportunities in post-expansions by extending, clarifying, summarising, paraphrasing and modelling learner contributions in both modes. However, the strategies in the mode that promote fluency and meaning making are more focused on co-constructing meanings, rather than focusing on accuracy. Interestingly, Can Daskin (2014) argues that shaping learner contributions may not lead to more learner participation in modes that focus on accuracy, which underscores the importance of paying attention to the

pedagogical goal of a lesson before adopting particular strategies. Thus, teachers can shape learner contributions by not accepting learners' first contribution directly, by pushing the learner to elicit more ideas and opinions, by facilitating opportunities for learning found in misunderstandings, and by co-constructing meanings by means of appropriate interactional strategies (Walsh, 2006, 2012).

5. RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY

As has been stated, the emergence of approaches highlighting social aspects of learning has called for a focus on the intricacies of interactional context and the role that the teacher as the expert has on learning (Cross, 2010). This is particularly true in an educational context such as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting. In an EFL context, language learners cannot benefit from some of the characteristics that English as a Second Language (ESL) settings provide to language learners, e.g. L2 practice outside the classroom, and different L1s shared by learners (which promotes the use of the L2). These characteristics highlight the crucial role of teachers and the impact of their interactional choices in such contexts.

In order to understand classroom events and how they influence learning it is necessary to find the appropriate tools to describe them (Seedhouse, 2004; van Lier, 1988; Walsh, 2006, 2011). It has been argued that CA is better suited to capture the interactional nuances of classroom interaction and the co-constructed behaviours of teachers and students than category-driven approaches (Walsh, 2006, Cancino, 2015). Therefore, CA can contribute to learning in a broader sense by exploring learning opportunities in the language classroom (Waring, 2009), which will be examined in the present study in relation to the shaping of learners' contributions.

The study will seek to examine aspects of interaction that are relevant to the following research questions:

1. In what ways do EFL teachers shape their learners' contributions in a Chilean classroom context?
2. How does shaping learners' contributions promote or hinder opportunities for participation in such contexts?

Research question 1 sought to describe the ways in which teachers shape their learners' contributions at a specific lesson stage identified by Walsh (2006), namely, the 'classroom context' mode (CCM). The CCM is one of four classroom modes identified by Walsh. Each of these modes are locally negotiated micro-contexts that shape the moment-by-moment interaction in a lesson and have a clear pedagogical goal, distinctive interactional features, and are representative of the teacher-fronted interaction that takes place in the second language classroom. In particular, the CCM is characterised by the interactional opportunities that learners are given. They are encouraged to talk about their feelings, emotions, experiences and attitudes that are part of their own cultural backgrounds. This mode allows extended learner turns managed

mostly by the learners themselves, with the teacher producing short turns that will usually take the form of direct repair (to fix a breakdown in communication). Repair is regarded as a component of scaffolding (Walsh, 2006) in language classrooms and thus it can shape learners' contributions when used appropriately. Content feedback (feedback on meaning, as opposed to feedback on form) and strategies for negotiation of meaning are also an important part of this mode, as learners are encouraged to develop a topic and manage turn allocation. Teacher and learner turn-taking patterns are more symmetrical in a CCM than in other modes, and opportunities for genuine communication are frequently provided by the teacher (Walsh, 2013). This learning context was selected because it is a facet of classroom interaction whose intricacies are usually left aside in teacher training courses. It is a crucial stage of a lesson because at that point learners are prompted to discuss meanings and engage in conversation.

Research question 2 sought to understand how the shaping that teachers perform in the language classroom promoted or hindered the opportunities for learning and participation provided to learners. Data analysis was informed by the Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) framework (Walsh, 2006) and one of the ways in which teachers demonstrate CIC; that is, by shaping learner contributions. Finally, it must be noted that the research questions in the study are mainly focused on teachers' CIC rather than learners' CIC because the teacher is seen as the most relevant agent in enabling opportunities for learning (Cross, 2010; Walsh, 2012).

5.1. Context of the Study and Participants

The dataset examined in this study is part of a wider dataset that consisted of audio recordings from a 10-week EFL course taught at a language institute in Chile in 2013. Six non-native EFL teachers and their students were asked to participate in that study. They had at least one year of experience teaching these particular courses. Due to accessibility and availability issues, convenience sampling was used to select the participant teachers. The aim of the course (as stated by the administrators) was to promote the four language skills with a focus on speaking. Teachers were expected to motivate students and promote communication by means of activities that could focus on the practice of speaking skills. The students were adult professionals who sought to improve their language proficiency in order to have access to a number of benefits in terms of scholarship applications and job prospects.

In order to answer the research questions in the present study two extracts in the dataset were identified and analysed: The teachers in each extract were labelled 'T1' and 'T2', respectively. The data in these extracts provided teacher interaction that was relevant to the discussion in terms of the successful or unsuccessful shaping that teachers performed in the form of scaffolding, clarification requests and confirmation checks. Extract 1 corresponds to an elementary level lesson, while Extract 2 was taken from an upper-intermediate level group. Since the target classroom mode was the CCM, the data contained teacher-fronted interaction and activities aimed mainly at developing oral fluency.

The present study lies within a qualitative research approach. The type of data gathered in the extracts allowed the researcher to analyse particular interactional sequences and describe the actions performed by a number of participants in a multi-party talk (Sert and Walsh, 2013) without focusing on characteristics of external context unless they oriented to them in the interaction (Seedhouse, 2005).

5.2. Method of Data Analysis

A CA methodology was used in the analysis of the interaction in order to shed light on the way teachers shape their learners' contributions and promote learning and participation. In order to assess the opportunities that teachers provide through their shaping of learner contributions for learner involvement, interaction and participation in the classroom, data portraying two sequences in a CCM were transcribed and analysed by means of CA. The process of data analysis was carried out by means of Nvivo, a software package that manages qualitative data and allows for their transcription, organisation and coding. The full system of notations used to transcribe the sequences has been summarised by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) and was adapted for the present study (Appendix 1).

The analysis followed Ellis and Barkhuizen's (2005) set of guidelines for the analysis of data, as it is better suited to tackle the interactional characteristics of teacher and learner talk. This set of procedures guided the researcher towards the description of a 'conversational 'practice' and the knowledge that conversational participants employ in conducting the practice' (Lazaraton, 2004, p. 57). The application of these guidelines yielded information about the way in which opportunities for participation and learning come in and out of existence in the language classroom by means of shaping learner contributions.

6. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, analysis of the ways in which T1 and T2 have shaped their learners' contributions will be presented. Following Ellis and Barkhuizen's (2005), the turns performed by the participants in the selected sequences were characterised in terms of the way in which the actions were delivered and the type of language that was used to reach mutual understandings. Also, the turn-taking structure and the timing involved in the initiation of turns were included in the analysis in order to describe processes such as repair and self-selection. Extract 1 below portrays the successful scaffolding performed by T1 and her use of clarification requests and confirmation checks in the interaction. In this elementary level lesson, the teacher is eliciting learners' answers regarding their favourite cities after giving them planning time.

Extract 1: T1.

1 T1: ((addressing L5)) what place did you talk about? (.)
2 L5: hmm:: (.) Bogota. I:: I (was) surprised that the people
3 in:: (.) Bogota? (0.5) hhh (.) eh:: (.) ba- it's the
4 capital: () Colombia? (.) an:d eh:: is: very kind
5 T1: people are very kind!
6 L5: (people are) very kind (.) yeah
7 T1: uh-huh?
8 L5: in:: (.) Santiago? eh:: (no)
9 L6: () horror
10 L2: ((chuckles))
11 L5: the capital in: Chile (.) not Chile (.)
12 T1: hmm (0.7)
13 L5: (si) (2)
14 (yes) (2)
15 T1: what do you think that- (.) ah- (.) I mean what is the
16 reason (.) what do you think that the reason is (.) for
17 (.) for that's (.) for those two extremes (that) in
18 Santiago people are so seriou:s (.)
19 L1: hmm=
20 T1: =they can (push) you out there and they're going to say
21 I'm sorry
22 L2: no
23 L5: I don't know (0.5)
24 L6: I think (0.7) the Chilean people (.) eh:: (.) think are
25 the best
26 T1: think?
27 L6: are the best
28 T1: ah::: (.)
29 L6: superior from the (.) hhh eh:: eh: rest of the neighbour
30 T1: they're superior to: (0.3) [the neigh]bours
31 L6: [(I think)]
32 L5: maybe (0.6)
33 T1: hmm:
34 L6: include (.) Santiago? between the rest of Chile (0.4)
35 T1: yes
36 L6: yes?
37 T1: yes (0.5) you can put here a person from here to a
38 per[son ()]
39 L6: [first San]tiago, second Santiago, third Santiago,
40 fourth the rest of the Chile
41 T1: hmm: (.) do you agree?
42 L1: yes=
43 L7: =yes (0.9)
44 L1: but I don't know? whe- (.) eh: (.) if that is the reason

45 because we are so: (.) different (.) for the: (.) the
46 other (.) Latin American people (0.5) I think it's (.) eh
47 hmm: (0.6) idiosyncratic? (0.9) but is that () eh hmm:
48 L4: geographic
49 L6: si (0.3) Chile's like an island ((mispronounced))
50 yes
51 L1: no () I think, eh hmm: (1) in history (1.2) eh:: (.)
52 eh::: (3) our history is different? (0.5) that ah: (0.5)
53 the other countries of the (South America) (0.6) the
54 construction (0.9) of the: (.) discourse ((mispronounced))
55 of the history (.) not the hist- not the real history (.) but
56 the dis[course]
57 L6: [ah ya]
58 T1: the- [the real,]
59 L6: [the ()] (0.4) [marketing]
60 T1: [()]
61 L1: yes=
62 T1: =the history told
63 L1: yes (.) yes (.) yes (.) eh:: (.) the history (about)
64 the:: our heroes (0.5) a:nd (.) how (.) the country (.)
65 was (.) eh:: (0.7) buil- building? (.)
66 L6: building [()]
67 L1: [buil-] build?
68 T1: built
69 L1: ah:: (build)=
70 T1: =built
71 L1: and things (like) (.) I think? (0.6) eh:: (.) that is
72 better (0.4) the construction of the discourse? (.) of
73 the history? (.) is the (.) more different an- between us
74 and the other (0.6) Latin American countries
75 L6: yes (.) the Chilean army (.) is (.) eh- (.) always winner,
76 never defeat (.) eh-
77 T1: hmm!
78 L6: is a- is a::: (.) is [a (fo)- is a::]
79 L1: [
80 only country (will) celebrate a::: hero like Arturo Prat
81 L6: ((chuckles))
82 L1: in a battle that we:: lost (1) ()
83 L6: but, chile? (.) in the last year (.) in the rest of the
84 years? (0.5) eh:: (0.7) could connecting (.) eh: with the
85 other countries (0.4) in the: (0.5)
86 T1: could make a connection to another? (.)
87 L6: another countries=
88 T1: =uh-huh?=
89 L6: =eh:: (.) eh: always Chile: is: like an island((mispronounced))
90 T1: like a?

91 L6: island. ((mispronounced)) (.)
92 T1: like an island
93 L6: si, desert ((mispronounced)) (.) desert (.) eh::
94 yes
95 (.) in the north (.) eh:: (0.8) cordillera? (.) mountains
96 *mountain range*
97 mountain range eh:
98 T1: ()
99 L6: at the east, east (.) ocean (.) on: the: (.) west (1.6)
100 ice (0.6) to the south
101 T1: that was what you meant when you said that (.) chile is
102 different because of geography?
103 L6: yes (.) yes [<a:nd>] the more important in chile is the
104 money (a:nd)
105 T1: [was that the point?]
106 T1: also?
107 L6: yes (.) a::nd=
108 L9: =the- the sun? (0.6) in::: (0.4) influye? influy? en:::
109 *influences*
110 (0.5)
111 T1: influences
112 L9: influence? (.) hmm: (the person) (0.4) the people (0.6)
113 the sun
114 T1: the sound? [the] music?
115 L9: [si].
116 [yes].
117 L9: no, the [sun] ((mispronounced)) (0.6) the sun
118 L7: [the] sun
119 T1: ah:: <sun>
120 L9: the sun (.) influye a las personas
121 *influences the people*
122 T1: yes I was going to ask you about that about the
123 weather

6.1. Scaffolding (Extract 24. Lines 5, 30, 68, 92 and 111)

In Extract 1, T1 scaffolds learners' contributions by means of reformulation (lines 5 and 30) and modelling (lines 68, 92 and 111). In line 5, T1 rephrases L5's inaccurate expression ('is very kind') after L5's attempt to express the idea that the people in Bogota are very kind. By reformulating L5's utterance, T1 agrees with L5's statement, corrects it, and displays the corrected version so that other students can hear it. It is important to note that T1's scaffolding is taking the form of an embedded correction, that is, a correction taking place as a 'by the way occurrence in some ongoing course of talk' (Jefferson, 1987, p. 95). T1 wants her rephrasing to fit in the context of a conversation and this is confirmed by the emphasis she gives to her post-expansion,

which conveys a degree of surprise at L5's idea. T1's embedded correction is then more geared towards emulating the type of repair seen in ordinary conversation – or in van Lier's (1988) words, 'conversational repair' – which promotes the production of language focused on personal meanings rather than accuracy and is part of the pedagogical goals of this mode. After T1's reformulation in line 5, L5 acknowledges it, repeats it, and produces a discourse marker ('yeah') to further reinforce the meaning of the utterance. L5's reply to the reformulation suggests that he also wants to do something with the feedback that T1 has produced, since L5 does not immediately introduce new information to develop the topic. The fact that L5 decides to do something with T1's feedback in line 6 is important in order to secure successful scaffolding, as L5 is demonstrating some degree of task mastery by reproducing what T1 is trying to model in her embedded correction. Later in the sequence (lines 24, 27 and 29), L6 produces a series of 'Turn Constructional Units' (TCUs) (Sacks et al., 1974) in order to make the point that Chilean people believe they are better than people from other countries, but uses an incorrect preposition in line 29. This prompts T1 to rephrase L6's TCU in line 30 ('they're superior to the neighbours'). Again, this reformulation has taken the form of an embedded correction. This can be confirmed by examining the way in which the utterance is delivered and the turn-taking sequence. In T1's embedded correction, the corrected preposition is not being delivered with a high pitch or with a stress, which suggests that T1 is not directly orienting to L6's incorrect use of the preposition. L2 also orients to the meaning of T1's reformulation by producing an overlapped epistemic marker in line 31 ('I think') which is followed by L5's self-selection. L5's TCU takes the form of another epistemic marker ('maybe'), as she wants to orient to the content of the idea being discussed. In line 33, T1 further appraises L6's idea, which leads to L6's development of the topic in line 34. Although the reformulation sequence starting in line 5 is more satisfactory in terms of what L5 actually does with it in line 6, the reformulation sequence beginning in line 30 is another good example of scaffolded interaction that does not reduce interactional space and allows learners to express themselves.

In Extract 1, T1 models learners' utterances on three occasions. In line 68, T1's 'second pair part' (SPP) models L1's 'first pair part' (FPP), which initiates the action and makes a next action relevant (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In the sequence, L1 attempts to form the past tense of the verb 'build'. This direct repair did not prevent L1 from producing a long turn in line 71. Interestingly, L1 'requests' T1's help by adding a rising intonation to her attempts at producing the word (lines 65 and 67), which prompts T1 to model it. This FPP-SPP sequence is very similar to what occurs in line 108, where L9 adds the same intonational contour to a word that she is struggling to produce ('influences'). Again, T1 provides in her SPP a model of the word by means of direct repair (line 111) but does not correct L9's uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) in line 112. This shows that the pedagogical goal of T1 at the time was not to improve accuracy but to encourage discussion and focus on meaning. A slightly different interactional layout for modelling is found in lines 89-92. In line 89, L6 mispronounces the word 'island' in such a way that it is pronounced as the word 'Ireland'. Then, T1 prompts L6 to utter the word once more. She does so in line 90 by means of a 'designedly

incomplete utterance' (Koshik, 2002) with upwards contour ('like a?') that seeks to elicit missing information. After this, L6 produces the word, delivered in the same manner. Only then, L6 models the word with the correct pronunciation, which instead of being acknowledged by L6, is seen by him as a third-turn repeat that prompts more talk from him (Park, 2014). T1 then has deployed interactional strategies that show her orientation to her pedagogical goals. She refrained from repairing L6's first attempt at pronouncing the same word (40 lines before in line 49) in order to allow L1 to produce a long turn (lines 51-56). When she does model the word in line 92 she first requests L6's clarification of the conflictive item in line 90 before providing the correct model. It can be stated then that this teacher has attempted to scaffold her learners' contribution by means of well-timed embedded corrections as non-minimal post-expansions and direct repair that have not resulted in significant interruptions or long teacher turns, and that these actions produced language that was in line with the pedagogical goal in this particular context, i.e. promoting participation, fluency and meaningful interaction.

6.2. Requests for clarification and confirmation checks (lines 15, 26, 62, 86, 90, 101, 105, and 114)

Several instances of negotiation of meaning in the form of clarification requests can be found in Extract 1 (lines 15, 26, 86, 90 and 114). These instances helped learners to provide more complete contributions and convey their meanings in a more effective manner. The clarification request in T1's FPP in line 26, for example, is delivered with rising intonation in order to have L6 reproduce and potentially reformulate his idea. L6 reacts to this by restating the final part of his original contribution in his TCU. This makes T1 produce the discourse marker 'ah' in line 28, which suggests a shift in T1's understanding of L6's utterance, i.e. a shift in T1's 'epistemic status' (Heritage, 2012). More importantly, T1's request for clarification has prompted L6 to rephrase his opinion on Chilean people and to add further information in line 29. In line 86, after several turns where L2 and L6 engaged in conversation and delivered extended turns (lines 42 to 57), T1 asks L6 to clarify his idea about the connections that Chile was able to create in the last years. The clarification request produced by T1 is also serving the purpose of rephrasing a faulty utterance ('could connecting with the other countries') while asking for clarification (line 86). L6 orients to T1's need for clarification by using a word provided by T1 in her clarification request in order to complete his idea ('another countries') in line 87. T1 then uses backchannel feedback to 'give back' the floor to L6 which results in further development of the topic. The point could be made that T1 should have given less information while requesting clarification in order to prompt L6 to reformulate his idea into a new sentence. However, at elementary levels, learners may not be able to engage in full reformulations of their ideas and opinions every time they are prompted by teachers.

The teacher in Extract 1 is also attempting to understand her learners' contributions. She does this by delivering confirmation checks (lines 62, 101 and 105) that help her check meanings and relate them to learners' previous ideas. Her confirmation check

in line 62 prompts L1's acknowledgment and further elaboration on her idea about Chile's history (lines 63-65). Interestingly, T1's confirmation check is not the only one in the sequence. L6 produces a confirmation check in line 59 that overlaps T1's previous attempt to check meanings (line 58). The way in which T1 and L6 orient to the meaning of L1's utterances can indeed promote understandings in the classroom as a whole. Later, in lines 101 and 105, T1 reacts to L6's contribution by connecting his description of Chilean geography (lines 93-100) to a previous topic in the conversation where L1, L4 and L6 were discussing why Chile was different from other countries (lines 44-56). L6 acknowledges and accepts T1's meaning check by uttering the affirmative token 'yes' (lines 103 and 107). T1's confirmation checks give her and other learners the possibility to understand the meanings being negotiated in the classroom, while providing content feedback. Both clarification requests and confirmation checks in Extract 1 have provided opportunities for participation because these strategies have encouraged learners to clarify and expand their utterances, outcomes which are aligned with the pedagogical goals of the teacher at the time.

Overall, the way in which T1 has steered the interaction in Extract 1 has shaped her learners' contributions by providing scaffolding when necessary, and by negotiating meanings in order to reach understandings as the conversation unfolds. The minimum repair and T1's constant focus on content allowed learners to have a more symmetrical role in the discourse (Seedhouse and Walsh, 2010). This more symmetrical relationship is also achieved when T1 extends the opportunity to take the floor to other learners (line 41), when learners are able to hold the floor (lines 42-57 and 71-85) and when learners are able to take or regain the floor from T1 or from other learners (e.g. lines 39, 71, and 83). The turn taking is managed by learners on a number of occasions, with T1 providing content and backchannel feedback, expanding to other learners, and negotiating meanings when necessary. As a result of this, a salient feature of Extract 1 is its 'jagged profile' (Walsh, 2011), containing features that are common in everyday conversation, such as a more symmetrical relationship between participants, longer (learner) turns, more frequent overlaps, pauses and interruptions.

6.3. Missing Opportunities to Shape Learner Contributions

Extract 1 is an interesting sequence because it portrays interaction that is part of an elementary level lesson where the teacher has been able to shape her learners' contributions by scaffolding and negotiating meanings while still giving the floor to the learners. A sequence where this is not achieved is Extract 2 below, which is part of an upper-intermediate level lesson. Here, T2 is seeking to elicit learners' answers on the problems that young popular celebrities have in their lives.

Extract 2: T2.

- 1 T2: what problems (.) can they (.) face (.) if they're (.) so
2 popular (0.6) what problems (0.3)

3 L6: drugs?
4→ T2: drugs, (.) yes? (0.6)
5 L6: depression? (1)
6→ T2: the pressure. (0.3) ye[ah: the] pressure of you know
7 being famous so young (0.3) okay?
8 L6: [depression?] (0.6)
9 L4: they have access: (.) to different things that they
10 shouldn't even know (0.3)
11→ T2: yeah: (.) for example? (.) dru[gs] (.) [<yeah>]
12 L4: [dru]gs (.)[alcohol]
13 T2: (fresh) alco[hol]
14 L7: [may]be the:: (.) the problem of (.) you don't
15 know if you have problems because (.) of you? or because
16 people you are (famous) (1)
17→ T2: <yeah> okay (.) that's- [that's ()]
18 L8: [eh- ()]
19 T2: hmm?
20 L8: that- that would be: that- bad influence (.)
21→ T2: yeah bad influences (.) yeah? (.) .hhh (.) okay yeah (1.2)
22 L7: the salary (0.4)
23→ T2: yes they might get like a lot of money (.)[yeah?] (.)
24 they're like
25 L4: [((chuckles))](1.3)
26→ T2: young (0.5) singers nowadays they get a lot of money i-
27 in short time and then: ()

Extract 2 is characterised by a number of instances in which the teacher could have ‘pushed’ learners to reformulate their output and negotiate meanings, but did not take advantage of them (lines 4, 6, 11, 17, 21, and 23). In each of these turns, T2 accepts the learners’ first contribution by producing the tokens ‘yes’ and ‘yeah’ as part of his TCUs, showing the learner that there’s no further talk expected from them at that point. In line 17, T2 seems to question whether L7’s TCUs (lines 14-16) are comprehensible, as the production of ‘yeah’ delivered at a slower speed suggests. At this specific point, a clarification request or a confirmation check would have been appropriate to make the meaning of the utterance clearer to the teacher and other learners. However, T2 does not orient to L7’s idea and produces a single turn in the form of a ‘sequence-closing third’ (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) after L7’s SPP. T2’s management of the turn-taking remains unchanged in nature throughout the sequence. In turn 20, L8 elicits a FPP that provides content feedback to L7’s idea, which is met with further acceptance by T2 in line 21 (yeah, bad influences). However, T2’s SPP is again functioning as a minimal post-expansion to L7, and no further negotiation ensues. This pattern is repeated in turn 23, where T2 reacts to L7’s single phrase (‘the salary’) by first providing evaluative feedback and then by producing a rather long explanation about the reasons why earning too much money could be problematic. The reasons provided by T2 may not match L7’s reasoning underlying his contribution in

line 23. Thus, T2 is not doing any favours to learners by not challenging their short but meaningful contributions and, instead, supplying his own. A clear example of this can be seen in line 6, as L6 produces the word ‘depression’ in line 5. This is understood by T2 as ‘the pressure’, which prompts him to describe how pressure can affect famous people (lines 6-7). L6 attempts to repair T2’s misunderstanding by repeating the word, which overlaps T2’s explanation (line 8). However, L6 is not successful, and the floor is taken by another learner. It can be seen then that the interaction in Extract 2 mainly falls into a pattern where learners provide single words or phrases and T2 recycles them to formulate his own accounts, instead of asking further questions or prompting learners to elaborate on a topic. It can be seen that the turn-taking patterns in this interaction were mainly managed by T2. This prevented learners from developing their own ideas and linguistic structures in an episode where opportunities for shaping learners’ contributions through scaffolding and negotiation of meaning were simply not taken by the teacher.

7. CONCLUSION

In light of the analysis, it can be stated that the teacher in Extract 1 was able to shape her learners’ contribution successfully through the use of scaffolding, clarification requests and confirmation checks in her post-expansions, findings that are in line with Walsh (2002), Walsh and Li (2013), and Can Daşkın (2014). Reformulations in the form of well-timed embedded corrections and modelling in the form of adequate direct repair were not found to disrupt the interaction significantly, did not result in long teacher turns and maintained the focus on meaning. Thus, repair that allows participants in a conversation to make contributions and maintain the flow of interaction can function as a communicative move and can go beyond the provision of evaluation (Nakamura, 2008). However, certain interactional strategies can be more appropriate to a particular mode according to the teacher’s ongoing pedagogical goal (Walsh, 2013). In the particular case of the CCM, interactional features such as modelling and extension may be less appropriate or less ‘mode convergent’ (p.85) when they are used in excess. Modelling a learner’s utterance is typically unwarranted in this mode/context because the main pedagogical goal is to develop fluency and allow learners to express themselves, and not to focus on pronunciation aspects. With respect to extensions, they can result in long teacher turns that will likely take up learner’s space. Modelling and extension may be more necessary in contexts such as the skills and systems mode, where the main goal is to develop accuracy, where specific linguistic forms produced by learners are closely evaluated and expanded by the teacher when necessary, and where learners are deliberately provided with less interactional space (Walsh, 2006; Can Daşkın, 2014). Nevertheless, at elementary levels adequate use of these scaffolding techniques can allow learners to express themselves more accurately without impeding their participation and interaction.

Requests for clarification and confirmation checks, considered a crucial component of SLA (Long, 1983, 1996), were also found to maximise opportunities for learning

and participation from a CA perspective. They helped learners clarify the meanings they wished to convey and reach mutual understandings which kept the discourse meaningful for all participants and encouraged their participation. Thus, when teachers merely accept learners' first contribution, important opportunities for clarification and participation are lost (Walsh, 2006). The 'jagged profile' (Walsh, 2011) that results from scaffolding and negotiating meanings should be encouraged in a CCM so as to allow learners to become active participants in the co-construction of meaning. Moreover, analysis of Extract 2 suggested that opportunities for scaffolding, requests for clarifications and confirmation checks can be lost even at higher proficiency levels when teachers do not take advantage of these instances. Acceptance of learner contributions by means of acknowledgement particles and swift repetitions of learners' short utterances functioned as minimal post-expansions and prevented learners from elaborating on their own ideas and using their own language to clarify them. Finally, and in line with Walsh (2006), clarification requests from learner to teacher were scarce in the data for this particular context, which suggests that teachers should sensitise learners to their value.

There are a number of considerations that need to be made in light of the study. First, the types of findings provided by analysing classroom data under a CA approach may inform second language pedagogy by generating more insights into the way teachers make moment-by-moment pedagogical choices with their use of language. When teachers are not able to match a particular pedagogical goal with adequate teacher talk, then opportunities for learning and participation will be missed. This is especially true of EFL contexts, where learners must rely mainly on what takes place in the classroom in order to advance their learning. Second, teachers should be sensitised to the sociocultural idea that learning takes place when learners participate (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Donato, 2000), and that the very same action of making learners engage in the interaction is what embodies learning. As van Lier (2000) writes, interactional features that create opportunities for learning 'do not just facilitate learning, they *are* learning in a fundamental way' (p. 246, italics in original). Thus, the interactional features that shape and elicit learner talk should be promoted in a CCM if teachers wish to nurture a 'facilitator-oriented' approach to teaching that grants greater participation rights (Lee & Ng, 2010) and can enhance CIC. Third, the role of the teacher as a facilitator or a disruptor of opportunities for learning and participation has been underscored in the study. While it is acknowledged that learners are as relevant as teachers in the co-construction of classroom interaction, an educational context such as the one selected can benefit from such an approach. The fact that negotiation of meaning from learners to teachers is scarce (Walsh 2006) does not mean that by merely telling learners to negotiate more meanings in the classroom they will start doing it. Shaping learners' contributions is a co-constructed activity and emerges out of the pedagogical goals that teachers set at a particular moment. The teacher is the one who 'orchestrates the interaction' (Breen, 1998, p. 119) and is in a better position to make changes that will enhance it. These changes are more likely to emerge once teachers become aware of the fact that their use (or misuse) of language can affect participation and learning development. In order to avoid this, teachers

need to be sensitive to the manner in which they ‘give back’ a learner’s utterance. By encouraging interactions that contain a ‘jagged profile’, where learners are active agents in co-constructing meaning and where there are opportunities for appropriate scaffolding and meaning making and negotiation, learners can be exposed to linguistic and interactional resources which will likely support learning.

REFERENCES

- ATKINSON, J. AND HERITAGE, J. 1984. Transcript notation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Pp. IX-XVI. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BREEN, M. 1998. Navigating the discourse: On what is learned in the language classroom. In W. Renandys & G. Jacobs (Eds.), *Learners and language learning*. Pp. 72-88. Singapore: SAMEO, Regional Language Centre.
- BROUWER, C., & WAGNER, J. 2004. Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice* 1(1): 29-47.
- BRUNER, J. 1983. *Child’s talk: Learning to use language*. New York: Norton.
- CAN DAŞKIN, N. 2014. Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse* 6(1): 33-56.
- CANCINO, M. 2015. Assessing Learning opportunities in EFL classroom interaction: What can conversation analysis tell us? *RELC Journal*, 46(2): 115 –129.
- CROSS, R. 2010. Language teaching as sociocultural activity: Rethinking language teacher practice. *The Modern Language Journal* 94(3): 434-452.
- DONATO, R. 2000. Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Pp. 27-50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ELLIS, R. AND BARKUIZEN, G. 2005. *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FIRTH, A. AND WAGNER, J. 1997. On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal* 81(3): 285-300.
- FRÖHLICH, M., SPADA, N. AND ALLEN, P. 1985. Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(1): 27-57.
- HALL, J. AND VERPLAETSE, L. 2000. *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, N.J: Erlbaum.
- HERITAGE, J. 1997. Conversational analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. Pp. 161-182. London: Sage Publications.
- HERITAGE, J. 2012. The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 30-52.
- HUTCHBY, I. AND WOUFFITT, R. 2008. *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- JEFFERSON, G. 1987. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation*. Pp. 86-100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- KASPER, G. AND WAGNER, J. 2011. A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. Pp. 117-142. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- KOSHIK, I. 2002. Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35: 277-309.
- KUMARAVADIVELU, B. 1999. Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(3): 453-484.
- LANTOLF, J. 2000. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LANTOLF, J. 2011. The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. Pp. 24-47. London: Routledge.
- LANTOLF, J. AND APPEL, G. 1994. Theoretical framework: an introduction to Vygotskian perspectives on second language research. In J. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Pp. 1-32. Norwood: Ablex.
- LANTOLF, J. AND THORNE, L. 2006. *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LAZARATON, A. 2004. Conversation analysis and the nonnative English speaking ESL teacher: A case study. In D. Boxer and A. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*. Pp. 49-57. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- LEE, W. AND NG, S. 2010. Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy. *ELT Journal* 64(3): 302-313.
- LIDDICOAT, A. 2011. *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.
- LONG, M. 1983. Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input1. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2): 126-141.
- LONG, M. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Pp. 413-468. San Diego: Academic Press.
- LYSTER, R. AND RANTA, L. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19(01): 37-66.
- MONDADA, L. AND PEKAREK, S. 2004. Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88(4): 501-518.
- NAKAMURA, I. 2008. Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how 'repair' displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research* 12(2): 265-283.
- PARK, Y. 2014. The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics* 35(2): 145-167.
- PICA, T., LINCOLN-PORTER, F., PANINOS, D., & LINNELL, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1), 59-84.

- SACKS, H., SCHEGLOFF, E. AND JEFFERSON, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4): 696-735.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. AND SACKS, H. 1973. Opening up closings *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.
- Schwab, G. 2011. From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse* 2(1): 3-19.
- SEEDHOUSE, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. U.K: Blackwell Publishing.
- SEEDHOUSE, P. 2005. Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching* 38(04): 165-187.
- SEEDHOUSE, P. AND WALSH, S. 2010. Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics*. Pp. 127-146. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- SERT, O. AND WALSH, S. 2012. The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education* 27(6): 542-565.
- SINCLAIR, J. AND COULTHARD, M. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Routledge.
- VAN LIER, L. 1988. *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. New York: Longman.
- VAN LIER, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- VAN LIER, L. 2000. From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Recent advances*. Pp. 245-259. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VYGOTSKY, L. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- WALSH, S. 2002. Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*. 6(1): 3-23.
- WALSH, S. 2006. *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.
- WALSH, S. 2011. *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- WALSH, S. 2012. Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)* 6(1): 1-14.
- WALSH, S. 2013. *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- WALSH, S. AND LI, L. 2013. Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23(2): 247-266.
- WARING, H. 2009. Moving out of IRF (initiation-response-feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning* 59(4): 796-824.

APPENDIX 1

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS (ADAPTED FROM ATKINSON & HERITAGE, 1984)

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

