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Establishing Recipiency in Pre-Beginning Position in the Second Language Classroom

Kristian Mortensen

Unit for Sociocultural Research on Learning and Development (LCMI), University of Luxembourg

This article describes how students in the second language classroom claim incipient speakership and establish recipiency with a co-participant before the turn is properly initiated. The resources used by the incipient speaker include in-breaths and body movements. The article shows that when the teacher’s turn is designed as not to pre-establish the participation roles “speaker” and “recipient” of the response turn, the next speaker orients to establishing visible recipiency as a relevant task during, or prior to, the turn beginning. In this way, the teacher’s instruction, and the way it is designed and enacted, provides the students with specific interactional jobs that are not only relevant, but also crucial for the production of the student’s turn.

Instructions and, in particular, questions are important in the educational system, not the least in the classroom (e.g., Levinson, 1992; Long & Sato, 1983; Markee, 1995; Szymanski, 2003). The ways in which instructions are designed and produced, however, matter for what interactional jobs the students are faced with. In the second language–foreign language classroom, the focus on form during form-and-accuracy tasks constrains how the student should respond to the teacher’s question (e.g., Seedhouse, 2004). For instance, a student’s answer may not be “accepted” by the teacher if the target item is not produced “properly,” although the answer is (linguistically) correct.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kristian Mortensen, Unit for Sociocultural Research on Learning and Development (LCMI), University of Luxembourg, Route de Diekirch, Walferdange, L-7220, Luxembourg. E-mail: kristian.mortensen@uni.lu
In this article, I show that the ways in which teachers structure the lesson, and the instructions the lesson normally involve, is intimately related to how students participate in the lesson. I analyze this in a specific sequential context: when the next speaker has not been selected by the prior speaker (i.e., she or he self-selects; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). I show that when the main recipient has not been specified prior to the next speaker’s turn-at-talk, the self-selected speaker is also faced with the task of securing that someone effectively will receive the talk. Several studies have revealed how speakers construct their turn beginnings so to establish recipiency with a co-participant (C. Goodwin, 1980, 1981; Heath, 1984, 1986; Kidwell, 1997). In this article, however, I show how recipiency may be dealt with before the turn is properly initiated. I focus on how this can be done through means of in-breaths (indicated with .Hhh in the transcripts) and body movements. Constructing the ongoing activity in one way may add to the complexity of the task students are faced with, and this may not (necessarily) be part of the teacher’s (intended) pedagogical focus of the activity.

The article contributes to the substantial amount of research that shows how mutual orientation between co-present co-participants is necessary for talk to emerge (e.g., Carroll, 2005; C. Goodwin, 1981, 2006; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2005; Heath, 1986; Mondada, 2007; Rae, 2001). What this line of research demonstrates is how talk is an interactional accomplishment not just between turns-at-talk (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) and within the boundaries of the turn itself (e.g., C. Goodwin, 1979), but also during the very set-up of the turn-at-talk. In particular, this study adds to the discussion of turn beginnings (Mondada, 2007; Streeck & Hartge, 1992), and thus extends the boundaries of traditional linguistics. Similarly, it adds to the existing literature on the use of multimodal resources as “an ecology of sign systems” (C. Goodwin, 2003a) that is used in and through interaction to perform a range of social actions (e.g., C. Goodwin, 2001, 2003b; Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000, 2003; Keating & Mirus, 2003; Lazaraton, 2004; Szymanski, 1999). In this article this is related to, and based on, video recordings from second language classroom interaction, and is discussed in related to pedagogical implications for second language teaching.

SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Research in various fields such as linguistics, pedagogy, and second language acquisition has emphasized different approaches to teaching second languages (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In a recent article, Savignon (2007) referred to communicative language teaching as the “buzzword [of the 21st century] in discussions of the practice and
theory of second and foreign language teaching” (p. 208). The emphasis on students’ communicative competence; a focus on meaning rather than form; an (intended) aim to replicate language outside the classroom; and, in particular, “conversation,” however, is criticized by, for instance, Seedhouse (1996) and others for being considered as a pedagogical concept, rather than being based on communicative or sociolinguistic theory. Similarly, task-based instruction (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan, 1999, 2003) is supposed to stimulate specific types of language (Nunan, 1989, p. 45), and is, therefore, an intended pedagogical methodology (see also Seedhouse, 1999, 2005).

Drawing on Breen’s (1989) distinction between task-in-process and task-as-workplan, Seedhouse (2004) argued that “the main focus of [second language] teaching research should be on what actually happens, that is, on the task-in-process, rather than on what is intended to happen, that is, on the task-as-workplan” (p. 95). Following this line of thought, this article is not intended as a critique of contemporary methods or approaches to second language teaching or as a suggestion for how teachers should organize tasks in the classroom. Rather, the aim is to present empirical analyses of classroom interaction to gain insight into the complexity of the social organization from the participants’ perspective (see also Evaldsson, Lindblad, Sahlström, & Bergqvist, 2001). By looking in details at what actually goes on in the classroom, this article provides an example of how teachers’ “instructions” constrain students’ participation not only when they participate, but also how they participate in terms of which (interactional) jobs students are faced with (see also Macbeth, 2004; Sahlström, 1999). This is not done on the basis of, or in relation to, pedagogical concepts, but rather by careful examination of the social interaction of the classroom as it unfolds moment by moment.

Data Material

The data consist of approximately 25 hr of video recordings of Danish as a second language classrooms from three different language schools. The recordings are part of a cross-institutional research project, “Learning and Integration—Adults and Danish as a Second Language,” between three Danish universities.¹ The students have different geographical, linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds, and represent the heterogeneous group of migrants in Denmark. The recordings were made in the period of 2005 to 2006 with two different cameras.

¹The following universities and researchers are involved: The Danish University of Education (Karen Lund and Kirsten Lundgaard Kolstrup), Roskilde University Center (Michael Svendsen Pedersen, Karen Risager, and Louise Tranekjær), University of Southern Denmark (Johannes Wagner, Catherine E. Brouwer, Gitte Rasmussen Hougaard, and Kristian Mortensen). The project is financed by The Danish Research Council for the Humanities (Statens Humanistiske Forskningsråd).
that were placed on tripods because the researcher was not present during the recordings. A flat table microphone was attached to one of the cameras, and another two or three external hard disc recorders were positioned among the tables in the room. All names in the transcripts are pseudonyms. Transcription is done according to “standard” conversation analysis (CA) conventions (e.g., see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The Danish transcription is translated into English in a word-by-word translation and an idiomatic translation (in italics).

**TURN-TAKING IN CLASSROOMS**

Turn-taking organization (Sacks et al., 1974) in classrooms has been shown to differ from ordinary conversation in a number of ways (Markee, 2000; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 2004)—in particular, in relation to how turns are allocated. Several studies report that the most frequent way by which a student can get a turn-at-talk is either by the teacher selecting him or her as a next speaker (e.g., Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), or by the student requesting the floor, most typically done by hand raising (Sahlström, 1999, 2002). Consequently, self-selection by students is noted to occur with “low incidence” (Jordan, 1990, p. 1154; see also Orletti, 1981). These observations lead Paoletti and Fele (2004) to conclude that “since [students] have no control over turn-taking, they cannot ask for clarification [and therefore] cannot exercise control over sense-making in [the] development of turns at talk” (p. 80).

Most social or interactional oriented studies analyze how turns are allocated in relation to different activities. Seedhouse (2004), for instance, documented the reflexive relation between the turn-taking organization and the pedagogical focus of the current activity. He found that when the pedagogical focus changes, turn-taking organization changes accordingly, as part of how different activities are done and recognized by the participants. However, the social practices involved in self-selecting in classroom settings have, to my knowledge, not been analyzed so far (however, see Sahlström, 1999). When a student self-selects, is his or her only task to produce a turn-at-talk? How is the turn-at-talk initiated and how, if at all, is it interactively accomplished? As I show, several studies in other settings, institutional as well as ordinary conversation, have documented the interactional accomplishment of initiating turns-at-talk. These studies are related to recipiency as an intrinsic part of talk-in-interaction, and before continuing a somewhat extensive review is appropriate.

**TALK, EMBODIMENT, AND RECIPICIENCY**

According to CA, the natural environment of “language” is social interaction (e.g., Schegloff, 1982, 1992, 1997, 1998, 2006). Through interaction, including
"talk," we engage in, and build, the social world. This involves the speaker addressing the talk to his or her co-participants (e.g., talking loud enough for the co-participant to register the talk, looking at the [intended] recipients; see C. Goodwin, 1981) and possibly allocating a next turn to a co-participant (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). Interaction also involves monitoring the co-participant’s display of engagement in, and understanding of (Clark & Krych, 2004), the interaction (i.e., continuously analyzing whether she or he is “paying attention” to the current speaker; e.g., C. Goodwin, 1980, 1981, 2006). In these ways, the speaker’s talk is but one, although absolutely crucial, aspect of interaction.

An extensive amount of research in interactional linguistics within a CA framework has argued for the interactional construction of syntax (e.g., Lindström, 2006; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1996; Steensig, 2001), including how “hearer’s” embodied action has an influence on speaker’s verbal talk (e.g., C. Goodwin, 1979, 1981, 2000). In this way, a basic argument in relation to turn-taking organization and, in fact, at the central heart of CA in general, is a view of recipients as “not passive listeners but incipient speakers, continuously monitoring current talk to project the completion of the current speaker’s [turn-constructional unit—TCU] or a transition-relevance place (TRP) where speaker change may occur” (Aoki et al., 2006, p. 394).

Another line of research deals with how hearers display that they are “listening” and, thus, are “receiving” the talk of the speaker. Listening is not seen as merely “acoustic reception” but as an embodied practice—something that current non-speakers do and display (e.g., Brouwer, 2000; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2005). These displays are crucial not only for the continuation of a turn because the recipient, through these displays, defined the participation roles “speaker” and “hearer” (e.g., in multiunit turns; Gardner, 2001; Jefferson, 1985; Schegloff, 1982), but also for the way in which turns are constructed (Carroll, 2004; C. Goodwin, 1979, 1980). Examples of displayed recipiency signals are continuers (Schegloff, 1982) and other kinds of story-receipt tokens (e.g., assessments; C. Goodwin, 1986) during a storytelling. By producing continuers such as uh huh and yeah, and assessments, such as wow and really?, the story recipient is not only displaying orientation to the co-participant as the storyteller, but is also claiming not to take a turn-at-talk. Displayed recipiency signals are crucial for, and an integrated part of, the production of a story. This has lead to a severe critique of the classic notions of speaker and hearer as separate entities and highlighted the interactive construction of storytelling (e.g., see C. Goodwin, 2006; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2005).

Recipiency, however, need not be displayed through verbal means, but may be displayed visually such as nodding during the other participant’s talk (M. H. Goodwin, 1980; Helweg-Larsen, Cunningham, Carrico, & Pergram, 2004). Similarly, the gaze of the recipient has been shown to be an important way of
Displaying recipiency, and this has resulted in a range of studies that describe how the recipient’s gaze is related to various aspects of ordinary conversation including turn design (C. Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 1981), evaluations during descriptions (M. H. Goodwin, 1980), assessments (C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987), stance taking (C. Goodwin, 2007; Haddington, 2006), storytelling (Bavelas, Coates, & Johnson, 2002), as well as institutional interaction such as doctor–patient interactions (Heath, 1984, 1986; Robinson, 1998; Ruusuvuori, 2001) and workplace studies (C. Goodwin, 1994; Heath & Luff, 1992; Rae, 2001). C. Goodwin (1981) noted that during a turn “the hearer does not gaze continuously towards the speaker . . . [but] gazes away from the speaker, as well as towards him” (p. 71). Specifically, he found that a position where gaze is crucial for the speaker is when the speaker turns the gaze toward a non-gazing recipient. In these cases, the speaker often requests the gaze of the recipient (e.g., by means of hesitations and restarts). Speaker and hearer, therefore, have different rights and obligations in terms of mutual orientation, and as C. Goodwin (1981) continued, “a hearer may and should gaze frequently at the speaker, [but] speaker himself is under no such obligation; his gaze towards hearer can be intermittent” (p. 75).

Display of Recipiency in Turn Beginnings

One place where the co-participant’s display of recipiency is crucial for the actual production of the speaker’s turn-at-talk is turn beginnings. As a feature of turn-taking organization, a possible next speaker may initiate his or her turn before the actual completion of the prior speaker’s turn (e.g., Jefferson, 1984). A new speaker may, therefore, find him- or herself in overlap, and the turn beginning may, therefore, not be “heard” by the (speaking) co-participants. To prevent this the incipient speaker may pre-begin the TCU by using a pre-placed appositional (Schegloff, 1987) such as well, but, and y’know, which may “[absorb the] overlap with prior turns, without impairing an actual turn’s beginning” (p. 74). In relation to visual displays of recipiency, the relation between the speaker’s talk and the recipient’s display of engagement has been documented in ordinary conversation (C. Goodwin, 1980, 1981; Kidwell, 1997), in doctor–patient interaction (Heath, 1984, 1986), as well as conversations between native and nonnative speakers (Carroll, 2004, 2005). These studies outline speaker’s sensitivity to the co-participant’s display of engagement during turn beginnings. For instance, C. Goodwin (1981) showed how speakers modify their turn beginnings by restarts, pauses, and hesitation markers to allow for the co-participant’s gaze to arrive at the speaker. In this way, gaze is an important resource for engagement frameworks (C. Goodwin, 1981; Robinson, 1998); i.e., the participants’ embodied display of being engaged in interaction.

However, similar activities may occur before the talk itself is initiated. Schegloff (1996) noted that several elements of conduct can work as pre-beginnings—
that is, “elements which project the onset of talk, or the beginning of a (next) [TCU] or a turn, but are not yet proper recognizable beginnings” (p. 92). These are elements such as “turning the head towards . . . a potential recipient, the onset of gesture deployment and often its full realization . . . , incipient facial expression (e.g., smile), lip parting, cough or throat clear, (hearable) in-breath . . . , [and] ‘uh(m)’” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 93). Similarly, Jefferson (1984) noted that pre-speech activities (e.g., in-breaths) are a way for “gearing up” for starting a next turn. Streeck and Hartge (1992) looked at gestures in the transition space between turns in Ilokano. They showed how a gesture (palm up) and a facial expression projecting the articulation of [a] (the [a]-face) may contextualize upcoming utterances. In this way, the facial expression, the [a]-face, works as a way of gearing up for starting a next turn and, according to Streeck and Hartge, it can even be interrupted by another speaker. Similarly, Mondada (2007) looked at pointing gestures in pre-turn positions, in this case during the co-participant’s turn-at-talk, as a way of securing the position of next speaker. She analyzed the emergent nature of speakership and how participants monitor the temporally unfolding development of TCUs and their possible completion. In this way, she provided a careful analysis of a visual, or multimodal, resource for managing turn taking.

This study deals with turn beginnings, although in a quite different setting—second language classrooms. I show how participants establish recipiency before initiating the (verbal) turn-at-talk. What is characteristic in the examples analyzed in this study is that it has not been established (a) who will be next speaker, (b) when a new speaker will initiate his or her turn-at-talk, or (c) what the action of the new speaker’s turn should be. These cases show how recipiency is a relevant interactional job for participants to manage. I show that pre-beginning elements may not merely be ways of gearing up or projecting a turn-at-talk, but are ways of setting up a participation framework (Goffman, 1981; see also C. Goodwin, 2006; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2005) out of which the talk can emerge. By focusing on the participation framework rather than the pre-beginning elements’ (syntactic) relation to the upcoming turn-at-talk, the intrinsic interactive construction of the beginning of a turn in (second language) classroom interaction is highlighted.

INITIATING A TURN-AT-TALK WITHOUT DISPLAYED RECIPIENCY

As the previous review suggests, the recipient’s gaze is crucial for the speaker at turn beginning. However, this is not the case when the recipient is involved in an activity that is relevant to the ongoing action. C. Goodwin (1981, p. 79f.) showed how a speaker may turn away from the co-participant while searching for a word. Similarly, Robinson (1998) found that a recipient’s gaze removal from the
speaker may be relevant to the ongoing activity, and is in these cases not oriented to by the speaker as a disengagement of the interaction. In classrooms, students are often engaged in tasks that involve several foci of attention such as the teacher, classmates, their textbooks, or other written material. In these cases, the immediate focus of attention of the individual participant provides a framework for the co-participants to determine to what extent that student is available for focused interaction (Goffman, 1963). This has consequences in relation to the extent to which recipiency has to be established between speaker and hearer. In the following, I describe a specific sequential environment where recipiency does not seem to be an interactional job for the participants during the speaker’s turn beginning because recipiency has been established prior to the student’s turn.

Display Questions

A typical type of question in the classroom is what is normally referred to as a display question (e.g., Banbrook & Skehan, 1990; Cazden, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983; Seedhouse, 2004; Szymanski, 2003). This is where the “questioner,” typically the teacher, asks a “known-answer question,” and the students have to display that they know the answer. In this way, the answer is primarily produced for the teacher, who often responds with an evaluation or other kinds of feedback; hence, the initiation–response–feedback pattern (e.g., Hall, 1997; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 2004; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). What is characteristic about display questions is that they (a) specify what the answer should look like (i.e., they provide the selected student with highly restricted possibilities for what to do in the next turn and how the turn should be designed, and thus that only a specific answer will be considered to be right), and (b) establish who is the appropriate main recipient of the answer—namely, the teacher who produced the question (see the following discussion). In this way, display questions in various ways constrain the possibilities for the students’ participation in the ongoing activity. A classroom activity where the teacher’s (display) questions often highly constrain the students’ participation is going through a homework assignment, pair or group work, and so forth, where the teacher controls, or checks, that the students have done the task correctly, and this is typically related to written material such as a textbook (Mortensen, in review). Example 1 is an example from such an activity. The students have listened to a taped dialogue and the class is now going through a list of questions about the dialogue. The teacher reads aloud the questions, and selects students to provide answers.

Example 1: O620U1—52:30

The student who is selected to answer the question, Poh, does not orient to visibly displayed recipiency as something that has to be established during the
EXAMPLE 1

2 Teacher:  Eh::: Poh, ik du fat i=eh hun for Lisbeth ikke køber en ny cykel
Eh::: Poh did you get—eh why Lisbeth doesn’t buy a new bike

4 Poh: Fordi hun har ikke råd
Because she has not afford
Because she not can afford it

6 Teacher:  Fordi (1.4) hun (1.8) ikke (0.5) har råd
Because (1.4) she (1.8) not (0.5) has afford
Because she cannot afford it

turn beginning. He gazes toward his textbook on the desk in front of him and only turns his gaze toward the teacher at the end of the answer in line 4. Similarly, the teacher turns toward the blackboard after selecting Poh as next speaker in line 4.

Poh’s turn is grammatically incorrect (subject–verb–negation). The correct word order should be subject–negation–verb, and the turn should therefore be “Fordi hun ikke har råd” (‘Because she cannot afford it’). Following the incorrect word order, the teacher starts writing on the board and initiates a repair sequence.
Thus, the participants find themselves within a complex *activity system* (C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987) of talk, bodies and physical objects, which shape the participation and the context in which the participants’ action emerge (e.g., see also C. Goodwin, 2001, 2003b). However, apart from the physical objects, another issue seems relevant here. The question is constraining the student’s participation in various ways, which are visible in the way the student’s answer is designed and enacted: (a) the student does not orient to the mentioning of his name (line 2) as a *summons* (Schegloff, 1968); i.e., as a check for availability that would make a response; e.g., *yeah?* or turning the gaze toward the teacher as conditionally relevant; (b) the teacher turns toward the board and, thus, displays an orientation to the board, or rather a projection of *writing* on the board, as relevant to the answer; (c) the student gazes toward the teacher toward the end of the answer and, thus, projects a next turn from the teacher (e.g., an evaluation). This indicates that the participation roles have been established *before* the student’s answer. Even before the student’s answer is initiated, it has been established who the main recipient of his turn is (i.e., the teacher); therefore, recipiency needs not be established during the beginning of the turn. This suggests that when recipiency and the participation roles of speaker and hearer have been established prior to a turn, the speaker does not orient to displaying recipiency visibly as a relevant interactional job during his or her turn beginning.

However, a first pair-part need not select the producer of the first pair-part as the main recipient of the second pair-part. For instance, teachers often instruct students to do specific tasks such as engaging in conversation with a peer. Prior to Example 2, two students, Maria and Fattouma, have performed a dialogue in front of the class. The dialogue, which was part of a larger task concerning a picture of an elderly couple, was performed as a range of question–answer sequences (cf. Mori, 2002) where the students took turns at asking each other questions about the persons of the picture (e.g., who they are, how they are related, etc.). Example 2 begins when Maria and Fattouma have just finished the task.

**Example 2: F521—10:25**

The teacher’s question in line 3 is marked as a continuation of the prior dialogue through “*flere spørgsmål*” (‘more questions’). At the first possible completion of the teacher’s question, after “*ønske*” (‘wish’) in line 3, Adan self-selects by projecting a turn-at-talk. Following the hesitation marker in line 4, the teacher, Maria, and Fattouma each turn their gaze toward him. Thus, Maria and Fattouma display that they are *relevant* recipients of his turn. Then, following his question (lines 7–8), Maria provides an answer to Adan’s question. In this way, the teacher’s question does not pre-establish the teacher as the main recipient of
Establishing recipiency in relation to a second pair-part is an interactional job participants in the second language classroom have to negotiate locally on a turn-by-turn basis: Whether a first pair-part establishes who is the main recipient of Adan’s turn-at-talk, but allows Maria and Fattouma as relevant recipients of his turn. In this way, a first pair-part does not necessarily select “self” as (the only) recipient of the second pair-part.

EXAMPLE 2

1  Teacher:  Ja
               Yes

2  (0.7)

3  Teacher:  Var der flere spørgsmål i kunne gønske (,) de [k u:  s:]jille hinanden
                        Were there more questions you could wish they could each other
                        Are there any more questions you would like them to ask each other

4  Adan:    [Uh- ch::]
               [Uh- ch::]

5  Teacher:  Ja
               Yeah

6  (4.0)

7  Adan:    Då (1.0) mennesker (0.2) i billede (0.8) hvad laver de frivillig,
                        Them (1.0) people (0.2) in picture (0.8) what do they voluntary
                        The people in the picture what do they do voluntarily

8  Adan:    (0.5) >eller< (1.3) ( ) (0.3) det er en frivillig aktivitet
                        (0.5) or (1.3) ( ) (0.3) it is a voluntary activity
                        or is it a voluntary activity

9  (2.0)

10 Maria:   Nej (,) jeg tror at e- at ch: >i Danmark< mange:: gammel mennesker
                        No (,) I think that e- that ch in Denmark many old people
                        No I think that in Denmark many old people

11 Maria:   har (0.5) ha::r et h:jlpe (0.4) til kommuner til laver fri aktivitet
                        have (0.5) have a help (0.4) to municipality to do free activity
                        receive help from the municipality to do activities free of charge
the second pair-part is negotiated interactionally. For instance, when participants do not have visual access to each other they are not in a physical position of orienting to the co-participants’ visual display of understanding of the first pair-part.

Example 3: F504U1—15:33

In Example 3, the class is discussing how to get to a specific language-learning center and how long they need for the visit (see line 1) in relation to a classroom

1 Teacher: Hvor lang tid tår det å besøge sprogcen er å lave interviews
   How long time takes it to visit language learning center and make interviews
   How long will it take to visit the language learning center and make interviews

2 (1.9)

3 Teacher: Hvor lang tid tår det
   How long time takes it
   How long does it take

4 (1.7)

5 Teacher: Å ta’ [*å å* t a’ f o t o s ]
   And take and and take pictures
   To take to to take pictures

6 Hasan: [( ) Det vil ta' ( ) en en halv time
   [( ) It will take ( ) one one half hour
   [( ) It will take one and a half hour

7 (0.8)

8 Hasan: Halvandet igne vil det ta’ hvis vi t- tog til ((bynavn))
   An hour and a half hour will it take if we t- took to ((name of city))
   An hour and a half will it take if we went to ((name of city))

9 Teacher: [Hm
   [Hm

10 ?: [*Ja*
    [Yeah

EXAMPLE 3
project. When a student, Hasan, answers the question he does not do any specific work to establish recipiency with a specific recipient. He gazes toward the front of the class and not toward a specific co-participant. In this respect, the physical position of the teacher is crucial because the teacher is standing behind Hasan. In this way, Hasan is not able to see whether the teacher displays recipiency visually without turning his entire upper body and head toward him. The answer is followed by a 0.8 sec pause where nobody responds, after which Hasan repeats the answer and this time receives a verbal response from the teacher and another student. In this way, because the recipient of Hasan’s answer has not been established prior to his turn beginning, and because he does not orient to recipiency as something he needs to establish in the turn beginning, it is not clear who the main recipient of his turn is. This has sequential consequences because he repeats the answer to get a response from a co-participant.

In conclusion to this section, it seems that when the teacher’s first pair-part is constructed and oriented to by the co-participating student, as to select self (i.e., the teacher), as a recipient of the student’s second pair-part, the student does not orient to recipiency as an interactional job in his or her turn beginning. It is not the first pair-part per se that pre-establishes who the recipient of the second pair-part is, but how the participants treat it (i.e., the participants’ intersubjective understanding of the first pair-part).

UNCERTAINTY ABOUT NEXT SPEAKER POSITION

In the prior section I described a situation where the new speaker could initiate a turn-at-talk without orienting to requesting and establishing displayed recipiency from a co-participant as a relevant job because the participation roles of speaker and recipient had been established prior to the student’s turn-at-talk. When this is not the case (i.e., when neither next speaker nor his or her recipient have been specified in advance), participants seem to orient to visually displayed recipiency as a relevant interactional job to deal with during turn beginnings.

Example 4: F521U1—20:26

As the teacher’s question in line 1 is explicitly addressed to the whole class (“noen” ‘anybody’) and is therefore open to anybody, it has not been established who is going to answer the question nor that someone actually will, or is able to, provide an answer. A recipient of the teacher’s question has thus not been established prior to the student’s turn. Similarly, although the teacher’s turn in line 1 makes her a relevant recipient of a (possible) next turn, this has to be negotiated between the participants (refer to Example 3). Although the student, Maria, verbally displays willingness to answer with a yeah, line 2, in overlap
with the teacher’s turn, the participants do not move into mutual gaze until the beginning of line 3, and Maria then restarts her turn-at-talk. In other words, because the speaker–hearer relationship has not been established prior to the new turn-at-talk, the new speaker restarts the turn beginning to allow the participants to establish mutual gaze before continuing her turn-at-talk.

In these situations in classroom settings, several participants are relevant next speakers. For the participants, this means that when the new speaker initiates his or her turn, she or he does not necessarily constitute the relevant focus of attention of the co-participants’ gaze. Establishing recipiency, then, seems to be something to which the participants orient as a relevant interactional job. This is intimately related to the ongoing activity and the way the teacher’s instructions are presented to the students. The instruction does not select a specific student as
next speaker, but provides for the opportunity to self-selection. This way of organizing activities is very different from planned activities (Mortensen, in review) and provides the students with the interactional task of establishing recipiency.

ESTABLISHING RECIPIENCY PRIOR TO TURN BEGINNING

Participants’ mutual orientation to, and display of engagement in, the participation framework is of utmost importance to the beginning of a turn-at-talk. This participation framework is often set up as part of the turn beginning; however, it may also be established before the turn-at-talk is initiated—thus, in a pre-beginning. By establishing recipiency before the turn is properly initiated, the incipient speaker deals with this task separately from the (verbal) turn beginning. The speaker, then, needs not establish recipiency as part of the turn beginning as in the prior literature has been described to be done through resources such as restarts, phrasal breaks, and hesitations.

Example 5: F504U1—4:38

Prior to the beginning of this example the teacher has instructed the class to discuss how to organize the lesson, but has not provided instructions for how they should do it or who should initiate the discussion. The class is working

1  
2 Rosa: .Ihhh .Ihhh
3  
4 Rosa: Altså først vi skal (0.3) besætte. *Well first we shall (0.3) decide*
Well first we must (0.3) decide
5  
6 Rosa: Altså vi har to muligheder *Well we have two possibilities*
So we have two possibilities

EXAMPLE 5
on a project where they are going to visit another language learning center and interview students and teachers there. The teacher’s instruction concerns the preparations prior to the visit. In line 4, Rosa breaks a period of silence by initiating a turn-at-talk. However, even before this happens two of her classmates who are sitting at the same table have turned their gaze toward her and thereby orient to her as the current or incipient speaker. How is this accomplished? First of all, it has not been specified in advance who will be the next speaker. This means that during the pause in line 1, Rosa does not constitute a relevant focus of attention in the classroom (i.e., someone the classmates should gaze at). In line 2, she produces a hearable in-breath. In-breaths are often seen exclusively in relation to the turn it precedes, and are characterized in relation to the turn (e.g., pre-speech; Jefferson, 1984; Schegloff, 1996). However, in this case it accomplishes a specific social practice. After the in-breath, Rosa pauses. Rather than analyzing the pause as a lack of verbal production, it is coordinated with relevant action by the co-participants (for the same argument, see C. Goodwin, 2001): Following the in-breath, two students who are sitting at the same table as Rosa turn their gaze toward her. It seems that the in-breath and the following pause accomplish the establishment of a new participation framework where Rosa is the relevant focus of attention. After the classmates’ gazes have reached Rosa, she initiates a turn in line 4. By producing an in-breath, she claims speakership and initiates a new participation framework in which she is the primary focus of attention, and the participants create an interactional space from which her talk, in line 4, can emerge.

**Visual resources to claim incipient speakership.** However, an incipient speaker can also use visual means, such as gesture and facial expression (Mondada, 2007; Schegloff, 1996; Streeck & Hartge, 1992), to project him- or herself as next speaker and request the displayed recipiency of the main recipient of the upcoming turn. In Example 6, the class is discussing the time frames of a visit at another language learning center that has already been decided.

**Example 6: F504U1—17:05**

The end of the teacher’s question in line 1 marks a position where the question has come to possible completion in terms of syntax, prosody, and actions or pragmatics. Gesturally, however, it is not complete because the teacher raises his left hand while mentioning the city (line 1) and maintains his hand in an elevated position. Khalid orients to the possible projectable completion of the question: Slightly before the teacher raises the hand, Khalid raises his eyebrows and leans back in his chair. The initial change in Khalid’s body position, the raising eyebrows and the beginning of a change in the position of the torso (-leaning back) in this specific sequential environment, projects him
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as a possible next speaker (Mortensen, in review). From displaying recipiency toward the teacher by gaze, he projects a change in the participation structure. This change is reflected in the teacher’s expansion of the turn—the initial word in the expansion, “fra” (‘from’) is cut off and restarted (for a similar analysis, see Rae, 2001). Thus, the teacher, having already projected a continuation of the turn (i.e., the raising gesture), continues despite Khalid’s visual display of
incipient speakership. The teacher’s orientation toward Khalid as the next speaker is further visible in the continuation of the expansion in line 3. From gazing toward Khalid, the teacher briefly turns his gaze away, before redirecting his gaze toward Khalid. As the teacher has redirected his gaze toward Khalid, his left gesturing hand is lowered and positioned on the table beside him. The gesture is completed simultaneously with Khalid’s answer in line 5. The retraction of the gesture and the gaze toward Khalid constitute an engagement framework out of which Khalid’s turn is initiated. In this way, both Khalid and the teacher orient to the initial body movement as a move into a speaker position in which the teacher will become the primary recipient of the projected turn-at-talk—the answer to the teacher’s question.

**Disengagement of visually displayed recipiency.** So far, we have seen how in-breaths and body movement may work as resources to request and establish recipiency with a co-participant, and thus that the incipient speaker orients to displayed recipiency of the main addressee as a relevant interactional job in turn beginnings. By establishing recipiency prior to the beginning of the turn, the participants move into an engagement framework out of which the turn can emerge. The incipient speaker then constitutes a relevant focus of attention and the turn beginning can be initiated with the displayed recipiency of the co-participant, which may otherwise be dealt with during the turn beginning (Carroll, 2004; C. Goodwin, 1980, 1981; Heath, 1984, 1986; Kidwell, 1997).

However, recipiency is negotiated as a temporally unfolding task. A participant toward whom the incipient speaker orients as the main recipient in pre-beginning position may move out of the engagement framework in the turn beginning as in Example 7. Prior to the beginning of this example, the teacher has instructed the class to decide on a program in relation to presenting their projects. He instructs them to discuss what the schedule should look like, who should be in charge of each of the schedule items, and whether they should invite another class to hear the presentation. Thus, he throws several balls into the air in a rather unspecified way before disengaging from the discussion by moving to the far corner of the room, thereby displaying that he is not to be a primary participant in the discussion. Pierre is selected as “secretary” (the teacher’s term) by the class to write the schedule on the board and to lead the discussion.

**Example 7: F509U1—5:08**

During the pause following Pierre’s talk to initiate the task (line 1), Rosa rubs her hands and stretches her arms as she leans back into the chair. Her change in body position marks a change in the participation framework (see Nevile, 2004, p. 135ff; Schegloff, 1998) and stands out in relation to the not-moving classmates and projects her as the next speaker. Pierre gazes toward her and
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displays that he is in a visual position to receive the upcoming turn-at-talk. However, after the turn-initial elements “je syns” (“I think”), he withdraws his gaze and turns around. Therefore, Rosa is left without a recipient and requests the gaze of another recipient with turn delays—elongations, gaps, and restarts—until her neighboring classmate turns her gaze toward Rosa. In this way, Pierre orients to her move into speaker position, but does not display visible availability as being the main recipient of the turn-at-talk.

DISCUSSION

The examples presented here are part of a larger collection of how students in classroom settings establish recipiency with a co-participant when neither the next-speaking student, nor the recipient of the student’s turn, have been selected prior to his or her turn or projection of the turn. Among the different verbal and visual resources, the collection confirms the techniques for establishing recipiency as part of the turn beginnings as indicated in previous studies (see the previous review). It is interesting to note, however, that the collection consists
of several examples where recipiency is established before the proper turn beginning. These include nonlexical pre-speech signals, as well as embodied practices, such as changes in body posture. This raises a number of challenging questions.

First, the social practice performed through these resources shows the intimate relation between framing the talk and the talk itself in classroom activities. The focus on establishing a participation framework rather than the talk seems to be relevant because talk may emerge from the established participation framework.

Second, this brings up the question of when a turn begins. Previous research in CA and, in particular, interactional linguistics has focused primarily on TCUs and, in particular, their (possible) completions because these are points where transition to another speaker is relevant, although not obligatory (e.g., Ford & Thompson, 1996; Sacks et al., 1974). In relation to TCU beginnings, these have been described primarily in relation to their completions. Sacks et al. described four different types of TCUs in English—sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical—and the beginning of a TCU projects what type of TCU has been initiated, and (roughly) what it takes to bring it to a possible completion. In this way, TCU beginnings are “sequence-structurally important places” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 72). However, a TCU can be expanded by pre-beginnings (e.g., Lindström, 2006; Schegloff, 1996; Steensig, 2001), which may be acoustic, including lexical elements such as pre-placed appositionals (Schegloff, 1987) or visual, and, as we have seen, can be used to accomplish fundamental interactional work.

Third, the observation that students may establish recipiency with one or more co-participants before the turn beginning brings up the relevant question of how this might be different from establishing recipiency as part of the turn beginning. Several resources are used to secure the recipient’s gaze in turn-initial position. Among these are restarts of turn beginnings and delays (gaps and hesitations). Thus, from a linguistic point of view, these constitute disfluent (syntactic) turn beginnings, although they may be interactively accomplished and serve interactional ends (Carroll, 2004, 2005). However, in second language classrooms, the focus of the class is on language, and it may be the case that by establishing recipiency prior to the turn beginning, students orient to (possible) disfluent turn beginning to secure the displayed recipiency of a co-participant.

Fourth, the organization of activities and the involved instructions of the teacher provide students with very different (interactional) jobs. When the activity is organized as having pre-specified the next action and associated participation roles’, visible recipiency does not seem to be a necessary job for the student. However, when this is not the case, initiating a turn-at-talk includes establishing visible recipiency with a co-participant, and thus requires interactional work. This adds to the complexities of the instruction not only in terms of the linguistic construction of the answer, but also the participation required of the self-selected student. Awareness of how instructions provide different
interactional jobs for students is important in relation to organizing the activities in classrooms. Depending on the pedagogical focus of the activity, instructions may be organized as to include unnecessary complexities, which may impede the students’ opportunities for dealing with the pedagogical focus.

In this regard, a relevant observation can be made. Throughout this collection, relatively few students initiate a turn-at-talk in this position (i.e., when the teacher’s instruction neither specifies the participation roles nor the activity of the relevant next action). This is striking because the teacher’s instruction precisely does not select a next speaker, but leaves it to the students as a collective group (Lerner, 1993; Payne & Hustler, 1980; Sahlström, 2002) to negotiate who should take the next turn-at-talk. In this sense, the instruction does not conform to a strict teacher-fronted organization. However, this study suggests that by organizing the classroom in this way, the teacher creates a specific situation for the students in which a certain kind of participation is not only relevant but also required of the students as a group. Rather than providing all students the opportunity to participate, these instructions seem to constrain the participation of the students by facilitating the participation of (a few) particular students. In this way, the way in which the teacher organizes instructions creates certain frameworks that favor the participation of certain students. These results are not meant as a critique of organizing classroom activities in particular ways, but as a way of reflection that should be considered by teachers when organizing, preparing, and going through classroom lessons. Awareness of interactional practices in relation to instructions is highly relevant for (second language) teachers, and should be considered as part of the intended pedagogical aims of teachers’ tasks and instructions.
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