



Turn Allocation Practices for Selecting a Speaker and Pursuing a Response in English Classroom Interaction

Amar, Cheikhna

(Citation)

神戸大学国際コミュニケーションセンター論集, 16:80-100

(Issue Date)

2020-03-31

(Resource Type)

departmental bulletin paper

(Version)

Version of Record

(JaLCD0I)

<https://doi.org/10.24546/81011986>

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/81011986>



Turn Allocation Practices for Selecting a Speaker and Pursuing a Response in English Classroom Interaction

AMAR, Cheikhna

Kobe University, Graduate School of Intercultural Studies
(Graduate Student)

Abstract

This paper analyses how teachers summon and select next speaker(s) in EFL classrooms. The focus is on three main interactional practices; (a) the teacher summons one student either by first name or full name from a carded list, (b) the teacher selects a small group of students to answer the question without specifically nominating one of them, and (c) the teacher asks a question and then opens the floor for students to bid for turn or self-select to provide the answer. The investigation also considers how teachers pursue responses when their answers do not receive timely uptake after the speaker selection is completed. My analysis of the data demonstrates that when teachers use the student's full name the selection is accomplished more smoothly than when they simply use first name. It also shows that when teachers select a small group of students, the selected students use gestures and talk to negotiate the speaker selection within the group. The findings suggest that selecting students who do not display availability can lead to extended interactional delay.

Keywords

Conversation Analysis, Turn allocation, Summoning, Pursuing response, Speaker selection

1 Introduction

One of the challenges that teachers face in language classrooms is how to actively engage students in discussion. Teachers use a variety of interactional practices in order to engage students in classroom talk. Fundamental to these practices is the question of how to locate a next speaker or speakers in the ongoing interaction, how to initiate a conversation with them and how to pursue a response when it is missing or delayed. This study therefore analyses how teachers in English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

classrooms in Japanese universities summon and select next speaker(s). In addition, the study investigates how teachers use such practices to pursue responses from students once a turn has been allocated but the second-pair part response is delayed or absent. The study contributes to previous work on turn allocation and pursuing of response in language classrooms by looking into how teachers deploy variety of practices to select next speaker and how that leads to classroom participation. It also analyses how teachers and students negotiate the turn allocation.

The investigation relies primarily on the Conversation Analysis (CA) approach that was developed by Sacks in the 1960s (Sacks, 1995). CA privileges the use of natural recordings of interactional data as a fundamental element of its approach. My analysis follows the CA methods of focusing on the social and sequential details of verbal and non-verbal elements of the participants' interaction. The transcription is based on Jefferson's conventions (2004) and notes on the gestures are shown in gray relative to the talk via a second tier, following Greer (2019). The approximate onset of the gesture is indicated with a vertical bar in both tiers. The data were recorded in four English classrooms at a university in eastern Japan. The classrooms are first year EFL classes with Japanese students and foreign teachers.

1.1 Turn allocation and Summoning

In their classic study, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) introduce what they term a turn-taking machinery in order to show how current speaker selects next speaker or next speaker self selects, and they claim that turn-taking can only happen at a transition relevance place. Due to the limits of technology available to them at the time, what is missing in this study is an analysis of the embodied practices used by interlocutors to select next speaker or self select, as SSJ were only able to analyze the speech elements, such as sentences, clauses, and phrases. In order to select next speaker, interlocutors use various interactional practices including recipient names, interrogative syntax (Lerner, 2003), pointing, nodding, and gazing (Lerner, 2003; Rossano, 2013). For example, when a speaker gazes at one particular participant during multi-party interaction the gaze serves as a tool to select an individual next speaker.

A summons is an interactional pre-sequence that serves to ready the recipient for further talk. In his seminal study Schegloff (1968) analyses how people use summons sequences in telephone conversation, where the English summons takes the form of *hello*. According to this study when the summoned answers the summoner, he or she is obliged to talk again and the summoned is obliged to listen. When the summons is not answered the summoner can repeat it up to five times according to Schegloff's study.

In face-to-face mundane interaction, a summons can be accomplished with phrases like "hey", "pardon me", or even upwardly intoned hesitation markers ("um?") and regularly also incorporates the recipient's name or some alternative address term, such as *sir* or *ma'am*.

1.2 Turn allocation and summons in the classroom

The organization of turn-taking in the classroom has been the focus of classroom-based CA research that shows how turn-taking is jointly negotiated by the teacher and student (Hauser, 2009; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mortensen, 2008). McHoul (1978) identifies a set of rules that apply to the institutional setting of classroom. For example, teachers can either specifically select a next speaker or they can open the floor and wait for one of the students to self-select. Teachers use many practices to select next speaker in the classroom; naming one student, inviting bidders, or inviting students to produce choral responses. The classroom is considered as two-party interaction with the teacher as one party and students as the other party (Lerner, 2002). The success of the teachers' turn allocation depends on the way they deliver it, as well as its timing. If the teacher uses embodied practices for turn allocation, participants need to be co-present and be able to see each other to accomplish the turn allocation (Käätä, 2012; Mortensen, 2008). Students often also need to make their reciprocity available in order to be nominated by the teacher. They can bid for the next turn by raising their hands and gazing toward the teacher (Mortensen, 2008). In order for the teacher to engage in talk with students they need to establish joint agreement on the participation. Teachers usually select those students who are gazing toward them and are thus displaying their availability or willingness to be selected (Lauzon & Berger, 2015). If there is no indication of any available next speaker, teachers may select students with particularly noticeable behavior, such as those disturbing others, and this can be taken as a form of disciplinary action. By selecting students with noticeable behavior, the teacher aims to better engage them in the activity (Lauzon & Berger, 2015). If there is no visual contact between the participants a summons is required (Gardner, 2015).

If need be, students can also obtain the teacher's attention through a variety of summoning practices, including calling them by address terms (such as Miss), their name, multiple repetitions of summonses, moving closer to the teacher, and touching the teacher (Gardner, 2015). In this study Gardner shows how children summon teachers, suggesting that summonses sometimes fail when the teacher is busy with other students at the same time. Young students also use more than just summons turn to get the teacher's attention: they can also use gestures and artifacts (Cekaite, 2008).

In this paper I examine turn allocation and summonses from a different angle. The focus will be on how teachers allocate turns or use summonses to select next speakers who have not bidden for turns or shown their availability. Previous research has shown how teachers select next speaker after students bid for turns (Kääntä, 2012), gaze toward teacher or produce noticeable behavior (Lauzan & Berger, 2015), or how students use summonses to get teacher's attention (Gardner, 2015). The current study instead looks at situations in which the teacher calls on students who have not indicated any particular readiness or willingness to respond to the question.

2 Analysis

This paper will therefore present an analysis of how teachers select students in English classrooms. Based on the data set I collected, I identified three main interactional practices with sub-practices in each one of them. The first practice is summoning one student by name from a carded list. This can be by (a) first name or (b) full name. The teacher summons one student by reading his or her name from a list and after the summons is established they move to ask a question. The second practice is the selection of a small group of three to four students. The teachers do not select a specific student but leave it to the students to decide who will answer on behalf of the group. The last practice is selecting the whole class by opening the floor after a question. The analysis will be presented in this order. Each of these practices is related to how teachers allocate turns in classroom. The first practice particularly involves summonses that teachers use to establish students' availability in order to ask them questions, and also to determine the student's location for themselves in cases where the teacher does not know the name of each class member. The remainder of the practices are related to selecting next speaker to answer a question that has already been asked. In these practices there is no need for summoning because the teacher either knows the names of the students or they are visually available to her/him. All of these practices share the fundamental starting point that teachers are selecting students who have not shown their willingness to be selected, such as by raising a hand.

In some of the excerpts the teachers needed to pursue the response after they have established the next speaker and asked a question. I will analyze the latter part of these excerpts as well.

2.1 Summoning one student by first and full name from a carded list

The following is a general schematic outline of the sequential structure of this speaker selection practice:

- T1: Summons: Teacher calls student name (FPP)
T2: Student provides response –spoken and/or embodied– (SPP)

In the following excerpts, the teacher uses a summons to select one student by reading his/her name from a carded list, which contains the names of all students in the class. The summoning is not in any order, so students do not know when their turn will come. Once the teacher has established the summoning, she/he asks the question. The analysis in this section will focus on the summoning sequence part and if there is pursuit of response after the teacher's question, I will revisit the excerpt and analyze that part later as well.

The excerpts are from an activity that takes place at the end of the class to check students' comprehensions of the material that has been taught in this class.

Excerpt 1. Repeating the summons by calling the name again

- 01 TOM okay |so naneka,
 |looks at the name cards
- 02 |(0.9)+|(0.4)
n-px |moves to the right and looks at T
t-bh |moves on name cards
- 03 TOM naneka. |if |if I am not a good
n-rh |raise
t-gz |gazes up



- 04 presenter what am i.

The teacher initiates the sequence in line 1 by closing down the prior activity with (*okay*) (Beach, 1995) and transitioning to the new activity with (*so*) and he looks down at the name cards. He then calls on Naneka by name, nominating her as the next

speaker. This is followed by 1.3 sec of silence during which the summoned student moves a little to the right to face the teacher because she is sitting behind another student and she then looks at the teacher. In line 3, the teacher repeats her name as he does not see her reaction to his selection and he asks a question immediately. The student treats this as reselecting and displays her availability by raising her right hand. However, when the teacher continues with the question she retracts the gesture quickly. The teacher gazes up briefly while he is asking the question.

In this case the teacher uses the first name as a summons to one particular student. The student reacts to this summoning by moving to face the teacher and by looking at him to display her availability. However, because the teacher is looking down at the name cards he is not able to see this and as a result the summoning fails (Kääntä, 2012; Mortensen, 2008). This appears to be the reason the teacher repeats the summoning (Gardner, 2015; Schegloff, 1968) by calling the student's name again. At this time the student raises her hand (Mortensen, 2008) as she noticed the gaze is not enough to grab the teacher's attention.

Excerpt 2. Repeating the summons using full name

```
01 TOM      |okay a::: |yuta
              |looks down at the name cards
              |looking at his notebook ----> ln 03

02          (1.9)

03 TOM      |yuta|takeda
              |looks up and shifts gaze across the class
              y-gz          |looks up toward the teacher

04 YUT      |yes
              t-gz          |looks at Yut
```

In this case, the teacher starts with *okay*, thereby transitioning to a new student. He looks down at the name cards and produces a stretched hesitation marker (*a:::*) while he is checking the list. He then produces a summons by calling the name of one student. The student does not display his availability in the next turn. In line 3, the teacher repeats the summons using the student's full name while he shifts his gaze across the class searching for the student. The student looks up at the teacher while he calls his name and then replies with a verbal response (*yes*) that displays his availability for further questioning. The summons thus constitutes a pre-sequence (Schegloff, 2007).

The teacher uses one name to select the student; however, in this case the student does not react to this selection. This might be because there are more than one Yuta in the class or at least the student is orienting to it that way. It might also be that the summoned student is resisting being selected by the teacher. When the teacher uses the full name the student then provides a response. This might indicate that speaker selection in this context is less problematic when students are nominated by their full name rather than their first name alone.

Next I will analyze the second part of Excerpt 2, in which the teacher asks a question and pursues a response for it. The excerpt will start from where the first half ends (line 05).

Excerpt 3. Speaking slowly and reformulating questions to pursue missing response

05	TOM	is is no music no life an eh ai es (HIS)
		looks down at the name card
06		(7.6)
	t-gz	looks at yut
07	TOM	is <no music no life> is ↑that an eh ai es,
08		(1.2)
09	YUT	ha- yes
10	TOM	yes okay and why?
		nods head tilt
11		what's what's one of the reasons,
12		(4.8)
	t-gz	keeps looking at yuta
13	YUT	it's memorable
14	TOM	it's memorable and it repeats

Excerpt 3 starts with the teacher asking a polar question in line 5 after the summons was completed with the student demonstrating his availability in the previous excerpt. The question is followed by long gap during which the teacher's gaze remains directed at Yuta. In this case, Yuta's embodied actions are not available in the data due to his position behind some other students. After the gap of silence the teacher, repeats his question, this time speaking very slowly and emphasizing the main part of

the question in line 7. Yuta provides a response after another 1.2 sec gap. In line 10 the teacher initiates a post-expansive account sequence (*why*) and immediately expands the question (Gardner, 2004) in line 11 to (*what's one of the reasons*) and thus seemingly treats (*why*) as ambiguous for this recipient. This also is followed by a 4.8 sec gap and the teacher keeps looking at Yuta while he waits for the response. In line 13, Yuta replies and the teacher closes the sequence by accepting Yuta's answer through repetition (Greer et al, 2009) and expanding it with further detail.

Although the teacher successfully accomplishes the summons and initiates a question after that, the student does not reply immediately. This leads the teacher to use a variety of practices such as reformulating the question and maintaining gaze at the selected student to mobilize the missing response (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). The student's delayed response after his first name is called might be because he is avoiding selection. This suggests that selecting a student from the list can lead to a delay in providing the response because the selected student may not be ready to answer the question.

2.2 Selecting small group of students

On occasions, however, teachers also select group of three or four students to answer a question that they have already asked, as shown in the following cases. The teachers do not select any particular student, but instead let them manage who will answer on behalf of the group. This section will document such instances, where a general group selection gives rise to an intermediary speaker selection phase among those within the group. For the brief period in which this negotiation takes place, the participation framework is altered and the teacher becomes a peripheral participant (Goffman, 1981). The progressivity of the talk is momentarily delayed, but once the matter is settled the teacher again becomes a ratified participant. Much of this reworking of the participant constellation is accomplished via multimodal interactional practices, including fine-grained adjustments in gaze and proximal orientations.

The following is a general schematic outline of the sequential structure of this speaker selection practice.

- T1: Teacher selects one group via gaze, gesture and talk
- T2: An insertion sequence in which the students negotiate who will take the turn
- T3: Selected student provides verbal response to teacher

In Excerpt 4 the teacher asks his students to calculate how much money they

would spend on a trip to Tokyo Disneyland. They are expected to use USD.

Excerpt 4. Students' gaze negotiate the selection of next speaker

01 TOM |okay (.) |so |how about this |↑gro|up
|looks at Kou's group
|raises his hand
|palm selects Kou's group----->ln 02



k-gz |raises his eyebrows to T
e-gz |looks down at NB
a-gz |looks up at T
j-gz |~~~ at T

02 |what's |your |number?
k-gz |looks back to the group members
j-gz |looks at Kou
a-gz |looks at Kou



t-rh |,,, raising hand

03 |(0.3)
k-gz |looks down at his NB

04 KOU |two thousand |five hundred
aya |smiles and keeps looking at kou
a-gz |looks at T

05 |twenty dollars
e-gz |looks up to T

In this case the teacher starts by selecting one group of four students. He looks at the students, points at them with his right hand, holding it (Chazal, 2015) while he verbally selects them (line 1). Three members of the group look at the teacher, but another one looks down at her notebook, meaning she might be avoiding the teacher's gaze or looking for the answer. In line 2, the teacher asks a question about the students' number referring to the amount of money and retracts the raising hand gesture as he completes the summoning action (Chazal, 2015), apparently because the students have begun to orient to the selection by moving closer to each other and started the negotiation of who will speak on their behalf. Kou, who is the closest to the teacher, looks back at his group members. Both Jun and Aya look at Kou, which could be a technique for appointing him as the speaker. Once Kou has established gaze with both of them he then looks back at his notebook and after a short gap (0.3 sec) he starts his response. At this point Aya smiles and fixes her gaze toward Kou before she looks up at the teacher. The fourth member of the group, Eri, who was looking down all this time, looks up at the teacher during the final part of Kou's response. In the remainder of the talk (not included here) the teacher repeats the answer and then moves on to select another group.

The analysis of this excerpt shows that since the teacher selects a group of four students without nominating any specific one of them, the four students must manage the turn allocation and they do this primarily through gaze. When one student looks at the rest of the students they treat it as an initiation of turn-taking and two of them look at him at the same time, which serves to select him. The fourth student's avoidance of the teacher's gaze and that of her group members suggests that she is displaying her unavailability (or unwillingness) to participate. She simply raises her head and looks up only after another student has begun to provide a response. Students can therefore use gaze to manage turn taking and to show availability and unavailability as well (Weiss, 2018).

In Excerpt 5 the teacher selects a new group of students to answer the same question.

Excerpt 5. Talk and nods to negotiate the selection of next speaker

01 TOM	okay next group
	raises rh
	points with his finger to ken's group
k-gz	looks down

- y-gz |looks at ken
- 02 | (1.1)+ | (2.1)
- k-gz |looks at you
- |the group members move
closer to each other
- 03 Ss | (speaking Japanese quietly)
- t-gz |looks at the group
- Ss-gz |other students look at the selected group
- 04 | (0.6)
- ken |nods, moves back a little and
looks at his NB
- yuu |nods back to Ken and looks at T
- 05 YUU |fifty thousand dollar
|looks at T
- 06 TOM ha[haha
- 07 Ss |[hahahaha
- yuu |shakes his head and smiles
- 08 YUU (chigau)
different
- 09 | (5.4)
- t-gz |looks at the selected group
- j-gz |looks back at the other group members
- Ss-gz |look at Jun
- 10 JUN |one point five |thousand
|looks up to tom
|looks down to his notebook
- 11 TOM we don't say that



The teacher moves to a new group and selects them by pointing with his finger and referring to both their temporal sequentiality and their physical location as they

are seated behind the group who has just finished answering (*next group*) in line 1. Yuu looks at Ken, who then looks back at him after that the four group members get closer to each other and start talking Japanese very quietly. During this time the teacher and the rest of students keep looking at the selected group. In line 4, it seems that they come to an agreement when Ken nods and Yuu nods back to him, and this completes the brief insertion sequence (Schegloff, 2007). Immediately after this, Yuu looks up at the teacher and starts his response in line 5. However, the teacher and students treat the response as wrong by laughing at its absurdity because fifty thousand dollars is far from the expected amount a student would spend at Disneyland in one day. After this Yuu, who provides the answer, shakes his head and says *chigau* in Japanese, which means wrong and therefore initiates repair on his mistake (line 08). The teacher's gaze remains directed at the selected group showing them he is still waiting for a response and he is not accepting this inapposite one. At this moment Jun shifts his gaze back to his group and two of them look at him at the same time. He treats this as a selection to be the next speaker (line 9) and looks up at the teacher as he provides his response in line 10. In line 11, the teacher points out the mistake and corrects it in the remainder of the talk (not transcribed here).

The analysis in this section has shown some ways students use their native language to manage turn-taking in EFL classrooms. It also shows how embodied practices such as nodding to each other enables group of possible next speakers to agree on who will take the next turn (Mortensen, 2009). When the students response was treated as inaccurate they were able to renegotiate the turn allocation and through gaze they selected a different speaker to repair the trouble source. The analysis also shows how the teacher is deselected from the conversation as the group members start talking amongst themselves in Japanese (Greer, 2013) to negotiate the speaker selection. However, at the same time, the teacher is still very much a part of the conversation, although he cannot be expected to continue until the question of reciprocity has been solved by the students. In that sense, their audibly adjusted and code-switched turn shows their orientation to this too, and it is an embedded sequence, since the second pair part is still hearably due to the teacher. Once the respondent has been selected, the other group members are "off the hook" and this similarly involves a readjustment of the participant framework so that they then become ratified overhearers rather than selected next speakers.

2.3 Whole class selection

Finally, in this section I consider cases in which the teachers ask questions without

specifically selecting a particular next speaker or speakers, and thus open the floor for any student to reply or orient toward the preference for choral response.

The following is a general schematic outline of the sequential structure of opening floor practice.

Turn 1: Teacher asks a question (FPP)

Turn 2: One or few students provide response (SPP)

In Excerpt 6, the teacher has written four numbers on the board as candidate responses to a multiple choice question about the populations of India, Japan and Tokyo.

Excerpt 6. Failure to get bidders after opening the floor

01 TOM | which is the population of india
 | ~~~ across Ss---->ln 6

02 | (2.7)
 Ss | smile and look at the board

03 Ss (speak Japanese quietly)

04 TOM what's the population of india

05 Ss | (0.6)
 Ss | keeps looking at the board -----> ln 11

06 SS (speaks Japanese quietly)

07 S? (di)

08 | (2.9)
 t-gz | turns and looks at the board and then looks
 back to the Ss

09 TOM ↑india

10 (1.1)

11 TOM indo indo
 india india

12 | (1.2)

13 Ss (talk in Japanese and laughs)

14 TOM |\$no\$
t-gz |~~~~ to Ss

15 (1.9)
16 S? (honto)
really

17 TOM it's |easy,
|Ss stop talking and look at the board

18 (2.7)
19 TOM |no?
|head tilt

20 (2.4)
21 TOM what's the population of japan?
22 |(0.9)
Ss-gz |look at tom and the board

23 Ss |(speaks in Japanese)
|turn to each other

24 |(2.4)
t-gz |turns and looks at the board and
turns back to Ss

25 TOM no::: |you gu- you guys (are-)
|shakes his head -----> ln 20

26 |no no (mo) |benkyo benkyo
study study
|nods

27 Ss hahaha
28 TOM |alright
|turn to the board

The teacher initiates the sequence by asking a question about which one of the three choices is the population of India without nominating a particular individual or sub-group to respond (line 1). This opens the floor with the expectation that the students will either (a) indicate a willingness to respond (such as by raising their hands) and wait for teacher to call on them, or (b) self-select to answer the question (i.e., “call out”). After this the teacher keeps looking around the class while the students are looking at the board and talking to each other in Japanese inaudibly. In line 4, the teacher reformulates his question from (*which* to *what*), although this fails to prompt any response from the students. One of the students says *di*, which might represent an initial response to the question. However, the teacher does not react to this, and neither do the rest of the students. The teacher looks at the board and then back at the students and produces a reminder of the question (*india*) in line 9 that serves to reinitiate it and therefore pursue it. When no one answers, the teacher switches to Japanese saying *indo indo*, which means India in Japanese. After this, the students start laughing and talking in Japanese louder, which could be due to the teacher’s use of Japanese. In line 14, the teacher says *no* and gazes across the class and then assesses the question as *easy* in line 17 to emphasize that it should not take all this time. Again he says *no* and tilts his head to one side showing he is surprised by their failure to answer this “easy” question. The teacher abandons the sequence when no one answers the question and instead moves to another question about the population of Japan. Again this does not get any response and the students keep speaking Japanese and looking at the board. In the rest of the talk the teacher repeats *no* multiple times (Stivers, 2004) and the word *benkyo*, which means study. By doing this he treats not answering such questions as unacceptable and that he finds their failure to answer as problematic and makes public his expectation that students should be able to answer such “easy” questions. The repetitions of these words (*no*, *benkyo*) are addressing the missing response in all of the interaction not only the prior turn and treating it as problematic. According to Stivers (2004) multiple sayings address the prior talk and aims to halt it however; in this data they are addressing the absence of talk and aims to get recipients to provide response. When all of these practices fail to elicit a response from students, the teacher then moves on and provides the responses himself.

By providing an initiating action, the teacher invites the students to bid for the turn, and some form of speaker nomination becomes relevant in the next turn. When it is found missing the teacher reacts by pursuing it, employing a range of verbal and embodied practices in order to attract some bidders. He reformulates and rephrases his question many times (Kasper & Ross, 2007), shakes his head, shifts his gaze around the

class, and uses the students' native language (Okada, 2010). None of these actions work in getting the students to provide a response in the next turn. This shows that if students do not bid and produce the next turn the teacher cannot proceed with the activity.

3 Discussion and conclusion

This study has covered several practices that classroom teachers use as summonses and turn allocating practices to identify and select a next speaker. It also linked these practices to teachers' pursuit of students' responses. The first section showed how teachers use students' first names and full names from a carded list as a means of accomplishing summons in a large group where the students' names may not be immediately available to the teacher via memory alone. The analysis shows the summoned students align to the summons with both verbal and embodied responses (Mortensen, 2009) to display their availability. It has also examined how summoning the students by full name is more successful than summoning them by just given name. Some of the students do not respond to first name summoning and the teachers need to repeat or reformulate the summonses (Gardner, 2015; Schegloff, 1968). The students may be resisting the selection or they might be not sure if they are the ones who have been summoned because there could be others in the class with the same first name. In some of the excerpts, after the teacher completes the summons and asks a question the students' responses were delayed. This may be because the summoned students were not ready to answer because they did not know the answer or did not understand the question as the teacher selected them before he asked the question. In these cases the teachers use a range of practices to pursue the missing response. They reformulate their questions, rephrase them (Kasper & Ross, 2007), and tease the students until they get a response.

The second practice is selecting a group of three or four students to answer a question. The teacher starts by asking students to form groups before he asks them a question. He then selects a group using both talk and embodied means, usually by shifting his gaze as he points or nods (Kääntä, 2012) without specifying any particular student as next speaker. The students negotiate the turn allocation organization (Markee & Kasper, 2004) through gaze and sometimes talk. The teacher waits and gives them enough time to decide the next speaker without interfering in their decision. Some students withdraw their gaze and look down to avoid being selected by the teacher or by their group members (Weiss, 2018). The analysis demonstrates that these students are left alone and are not included in the turn allocation selection process in their group.

The selected student provides an answer on behalf of his group members, but when he or she provides a wrong answer, as happened in one of the cases, other group members can take over and answer. This shows that the turn allocation is conditionally sensitive and can be (re)negotiated by the students (Mortensen, 2008) and that they orient to themselves as one party (Lerner, 2002) as they repair each other's turns. It also demonstrates the shifting of participation as the teacher is de-selected from the group when they start negotiating in Japanese (Greer, 2013) in order to find a student who will speak on their behalf. The teacher becomes an active member of the conversation again when one of the students starts to deliver the response. Arranging students in small groups provides more opportunities to include them actively in classroom interaction. However, it might also provide a window to those who do not want to participate to avoid being engaged in the interaction.

The final practice was one in which the teachers ask questions and then open the floor for students to self-select or provide a choral response. The analysis has demonstrated that opening the floor in Japanese EFL classrooms can lead to a very long pursuit of response and delay both the interactional progress and the flow of the lesson. In such cases teachers use many practices to pursue the missing response, including reformulating the question (Svennevig, 2012) and switching to the students' native language (Okada, 2010). In most of the cases in my dataset, the students' response is delayed for a significant length of time after the teachers open the floor. The teachers can avoid this by having students respond in small groups and then ask them the question as shown in the previous section (Practice 2).

In this data the teachers repeat the summonses up to two times when their first summons fails to get response. This is different from mundane talk where interlocutors repeat summonses up to five times in telephone conversation (Schegloff, 1968). It is also different from classroom talk when the students are summoning the teacher because they repeat the summonses more than ten times (Gardner, 2015).

The findings show that selecting next speaker in language classrooms happens in various ways, and this can affect students' responses. In this study when the teacher selects one student by name without the student showing his availability first or open the floor this can lead to long delays, it wastes a lot of learning opportunities for the students, and also delays the progress of the interaction. However, when the teacher asks the question and selects a small group of students to answer it this usually gets a quicker response and gives students opportunity to discuss it with each other, which creates more active learning opportunities.

References

- Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: “Okays” and “official” priorities in medical interviews. In G. H. Morris & R. J. Chenail (Eds.), *The talk of the clinic: Explorations in the analysis of the medical and therapeutic discourse* (pp. 259-289). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cekaite, A. (2008). Soliciting teacher attention in an L2 classroom: Affect displays, classroom artefacts, and embodied action. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 26-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm057>
- Chazal, K. (2015). *Pedagogical artifacts in teacher-initiated response pursuits: a conversation analytic study of interaction in the French foreign language classroom*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Gardner, R. (2004) On delaying the answer: question sequences extended after the question. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 246-266). Continuum.
- Gardner, R. (2015). Summons turns: The business of securing a turn in busy classrooms. In P Seedhouse & C. Jenks (Eds.), *International perspectives on classroom Interaction* (pp. 28-48). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greer, T., Bussinguer, V., Butterfield, J., & Mischinger, A. (2009). Receipt through repetition. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 5-34.
http://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf/jalt_journal/2009a_jj.pdf
- Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Code switching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57, 100-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.002>
- Greer, T. (2019). Initiating and delivering news-of-the-day tellings: Interactional competence as joint development. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 146, 150-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.019>
- Hauser, E. (2009). Turn-taking and primary speakership during a student discussion. In H. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 215-244). National Foreign Language Resource Centre.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 125, 13-34.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.453.9317&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=24>
- Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers’ embodied allocations in instructional interaction.

- Classroom Discourse*, 3(2), 166-186.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.716624>
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2045-2070.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.011>
- Lauzon, V. F., & Berger, E. (2015). The multimodal organization of speaker selection in classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 14-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.05.001>
- Lerner, G. (2002) Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In C.E. Ford, B.A. Fox & S.A. Thomson (Eds), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp.225–256). Oxford University Press.
- Lerner, G. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, 32, 177-201.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450332202X>
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491-500.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-14-x>
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language and Society*, 7(2) 183–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005522>
- Mortensen, K. (2008). Selecting next speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next speaker in planned activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 55-79. [10.1558/japl.v5i1.55](https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v5i1.55)
- Mortensen, K. (2009) Establishing reciprocity in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes*, 46(5), 491-515.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530902959463>
- Okada, Y. (2010). Repairing “failed” questions in foreign language classrooms. *JALT Journal*, 32(1), 55-74. https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/art3_18.pdf
- Rossano, F. (2013). Gaze in conversation. In Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T., (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 308-329). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
[10.1353/lan.1974.0010](https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010)
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030>

- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* I (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., (2004). “No no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260-293.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004.tb00733.x>
- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(1), 3-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810903471258>
- Svennevig, J. (2012). Reformulation of questions with candidate answers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2) 189-204.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912441419>
- Weiss, C. (2018). When gaze-selected next speakers do not take the turn. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 133, 28-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.016>

Acknowledgment

I am very thankful to Tim Greer for his support and guiding throughout writing this article. I am also thankful to Rue Burch and Zack Nanbu for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article. Special thanks to Watanabe Masahito for his help during data collection process and to all teachers and students in my data.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

The transcripts follow standard Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson, 2004) with embodied elements developed by Mondada (2018). The embodied elements are positioned in a series of tiers relative to the talk and rendered in gray.

	Descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between vertical lines
---->	the action described continues across subsequent lines
,,,,,	action's retraction
~~~~	the action moves or transforms in some way
TOM	the current speaker is identified with capital letters
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	slightly rising intonation
:	lengthened speech
-	cut off word
(.)	a short pause
<u>Underline</u>	stressed syllable
CAPITALS	louder volume
[]	overlapping talk
<>	slow talk
(word)	dubious hearings

Participants enacting an embodied action are identified relative to the talk by their initial in lower case in another tier along with one of the following codes for the action.

rh	right hand
gz	gaze
px	proximity