Understanding the Dynamics of Classroom Communication

Understanding the Dynamics of Classroom Communication

By

Sungbae Ko

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

PUBLISHING

Understanding the Dynamics of Classroom Communication,
by Sungbae Ko

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4211-7, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4211-2

For Katrina, Bryan, and Christopher

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

(1) Acronyms

BAP	Base Adjacency Pair
BFPP	Base First pair part
BSPP	Base Second Pair Part
CA	Conversation Analysis
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
L2	Second Language
MR	Multiple Response
MRS	Multiple-Response Sequence
MUT	Multi-Unit Turn
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
NS	Native Speaker
NTRI	Next Turn Repair Initiation
NTOR	Next-Turn Other-Repair
OIOR	Other-Initiated Other-Repair
OISR	Other-Initiated Self-Repair
QAC	Question-Answer-Comment
SCT	Socio-Cultural Theory
SIOR	Self-Initiated Other-Repair
SISR	Self-Initiated Self-Repair
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SSJ	Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974)
STOR	Same-Turn Other-Repair
TCU	Turn-Constructional Unit
TRP	Transition Relevance Place
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development

(2) Grammatical Glosses

ACC	Accusative
ATTR	Attributive
CIRUM	Circumstantial
COMM	Committal
CONN	Connective
COP	Copula
DUB	Dubitative
IE	Informal ending
INS	Instrumental
NECESS	Necessitative
NEG	Negative particle
NOM	Nominative
NOML	Nominaliser
POL	Politeness
QUO	Quotative
TOP	Topic marker

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Conversational participants in the classroom are not ordinary conversationalists, but conversationalists in a pedagogical multiparty community. A different speech exchange system may produce different problems and different opportunities of sequential organisation when we shift our attention from ordinary conversation to a different speech-exchange system.

This book offers an integrated view of communication within language classrooms, one that acknowledges the importance of what teachers and students bring to the class environment, as well as what actually occurs during face-to-face communication within the classroom. More specifically, the primary purpose of this book is to provide micro-level details about the nature of multiple-response sequence (MRS), which are highly regulated patterns of communicative behaviour, as resulting from the moment-to-moment action that naturally occurs among teachers and students during the process of attaining mutual instructional goals (i.e. acquiring the target language).

The organisation of MRSs may well be a widespread phenomenon in language classroom talk-in-interaction, and technically more characteristic of language classrooms than of other institutional talk-in-interaction or ordinary conversation. The major possibilities of the occurrence of MRSs are delineated into basic conditions, whereby the MRS occurs in various situations. One is that the occurrence of MRSs is intimately related to the teacher's way of allocating turns to students. When questions are addressed broadly to the class, individual learners have the opportunity to formulate their own responses. To be more specific, the MRS may occur when the teacher does not expressly allocate any student as the next speaker, but, rather, addresses a group or the whole class. The lack of constraint on the learners' pre-allocated rights and obligations may, then, provide for the possibility that any of the learners can self-select to respond to the teacher's question, assessment, or comment on not only a mandatory basis, but also a voluntary basis. Alternatively, even where the teacher allocates a student to take a turn as a next speaker, the MRS can also occur when the initial speaker produces an insufficient response which appears to provide co-participants with opportunities to talk further,

either to develop the content of the response or to produce another attempted response against the initial response.

In the ethno-methodological tradition, this study draws heavily on the methodology of Conversation Analysis (CA) to explicate patterns, distributions, and forms of the MRS. In addition, the practice of MRS fundamentally involves social interaction, since language development arises in MRS as a result of interaction that occurs between individuals engaged in dynamic co-participation beyond properties of individual learner language. In this respect, the observations of the MRS also looks towards Second Language Acquisition (in particular, CA for SLA) to consider how the MRS can be potentially applied to second language/foreign language learning.

Since at least the 1980s, growing interest has arisen in Conversation Analysis (CA) or CA-informed research on talk in language classroom settings as providing approaches to the study of talk in institutional settings. The result has been a substantial contribution to the advancement of applied linguistics and Second Language Acquisition (e.g. Firth & Wagner 2007; Gardner & Wagner 2004; He 2004; Hellermann 2008; Ikeda & Ko 2011; Kasper 2004; Ko 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Koshik 2000, 2002a, 2002b; Lazaraton 2003; Markee 1995, 2000, 2004, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler 2004; Mori 2002, 2004, 2007; Ohta 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2001; Pallotti & Wagner 2011; Seedhouse 1994, 1997, 1999, 2004; Young & Miller 2004; among many others). These studies tend to demonstrate how second language (L2 for short) learning can be studied in a variety of situations in which either English is the target language (e.g. Hellerman 2008; Ikeda & Ko 2011; Ko 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Koshik 2000, 2002a, 2002b; Lazaraton 2003; Markee 1995, 2000, 2004; Pallotti & Wagner 2011; Seedhouse 1999, 2004; Young & Miller 2004) or other languages are used as an L2 (e.g. Gardner & Wagner 2004; He 2004; Ikeda & Ko 2011; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler 2004; Mori 2002, 2004, 2007; Ohta 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2001; Pallotti & Wagner 2011).

Although a good deal of CA in the context of L2 classroom research projects have dealt with various subject areas and pedagogical activities and made a distinctive contribution to our understanding of what goes on in the language classroom setting, only recently have conversation analysts begun to provide a close look at the language classroom talk. Further, the main focus of this study, the MRS, has been an under-investigated arena in the field of CA.

This book has six distinctive chapters. Chapter 1 provides a brief description of the MRS and reviews previous studies. As this study is primarily a conversational analytic study, in this chapter, the conversation

analytic literature review is given relative prominence and a concise review of SLA is also provided since the MRS is a potential site for second language learning: this chapter is particularly concerned with the notion of 'scaffolding' and 'learning as a social process'. Chapter 2 addresses some methodological issues employed in this study. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 analyse and consider micro-level details about the types of multiple responses that can be identified, and how the different types are activated within the MRSs. To examine the preliminary observations of MRSs, Chapter 3 presents the four basic types of multiple responses (i.e. identical, complementary, collaborative and competitive), and some inherent features in the practices of MRSs are examined. Chapter 4 further considers how each basic type of multiple response is organised and discusses the sequential complexity of the MRS, showing that a MRS may contain a mix of different types of multiple responses. Extending the in-depth analysis of multiple responses, Chapter 5 deals with two types of expansion multiple responses (i.e. preparatory-stage and post-expansion multiple responses). Finally, Chapter 6 draws some conclusions by way of summary of the findings discussed in the preceding discussion and analysis chapters, and then discusses some implications for SLA.

In brief, to contribute to a range of issues surrounding the dynamic and interactive nature of language classroom talk-in-interaction, this study examines dynamic origins and functions of the MRS, which can be considered as an intrinsic type of pedagogical interaction in ESL and EFL classroom talk, and probes how such classroom interaction provides an opportunity for learners to share participation and collaboratively achieve a local learning objective.[1] This study also attempts to make a small contribution to a range of issues surrounding the applicability of CA in SLA, as it could be suggested that the MRS is a potential site for second language learning.[2]

Many people have contributed, both directly and indirectly, to the ideas and the analyses in this book. First and foremost, I owe a tremendous debt to Rod Gardner who devoted a great deal of his time and invaluable ideas to this study. His careful, considered, and always incisive comments and criticism of my work was crucial not only in developing my own analytical skills, but also in shaping many of the analytic directions taken in this study. May I also take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to a large number of volunteers, who risked the embarrassment of recording, who agreed to being audio/video taped, and who provided the data with their kind cooperation without which this study would not have been possible. As always, I want to thank my wife, Katrina, for being

a continual source of support and encouragement. Our sons, Bryan and Christopher, have also contributed in immeasurable ways by giving me good reasons to take time off and for making that time off so much fun. Last, but not least, I also like to express my sincere gratitude to my parents for their eternal love. I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to the above people and to many other colleagues and friends who have also provided feedback and support for this book. If readers get anything out of this book, my thanks and theirs to the named and nameless here acknowledged. All mistakes and errors in this book are entirely mine.

Sungbae Ko, Sydney, Australia

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF MULTIPLE-RESPONSE SEQUENCES

1.1. Introduction

The multiple-response sequence (MRS) may occur when the teacher does not expressly allocate any student as the next speaker but rather, addresses a group or the whole class: any of the learners can self-select to respond to the teacher's question or other elicitation. Alternatively, even where the teacher allocates a student to take a turn as the next speaker, the MRS can also occur when the initial speaker produces a grammatically or pragmatically insufficient response which appears to provide co-participants with opportunities to talk further, either to develop the content of the response or to produce another attempted response against the prior response (Ko 2009a). To clarify the general notion of MRSs, an example is provided below.[3]

```
[1][AUSTR3:LCD:3S]
((Listening Tape))
1     ET:  alright¿ (0.5) <who: is talking>
2          (0.4)
3     S1:  ah:=
4     S2:  =Sue:=
5     S1:  =Sue a:nd Cindy¿
6          (0.2)
7     S3:  [Cindy
8     ET:  [yes
9          (0.2)
10    ET:  Sue and Cindy. goo:d
```

In this extract, three students participate in a sequence in which the teacher does not select an individual student to speak next. To be specific, rather than allocating the next turn by calling on a specific student, the

teacher asks the whole class a question (line 1: <*who: is talking*>) and a multiple response then occurs in lines 4-7. When the first self-selecting speaker, S1, does not produce any further talk after a hesitation marker (line 3: *ah:*), S2 provides the first response (line 4: *Sue:*). Just after the response has been produced, S1 self-selects (line 5: *Sue a:nd Cindy¿*) to build on S2's response, by supplying an additional item (*Cindy¿*) with rising intonation (possibly a confirmation request). After a pause (line 6), S3 also proffers the additional item (line 7: *Cindy*) which is overlapped by the teacher's acceptance (line 8: *yes*). The teacher then repeats the desired response (*Sue and Cindy.*) and completes his turn with an assessment (*goo:d*) in line 10.

Extract 1 demonstrates a preliminary procedure of MRSs. That is, when a question is initiated by the teacher in the first pair part (FPP), a MR may ensue in the second pair part (SPP). When two or more students self-select to respond to the question, the participation in the response turn is widened from an individual to multiple participants and becomes a MR. Thereafter, the teacher's post-expansion turn may occur to evaluate or comment on each of the students' responses.

The main purpose of this chapter is to survey several previous studies, covering some of the most important dimensions of conversational rules, practices, and structures and related findings to provide a rationale for the study of MRSs, since a fundamental assumption made in this study is that MRSs are patterned in a way which is most closely associated with the local sequential organisation of conversations, including turn-taking procedures, the organisation of sequences, and the repair system. This chapter also reviews some theories of SLA that can potentially be influential in the MRS.

In brief, to help illuminate the organisation of MRSs, this chapter consists of four principal concerns. The first is a concern to focus primarily on turn-taking, because the MRSs show participants' orientation to starting up (mainly in the SPP) at various points in relation to transition relevance places where the current speaker comes to a point of possible grammatical, prosodic or pragmatic completion, rather than its 'actual' occurrence), but also in relation to other SPP speakers, sometimes following them, sometimes collaboratively completing their SPPs, or sometimes providing an alternative.

The second describes the organisation of pedagogical sequences closely connected to the practice of MRSs. The language classroom is clearly one type of pedagogical multiparty setting, therefore, we may not expect the same sequential patterns that apply in mundane conversation, but anticipate a particular form of conversational sequence of the language

classroom talk-in-interaction, such as the MRSs in this study. To illustrate a preliminary framework for the organisation of MRSs, the critical phenomenon to be investigated as the second main concern is something that happens in the SPP of an adjacency pair (AP), and that SPP occurs either in a base AP (BAP) or expansion sequences overwhelmingly.

Repair is another phenomenon which is a prevalent activity in the practice of MRSs. Hence, the relevant characteristics of repair will also be discussed in this chapter. Due to the fact that other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) is predominate in the organisation of MRSs, the third concern is a survey of previous relevant studies of OIOR, rather than a full treatment of repair.

The last concern of this chapter is that MRSs are a potential locus for language learning, and there are some brief remarks about relevant theories of SL A.

1.2. Sequential Organisation in Ordinary Conversation

To contextualise the discussions of the four principal concerns adequately, the first main section begins with the turn-taking system, particularly in multiparty ordinary conversation. The second crucial goal of the first main section is to review the fundamentals of ordinary conversational sequences (i.e. APs). Thereafter, I will account for what research has, thus far, revealed regarding general characteristics of repair in ordinary conversation.

1.2.1. Turn-taking Strategies in Multiparty Ordinary Conversation

Based on some previous studies, this section reviews turn-taking strategies, including the operation of speaker selection techniques in multiparty ordinary conversation. Specifically, to explicate MRSs as possibly involving alternative turn-taking strategies, throughout this section, particular attention will be paid to describing two situations in which MRSs are made possible: (1) current speaker does not select next, and more than one next self-selects; (2) and alternatively, current speaker selects more than one as next speaker.

A Basic Set of Turn-taking Rules for Conversation

Before describing the multiparty talk in detail through a discussion of some previous research, I will, here, briefly summarise the rules governing turn-taking in ordinary English language conversations in order to further discuss how the rules are deployed in multiparty talk-in-interactions.

Based on empirical data from natural conversation, Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974: SSJ for short) propose a simple set of rules that describe how turns come to be allocated at transition relevance places (TRPs) semantically and intonationally. There are two main rules, with the first one being subdivided into three. Additionally, it is notable that the allocation of turns is achieved through techniques, the 'preference' for which is hierarchically arranged:

Rule 1 - applies initially at the first TRP of an initial turn-constructional unit (TCU):

(a) If current speaker selects next speaker in current turn, then current speaker must stop speaking, and next speaker has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at the first TRP after next speaker selection;

(b) If current speaker does not select next speaker, then any (other) party may self-select for next speakership; first starter acquires rights to a turn;

(c) If current speaker has not selected next speaker, and no other party self-selects under rule 1(b), the current speaker may, but need not, continue (i.e. claim rights to a further TCU).

Rule 2 - applies to all subsequent TRPs:

When rule 1(c) has been applied by current speaker, then the rules 1(a) - (c) reapplies at the next TRP, and recursively at each next TRP, until transfer is effected.

The basic set of rules shown above is described where the current speaker can select the next speaker to begin at a TRP and the next speaker has rights to begin speaking. This is a powerful technique not only for determining the next speaker, but also for extending the conversation to another turn. That is, if the current speaker does not select the next speaker then the first starter (here any other participant) takes rights to the next turn (self-selection), or if another participant, who could be the other in a dyadic conversation, or any of the others in a multiparty conversation, does not self-select, then the current speaker may, but need not, continue.

On top of that, the turn-taking system initially allots the speaker with one TCU, which is the basic unit of conversational interaction - that is to say any stretch of talk that is grammatically, intonationally and pragmatically complete. The end of such a unit constitutes a point at which speakership may change (i.e. a TRP). At times, on the other hand, conversational practice also provides opportunities for speakers to take longer turns at talk, but usually the speaker, or the listener, or both collaboratively, have to provide indications to allow for the speakers to take a turn of more than one TCU. To make a bid for multi-unit turn (MUT) to tell a story, for example, speakers often do what Sacks (1974) calls "story prefaces" (e.g. "Did I tell you who I ran into yesterday?"). Thereafter, the speaker should be able to proceed to construct his/her MUT when the hearer provides an acceptance of the offer. Taking a MUT in conversation is thus organised in part by the orientation of participants to the features of the turn-taking system.

It is also worthwhile pointing out that there are two major departures that occur from what appears to be a basic design feature of the turn-taking rules, and of talk-in-interaction more generally, in which unmarked turn-transition does not work: i.e. in overlap next speaker comes in early, and with silence, next speaker comes in late. Further, investigating the occurrence of overlapping talk 'when current speaker does not select next' is one way in which we can observe participants orienting to MRs in multiparty settings. Hence, the next subsection aims to provide an empirically grounded account of what happens when more than one person talks at one time in conversation through a discussion of overlapping talk.

Orienting to Overlapping Talk: Orderliness of Overlapping Talk

Although the notion of the overlap has been widely examined by many researchers (e.g. Bilmes 1997; Coates 1994; French & Local 1983; C. Goodwin 1981; James & Sandra 1993; Jefferson 1983a, 1983b, 1986; Lerner 1991, 1996a, 2002; SSJ; Schegloff 1982, 1988, 1995a, 2000a; Tannen 1994; West 1984; Zimmerman & West 1975; among others), there have been relatively few contributions to the explicit investigation of overlapping talk occurring in the multiparty talk-in-interaction. Particularly, in a large scale study of overlap in conversation, Jefferson (1983a, 1983b, 1986) identified three major categories of overlap onset: (1) transitional onset - where a next speaker orients to a possible TRP; (2) recognitional onset - where a next speaker comes in at the point where s/he has heard sufficient information to recognise what the current speaker is saying and

can, then, project completion of the TCU, even if that is well the before the end; and (3) progressional onset - where trouble with the current speaker's turn prompts a next speaker to come in and a next speaker suggests, for example, a completion in order to move the conversation forward. These categories can be used to account for the orderliness of overlapping talk, which is about where speakers begin to talk. The following extract demonstrates how overlapping talk can be deployed by more than one person when a current speaker does not select next in multiparty talk-in-interaction. It also shows that the multiparty overlapping talk may take place, in relation to Rule 1(b) "by competing self-selectors for a next turn, when each projects his start to be the earliest possible start at some possible transition relevance place, producing simultaneous start" (SSJ: 706-707) as follows:

```
[SSJ: 707]
1     Mike:  I know who d' guy is.=
2      Vic:  =[He's ba::d.
3    James:  =[You know the gu:y?
```

Here, multiparty overlapping talk is produced by *Vic* and *James* because they, as competing self-selectors, orient to a possible TRP. Firstly, the sequence-initiating action in line 1 does not select a next speaker, thus allowing for self-selection. Thereafter, *Vic* (line 2) and *James* (line 3) introduce a next turn in talk simultaneously just after the utterance produced by *Mike* in line 1 has been finished, even though they have not been selected to produce it.

In effect, conversation analysts (in particular, Jefferson 1983a, 1983b, 1986) have shown that most instances of overlap occur in the environment of possible TRPs. Even though it may seem that overlapping talk is disorderly, Jefferson's work has emphasised that both the onset and the termination of overlap are indeed extremely orderly, so the overlapping talk starting at possible TRPs tends to be unproblematic in terms of the talk flow. To be sure, in ordinary conversation, overlap is overwhelmingly an orderly, and not a chaotic phenomenon. However, as most previous studies of overlap with empirical data have been drawn from conversation, the practice of overlapping talk may be different across various institutional settings. To explicate this in considerable depth, in later chapters, I will draw attention to an explicit examination of how multiparty overlapping talk associated with MRSs is systematically managed in the language classroom talk.

Systematic Procedures for Multiparty Ordinary Conversation

Based on the turn-taking system proposed by SSJ, the possibility of distinctive features of multiparty talk-in-interaction has been alluded to, and a number of well-known studies of conversation offer some examples (e.g. Atkinson 1979; Egbert 1997a, 1997b; French & Local 1983; Goffman 1981; C. Goodwin 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin 1990; Lerner 1993, 1995, 1996b, 2002; Lerner & Takagi 1999; Maynard 1986; Sacks 1992a, 1992b; Schegloff 1995a; among others). These studies suggest that special turn-taking features can be important in studying multiparty talk-in-interaction (e.g. schisming; selecting multiple next speakers; collaborative construction of turns at talk) because there is the potential to alter the parties' opportunities for action, and to recalibrate the interpretation of almost every aspect of the activities that they structure.

Although multiparty ordinary conversation may constitute different turn-taking practices from the practices in dyadic ordinary conversation, it is basically carried out under the turn-taking system SSJ proposed, since the compass of SSJ's claim is not at all limited to the turn-taking system that is oriented to dyadic conversations, but is also interested in analysing multiparty talk-in-interaction. For example, as was briefly mentioned earlier, rule 1(b) specifically notes the possibility that more than one next speaker can self-select (i.e. multiparty overlapping talk produced by competing self-selectors for a next turn). Thus, the basic turn-taking rules also appear to be crucial to explicate obvious sequential characteristics of MRSs. Bearing this point in mind, based on the turn-taking system for mundane conversation, which is treated as a 'benchmark,' this section provides several preliminary observations of systematic procedures for the organisation of multiparty ordinary talk-in-interaction, and presents various specified characteristics of the turn-taking system in multiparty ordinary talk-in-interaction.

Selecting Multiple Parties to Speak Next

In multiparty talk-in-interaction, selecting 'more than one participant' to speak next can be possible simply because there are more potential participants than in dyadic conversation. Speakers can either select a particular single participant to speak next or specifically address their talk to more than one person. To a greater or lesser degree, therefore, the basic set of turn-taking rules can be applied and modified or transformed when current speaker selects more than one as next speaker. To illustrate this, the following two extracts can be considered.

```
(1)[Lerner 1993]
1     Michael:  Anybuddy wan' anymore peas?,
2               (0.5)
3       Shane:  Oo I [want s[ome
4      Vivian:       [(ekh) [An(h)ym↓o:re,
                     ((ekh=cough))
```

```
(2)[Lerner 1993: Line modified]
1     Al:  you two both stay at home?
2    Bob:  no I'm living out,
3          couple of blocks from campus.
4   Carl:  eh'h. I'm at home.
```

Rule 1(a) states that the speaker can make it clear, through the use, for example, of second person *you* and reference to 'person specific' people and events, just who is to speak next. However, as Lerner (1996b) claims, in multiparty talk-in-interaction, the use of *you* does not automatically resolve who is being referred to, since its use does not alone distinguish an addressed recipient from the speaker's co-participants. Instead, *you* can sometimes be understood to refer to all or several participants at once. Thus, in multiparty talk-in-interaction, when asking a question that anyone may answer, then more than one person may self-select to speak. More specifically, the absence of the insertion of a name to speak next, or indicating speakers as 'you', 'you two' or 'anybody', intending all or several speakers, can lead to self-selection. These two extracts demonstrate that MRSs may occur 'when current speaker selects more than one as next speakers,' and thereby, although the basic rule (i.e. current speaker selects next) is still the same, the rule may be modified or transformed in order to show multiparty talk-in-interaction in closer detail. In Extract (1), the current speaker, *Michael*, does not select a next speaker, but uses the non-specific, all-inclusive *Anybody*. After a pause, first starter, *Shane* takes a turn as a next speaker (line 3), but the turn is overlapped by *Vivian*'s self selection before a possible completion place is reached in line 4. Extract (2) also demonstrates that speakers have the opportunity not only to address an individual in a manner that selects that participant to speak next, but can also allocate their talk to co-participants in a manner that allows for self-selection of next speaker from among all or some identifiable combination of recipients in multiparty talk-in-interaction. In line 1, *Al* allocates a next turn to more than one co-participant as a next speaker. Since each has been selected, each could begin a turn at talk they are entitled to take. In contrast to Extract (1), first starter, *Bob*, takes a turn

as a next speaker and then *Carl* also self-selects when *Bob*'s turn has been finished.[4]

So far, I have briefly demonstrated that more than one person may self-select to speak when current speaker selects more than one as next speaker. This shows the second situation in which MRSs are made possible, i.e. current speaker selects more than one next. The self-selection technique, on the other hand, shows something further. Several previous studies, for example, are discussed to examine how multiple speakers collaborate to construct turns at talk. In fact, examining collaborative construction of interactional turns at talk furnishes one way of investigating MRSs because it challenges our notion of how a TCU can be jointly constructed by two or more speakers. To further argue this, the following subsection will review a number of relevant studies and continues to contribute to the investigation of the first of those two options in which MRSs are made possible, i.e. current speaker does not select next, and more than one next self-selects.

Collaborative Construction of Turns at Talk

Speakers sometimes produce TCUs that project in their course that the current unit is in some way a preliminary component and that a second sequential possibility of anticipatory completion will be produced to bring the TCU to completion. Sacks (1992a), in lecture 4 (1967), first termed these "collaboratives". He (p. 651) remarks "that persons go about finishing incomplete sentences of others with syntactically coherent parts would seem to constitute direct evidence of their analysing an utterance syntactically in its course".

Although several investigators (e.g. Coates 1994; Ferrara 1992; Lerner 1991, 1994, 1995, 1996a, 1996c, 2002; Lerner & Takagi 1999; Ochs et al. 1979; Sacks 1992a; Schegloff 1984, 1996a; among others) report instances of co-participant completion, Lerner's studies, in the most extensive treatment of collaboratives to date, have been finding aspects of the form which a collaborative completion of another's utterance is produced, and aspects of how such a proposed completion is received. Lerner gives attention to further examples of ways speakers can project a "compound turn-constructional unit" (compound TCU) that is recognisable as such by co-speakers and shows how its sequential structure provides a place for "anticipatory completion" by another participant. In brief, a compound TCU includes a preliminary component that not only projects roughly what it will take to bring that component to possible completion, but also projects a possible form for the final component of the TCU, and thereby a

shape for the TCU as a whole. Thus, although it is by reference to TCU possible completion that transition to a next speaker is ordinarily organised and understood, compound TCUs-in-progress furnish the sequential resources for the anticipatory completion of the TCU by another speaker. In addition, Lerner (1994; 1996a, 1996c) further remarks that in some (though not all) sequential environments, the production of an anticipatory completion by another participant can initiate a small sequence - the collaborative turn sequence - in which the acceptance or rejection of the proffered completion becomes an especially relevant responsive action as in the following extract:

```
[Lerner 1994]
1     A:  If you start watering,
2         it [will get gree-
3     B:     [it will come back
4     A:  y- yes uh huh
```

Here, *A* begins a TCU with a preliminary component "if X" in line 1 (*If you start watering,*), a second completion with a "then Y" component as a version of the final component is foreshadowed by *B* in line 3 (*it will come back*). The pre-emptive completion produced by *B* in line 3 makes relevant action for prior speaker in next turn. In line 4, *A* accepts the anticipatory completion proffered by *B* (*y- yes uh huh*).

As in the above instance, turns produced in a compound turn-constructional form provide a place - a projectable place at first component possible completion - and a form - the projected final component form - for another speaker to furnish the current TCU and the collaborative TCU completion proffered by a co-speaker can be followed by acceptance or rejection furnished by the first speaker who has produced the preliminary component.

Intra-turn silence also *sometimes* provides recipients of the turn with the chance to deal with the uncompleted TCU, as in the following extract:

```
[Lerner 1996a]
Jim:  Did they do that old trick with
      the basketball where they putta
      (0.4)
Ken:  String around it.
```

The intra-turn silence is produced by the current speaker, Jim, when he has paused to search for a specific word or phrase. The intra-turn silence

provides Ken with an opportunity to complete the TCU without being implicated in overlap (i.e. providing for 'one at a time'). As in this extract, intra-turn silence may provide recipients with the chance to create sequential resources for the anticipatory completion of the TCU. In this respect, a range of co-participant completion practices also involves a speaker's intra-turn silence as a feature.

The above characterisations of compound TCUs show how it could be possible for two participants engaged in conversation to jointly produce sequential component(s) of a single turn-constructional format. Compound TCUs, however, are not confined to dyadic conversations, but also occur in multiparty conversations. In multiparty conversation, another participant can join on-going talk to assist the original speaker as a "co-teller" (Lerner 1992) or "co-explainer" (Lerner & Takagi 1999). The next example shows that compound TCUs can also be effected by three or possibly more interlocutors:

```
[Sacks 1992]
A:  We were in an automobile discussion
B:  -discussin' the psychological motives for
C:  -drag racing on the streets
```

In this extract, compound TCUs provide opportunities to demonstrate one's position in the explaining sequence and to assist the original explainer. Here, the compound TCUs provide another way to demonstrate (at the level of syntax) that they are a 'team' by providing a method for jointly constructing an action even though, as Lerner (1991) states, the completion of a compound TCU-in-progress by another participant is not necessarily sequentially required or implicated. In this respect, this extract shows that a compound TCU may not only project a recognisable form for the final component of the TCU but also contribute collaboration as teamwork in order to elaborate prior talk.

Thus far, I have described co-operative conversational style that provides the opportunity for a collaboratively produced TCU in dyadic and multiparty ordinary conversation. Similarly, the co-participant completion of a compound TCU-in-progress described above contributes to research on MRSs because a number of turns are sometimes built up by a number of students who together construct a single response whether or not they are asked to do so by their teacher. That is to say that more than one student may produce a single TCU. In brief, turn-taking conventions are under the control of the interacting parties. In multiparty conversation participants can address an association of recipients, thereby making a

relevant response from those recipients as "members of an association" (Lerner 1993). For further investigation of collaborative construction of interactional turns at talk, a very considerable portion of the discussion will be made in the main analytic chapters.

1.2.2. Conversational Sequences

I now turn to another local management organisation in mundane conversation, of which the most basic example, from a CA perspective, is the adjacency pair (AP) dealing with sequences of actions that have some intrinsic shape or trajectory to them. Since many studies have been concerned with APs in English conversations (e.g. Heritage 1984a; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1999; Jefferson 1972; Levinson 1983; Psathas 1995; Sacks 1987, 1992a, 1992b; Schegloff 1972, 1980, 1990, 2007; Schegloff & Sacks 1973; Seedhouse 2004; among many others), this section offers a brief discussion of the organisation of APs and collaborative response sequences in an effort to establish the fundamental concept of the sequence structure of MRSs. To begin with, the following subsection shall briefly describe the 'minimal form of the AP'.

Minimal Form of the Adjacency Pair

A fundamental concept in APs is that a first utterance that makes relevant some specific second utterance (or one of several alternatives), such as a greeting/reciprocal greeting, an invitation/acceptance (or rejection), a question/answer, etc. In its minimal and basic unexpanded form an AP is that (1) it is composed of two turns; (2) each turn is spoken by a different speaker; (3) these two turns are independent and placed contiguously in terms of first pair parts (FPPs) and second pair parts (SPPs); (4) and a SPP is conditionally relevant to a FPP. The product of this practice and these features may be represented schematically in a very simple transcript as follows:

A: FPP
B: SPP

This shows that conversation can be done basically in a two-unit sequence, but they can be quite often expanded to more than just two pair-parts. Hence, for discussing particular courses of action opportunities in the MRS, studies of the format of expansions of BAP will be shown in the following section.

Expansions of the Base Adjacency Pair

As discussed briefly above, an important interactional sequence in an AP is that given a FPP, a SPP becomes immediately relevant and expected. However, there are many kinds of complex sequence organisation operating in conversation. The parts of the base adjacency pair (BAP) do not always need to be strictly adjacent at all. In other words, neither of these in the minimal form of the AP (FPPs & SPPs) is rigid or invariant. Rather, the FPP and the SPP form a base sequence which can be expanded in different directions: before the FPP (called pre-expansion), between the FPP and the SPP (called insert expansion) and after the SPP (called post-expansion), as shown in the following simple transcript diagram:

← Pre-expansion
A: FPP
← Insert expansion
B: SPP
← Post-expansion

Among the three expansions of BAPs, the pre- and post-expansion sequences are closely associated with MRSs. Thus, a full discussion of the insert-expansion is unnecessary for this study. Instead, pre- and post-expansions are discussed in detail.[5]

Pre-expansions

Pre-expansions show that speakers are careful in the order in which they present their actions. Some of the structural complexity in conversation arises from speakers avoiding potentially embarrassing or annoying situations. When a speaker makes an invitation or an offer, for instance, the speaker may expose him/herself to a possible rejection, so speakers typically avoid the possible rejection by producing *pre-sequences*, such as pre-invitations or pre-offers. A pre-announcement also is a pre-sequence for an announcement of news. It consists of a turn in which the announcing participant checks on the newsworthiness of the item, and may also consist of a turn in which the recipient allows or disallows the newsworthiness of the item before beginning a request-acceptance or question-answer sequence to elicit the announcement. In brief, a pre-sequence is a sequence that is often used to prefigure the upcoming action and secure the recipient's co-operation. These sequences may have 'go-

ahead', 'blocking' or 'pre-empting' responses, as in the following examples:

```
(1)[Schegloff 1997]
1   A: Oh Guess what.   Pre-announcement FPP
2   B: What.            Pre-announcement SPP
                        (go-ahead)
```

In this example, B's turn (*What*) indicates 'Go ahead and tell me'. This go-ahead response promotes progress of the sequence by encouraging its recipient to go ahead with the base FPP (BFPP). The response to a pre-announcement FPP, on the other hand, can block the BAP, as in the following example:

```
(2)[Terasaki 1976: Reprinted in Levinson 1983]
1   D:  Hey we got good news. Pre-announcement FPP
2   R:  I know.               Pre-announcement SPP
                              (blocking)
```

Perhaps the most prominent motivation for pre-announcements is a concern with not giving people information that they already know (Levinson 1983: 354). In this example, *D* produces the pre-announcement FPP (*Hey we got good news*) to ensure that *R* already knows the story which *D* wants to tell. *D*'s announcement turn is, then, blocked by *R*'s pre-announcement SPP (*I know*) implying that the story has already been told to *R*.

```
(3)[Schegloff 1995b: Line modified]
1    Bill:  Didju hear about that guy who
2           got-tho-tho-that family
3           in New Mex[ico (   )
4   Ethel:             [.hhh Oh:::
5           [Oh::: that [(mercury) poisoning?
6    Lori:  [That wz so [(       )
7    Bill:              [(         [       ])
8     Fay:                          [Oh thee] you
9           mean [in thee what? [in thee grain?
10  Ethel:       [((grasp))     [
11 (Jack):                     [The mercury
12          poison[ing?
```

In this example, a series of three pre-empting pre-announcement SPPs is produced by Ethel (lines 4-5), Fay (lines 8-9), and Jack (lines 11-12) after a pre-announcement FPP is produced by Bill in lines 1-3. As this extract is shown, "in the pre-empting response, the prospective recipient not only claims already to know, but displays this knowledge by pre-emptively undertaking the telling which the pre-announcement was taken to project" (Schegloff 1995b: 37).

One special type of turn-specific pre-sequence is a "preliminaries to preliminaries" or "pre-pres" (Schegloff 1980, 1995b), as when someone says "Can I [X]? (e.g. Can I ask you something? [i.e. pre-asking]; Can I make a suggestion? [i.e. pre-offer])" "Would you [X] (e.g. Would you do me a favour? [i.e. Pre-request])" or "Let me [X] (e.g. Let me tell you something" [i.e. Pre-telling]), before doing some preparatory work progressing to the question itself, and generic pre-sequences (e.g. A: Paul? -- B: yeah?), through which someone's attention is called before performing whatever it is the caller wanted to do. In other words, pre-pres are addressed to achieve some sort of preliminary which needs to be done before the projected sequence, for example, in order to answer the question that the speaker wants to ask, or ask the favour that s/he wants to ask, or to tell what s/he is willing to tell. Hence, as Schegloff points out (1995b: 42), the pre-pre is "preliminary not in the first instance to the action which it names, but to a preliminary or some preliminaries to that action".

Post-expansions

There are two types of post-expansions, namely 'minimal post-expansion' and 'non-minimal post-expansion' sequences. As Schegloff (1995b) remarks, minimal post-expansions get their character from having been designed to be possibly finished with a single turn following that SPP.[6] Further, although there are a number of forms or combinations of them, the most common minimal post-expansions might be 'Oh', 'Okay', and 'assessments ('That's good', 'Well done', 'Good job', etc)'. The next example provides an example of this.

```
[Gardner 1996: Simplified]
1    Ron:  >An what- we doin' f'r lunch=
2          fer a ↑drin:k<
3          (0.2)
4    Sal:  Y:euh.=
5    Ron:  =>↑Oh 'at's good id↓ea<
```

In line 5, a minimal BSPP is post-expanded by Ron with a minimal post-expansion (*↑Oh*), and an assessment (*'at's good id↓ea)*.

Non-minimal post expansions, on the other hand, are different in that the turn following that SPP is itself a FPP, and thereby projects at least one further turn, its responsive SPP. An example of a non-minimal post expansion sequence is shown below:

```
[Fox 1987]
1      A:  Do you like Virginia?
2      B:  Yeah.
3      A:  You do?
4      B:  Well, not really.
```

This example shows that a post-expansion FPP (line 3: *You do?*) and a post-expansion SPP (line 4: *Well, not really*) are produced when a sequence (BFPP): *Do you like Virginia?* [line 1]; BSPP: *Yeah* [line 2]) is complete, but the post-expansion is still part of the same sequence, as it serves to resolve the BAP, rather than move on to a new sequence.

Although the BAP appears to serve as a powerful normative resource for examining MRs, pre- and post-expansions also clearly reflect a functional and structural characteristic of MRs as an intrinsic pedagogical sequence construction. In the second main section, such expansion MRs will be further considered.

A Supportive MR to a Question

The notion of MRSs also contributes to an interdisciplinary investigation of supportive response sequences in which MRs may appear to take place when a learner makes an attempt to elaborate the prior speaker's response for a specific response the teacher wants or expects in shared activity *without* having been asked to do so. Analogously, Parker (1984) considers groupings of conversationalists acting in concert, and relationships between conversational activities that occur simultaneously, and suggest some implications of each for the development of more comprehensive conceptions of speech behaviour. In his study, certain interactional groupings are referred to as "teams", and their identifiable collaboration as "teamwork" (cf. Goffman 1959). This can be illustrated in the very brief extract shown in the example below, in which Sally and Herb collaborate on 'answering' behaviour: