Accepted for publication: *Classroom Discourse*, April 2021

Designedly incomplete elicitations: verbal and embodied practices to mobilise student-next action in Chilean secondary EFL classrooms

Katherina Walper[ab]*, Darren Reed[c], and Heather Marsden[a]

[a] *Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York, York, UK;*

[b]*Instituto de Lingüística y Literatura, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, CHILE.*

[c]*Department of Sociology, University of York, York, UK*

*Corresponding author: Katherina Walper, Instituto de Lingüística y Literatura, Facultad de Fislosofía y Humanidades, Universidad Austral de Chile, Campus Isla Teja, Valdivia, CHILE. 5090000. katherina.walper@gmail.com

Long abstract: 192 words

Managing student participation is a key interactional and instructional task in any classroom. This is even more relevant in language classrooms, as students need to demonstrate knowledge and proficiency through the production of lexical, clausal or sentential elements. Most studies of elicitations in classroom contexts have focused on Question-Answer-sequences within the Initiation-Response-Feedback pattern (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975); however, another less-explored kind of initiation turn is that of turns with incomplete turn-constructional-units which students need to complete in the next sequential slot (Hazel & Mortensen, 2019; Koshik, 2002, 2010; Lerner, 1995; Margutti, 2010). This study explores elicitations designed as incomplete in five secondary EFL classrooms in the South of Chile. Analysis follows a multimodal Conversation Analytic approach (Mondada, 2016; Sacks et al., 1974). Results show that teachers mobilise turn-completion not only through deictic gestures to explicitly signal to students that the floor is open, but also through gaze and gestures which project the turn completion and index the relevance of the teaching materials. This study contributes to the understanding of teachers' practices to manage participation

> and progression of the pedagogical project in general, and to previous research on designedly incomplete utterances, in particular.

1. Introduction

The present study is a descriptive exploration of teachers' interactional practices to mobilise responses in elicitations designed as incomplete (Koshik, 2002). It shows the ways teachers set up the sequential environment for students to complete the suspended turns. As these turns are syntactically incomplete and, thus, do not correspond to regular transition-relevance-places (TRPs) (Sacks et al., 1974), it is the combination of teachers' verbal and embodied practices which create the conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968) for turn-transition and which secure the success of the practice in instructional and interactional terms. This study expands previous findings on designedly incomplete utterances (Hazel & Mortensen, 2019; Koshik, 2002, 2010; Lerner, 1995; Margutti, 2010) by exploring teachers' multimodal practices, such as gaze shifts, hand gestures, and the manipulation of teaching materials (TMs).

Embodied practices in interaction are key since social actions are accomplished through the interplay of bodily actions, materials, and the spoken word (Goodwin, 2000; Heath & Luff, 2013b). The focus of the present article is on uncovering the organisation of these actions in building the interactional sequence (Streeck, Goodwin, and LeBaron, 2011) in the instructional setting, as teachers have to:

> . . . calibrate their language, facial expressions, gestures, body positions, and even the use of material [artefacts] such as a textbook or smart pad such that the pedagogical project is advanced, the shared attention of students is maintained, and individual student participation is promoted. (Hall, 2019, p. 47)

The present article will explore the combination of practices deployed to mobilise student-next action. This endeavour becomes especially relevant when using TMs, as teachers' and students' orientations to each other and to the objects become key in the

unfolding interactional and pedagogical sequences.

Conversation Analytic studies of classroom talk have widely explored the Initiation-Response-Feedback or Follow-up (IRF) pattern (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), the Initiation-Reply-Evaluation (IRE) (Mehan, 1979), or Question-Answer-Comment (QAC) (AW McHoul, 1990). The focus has mainly been on the types of questions in the initiation turn (Koshik, 2010; Lee, 2006), and the actions accomplished through the third turn (Author, 2019; Hall, 2007; Hellermann, 2003; Lee, 2007; Park, 2013; Waring, 2009). Although analysis of embodied practices has gained presence in the institutional classroom context in general (Mondada, 2011; Reed & Szczepek-Reed, 2013; Sert, 2015; Szczepek Reed, 2017; Waring, 2018), and the initiation turn in particular (Mortensen, 2009; Waring & Carpenter, 2019) teachers' practices to mobilise student-responses, and learners' orientation to these practices, still need exploring, especially in initiation turns not designed as questions.

The phenomenon of incomplete initiation turns was identified on the earliest studies of pedagogical interaction. McHoul (1978) referred to *modulation* as the practice in which teachers partially repeat incorrect utterances, and students complete them by fixing the errors, while Omaggio Hadley (1993) recognised it as *pinpointing*. A few more recent studies have been done from a conversation analytical approach. These will be reviewed next.

2. Background

2.1 Designedly incomplete TCUs in classroom contexts

The syntactic characteristics of initiation turns are relevant since they affect the opportunities for participation enabled for students (Lerner, 1995; Szczepek Reed, 2017; Walsh, 2011). Lerner (1993) approached the phenomenon from a CA perspective as a way to "produce the conjoined participation of an assemblage of individuals as a single social unit" (p.218). Lerner (1995) presents an extensive account of teachers' use of incomplete TCUs. For example, a question followed by an incomplete TCU narrows down the universe of relevant answers, while a three-part-list in which the third element is withheld projects that students provide the last item.

In the context of one-to-one second language writing tutoring sessions, Koshik (2002) explored teachers' use of DIUs in repair sequences and identified three purposes: to elicit self-correction, repetition or extension of prior talk, and to prompt students to continue an action. As highlighted by Koshik (2002), 'DIUs are recogni[s]ably complete actions, even though they are recogni[s]ably grammatically incomplete' (p.288). Their features are: an incomplete TCU, continuing (or "flat") intonation, lengthening of the last syllable, and a pause or gap. In relation to embodied practices, Koshik (2002) only highlighted teachers' deictic gestures to students' notebooks.

Margutti (2010), working with whole-class sequences in Italian primary geometry lessons, identified a sub-category of DIUs: 'main-clause DIUs'(p.318). She argues that DIUs evidence students' attentiveness and willingness to participate, but that these pose little cognitive challenge for students as only knowledge display is solicited from them. She also acknowledged that pauses and gaps are a recognisable feature of the

phenomenon, but it is impossible to quantify or generalise their length as DIUs are quite varied in turn-design, purpose and sequential environment. As can be seen, previous studies on DIUs have focused on their features to initiate repair sequences, and how students demonstrate attentiveness and knowledge by completing them.

The only studies on DIUs holding a multimodal perspective, to-date, are those of Mortensen and Hazel (2011) and Hazel and Mortensen (2019) who showed that, to engage learners, teachers set up incomplete turns when using pre-designed handouts that have 'gap fills' (sentences missing some lexical components), or when producing in-situ drawings on the board, such as an incomplete family tree (p.236). Students orient to these artefacts as teachers inscribe such objects as relevant in and through interaction. The present study differs in its research design as it does not include teaching materials (TMs) pre-designed to include gaps. It uses images without any written component on them; designedly incomplete elicitations emerged naturally. Despite increasing attention towards the phenomenon, there is still need for uncovering the practices that bring about its success.

2.2 Mobilising responses

Mobilising responses from students is an interactional task which can be done verbally (through address terms, for example), or through embodied means. In naturally-occurring interactions gaze has been found to play a significant role in securing recipiency (Goodwin, 1981, 2011; Kendon, 1967; Lerner, 2003; Rossano, 2012; Stivers & Rossano, 2010); for example, there is a higher chance of obtaining a response when the speaker is gazing at the recipient (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Similarly, co-participants display recipiency and attentiveness to the turn being produced through gaze (Goodwin, 1981). This is especially relevant in multi-party

interactions, in which securing the attention of a recipient could require more interactional work since recipients might not have access to the speaker's gaze (Lerner, 2003).

In classrooms, researchers have explored gaze shifts and teachers' and learners' orientations in relation to the turn-taking system (Belhiah, 2012, 2013; Hazel & Mortensen, 2017; Mortensen, 2009; Park, 2013; Sert, 2011; Waring & Carpenter, 2019). For example, through gaze panning, teachers can display orientation to open or closed participation frameworks (Co-Author, 2000). In open frameworks it has been shown that students display incipient speakership and willingness to take the turn through in-breaths and body movements prior to the TRP (Mortensen, 2009). Through gaze teachers can also switch between these open and closed frameworks to manage the attention of the whole class once a recipient has been selected (Waring & Carpenter, 2019). In short, gaze has been identified as one of the key practices that allow for pedagogical and interactional projects to move forward.

2.3 Manipulation of teaching materials

Teaching is an intrinsically embodied complex activity (Hall & Looney, 2019) as sequences of action are not only built through talk (Goodwin, 2000; Streeck, Goodwin and LeBaron, 2011). Manipulation of TMs, such as positioning them within students' field of vision, pointing at them or even gazing towards them, aid teachers not only in mobilising responses but also in helping learners achieve the pedagogical goals. These kinds of practices can also be used to secure recipiency (Belhiah, 2009; Campisi & Ozyürek, 2013; Mondada, 2007), to mark sequence closure (Goodwin, 2000), or to provide students with feedback (Walper, 2019).

Attention towards the use of the environment's contextual configuration has increased

in recent years (Richardson & Stokoe, 2014), for example, through the manipulation of tools or objects (Hazel & Mortensen, 2014; Heath & Luff, 2013a), documents (Mikkola & Lehtinen, 2014), and technology (Balaman, 2015; Hindmarsh & Heath, 2000; Jewitt, 2013). Kääntä (2010) demonstrated how students were attuned to the teacher's change in gaze direction and body orientation when manipulating a transparency on an overhead projector. Mortensen and Hazel (2011) explored classroom sequences in the form of round robins and showed how teachers oriented to the materials, textbooks and whiteboards through pointing gestures and gaze direction.

Teachers' orientation to TMs also displays incipient repair sequences. As shown by Chazal (2015), when obtaining the correct response, teachers shifted their gaze back to the computer, hit the enter key and, thus, closed the sequence by displaying the correct answer on the screen. By contrast, if students provided incorrect candidate answers, teachers were seen to hold their posture, maintaining the floor open for other students to provide candidate replies. These studies show how material artefacts are relevant not only for teachers' practices, but also for students to anticipate the trajectory of the sequence.

3. Materials and Methods

This qualitative exploratory study of multimodal elicitations in Chilean secondary language classrooms is of an observational and a semi-interventionist nature. The study is semi-interventionist as teachers who participated carried out a jigsaw picture storytelling task which was designed to trigger different kinds of interactions: teacher in front of the class, groupwork, and whole-class interactions in which students addressed their peers. All teachers carried out the same activity (with minor adjustments, see

below). The research question that guides the study is: How do teachers mobilise student-next action in initiation turns designed as incomplete? The data for the present study consists of 4.9 hours of video recorded in five classrooms with four participating teachers (teacher A carried out the activity with two classes). Each application of the task lasted approximately 50-60 minutes. Three to five cameras were placed in the corners of the classrooms, depending on classroom size. The collection of designedly incomplete elicitations consists of 37 cases; 18 of them are non-pursued and are reported on this paper.

3.1 The jigsaw storytelling task

The story 'The Great Escape' (Dupasquier, 1996) was used to design a jigsaw picture-story task. It was selected since it had previously been used in language classroom research to elicit narration episodes among teenagers and adults (Philp, 2015). This story is about a convict who escapes from prison and, while running away from the policemen, hides in different places. Six of these places were chosen for the activity: the museum, the shopping centre, the circus, the hospital, the building on fire, and the cinema.

Teachers were given general instructions for each of the stages: first, the teacher provides instructions for the task and introduces the story (whole class interaction); second, students work in groups to arrange the pictures in order and write sentences about them (teacher-group); third, students read their sentences to the rest of the class (whole-class); fourth, students negotiate the order of the events (whole-class); and, fifth, the teacher tells them the ending of the story (whole-class).

Teaching materials comprised only images with no texts on them to allow for language

to emerge naturally, for the task to be adaptable to the different language levels among schools, and to give teachers freedom of what structures they wanted to focus on – for example, which verb tenses to practise or what vocabulary items to elicit. The set of materials included: big flashcards of the main picture of each of the six events (for the teachers to use in front of the whole class), and, for each event, a set of smaller pictures (for the students to use during groupwork). The activity and the materials were designed to be the least obtrusive and the most adaptable to students' and teachers' needs. This is considered one of the main strengths of the research design, as the task can be applied in classrooms of different contexts, ages, levels and linguistic needs. Teachers were given the freedom to skip any part they felt was unnecessary, to add stages to the activity as they felt necessary, and to manipulate, use and display the pictures in any way they felt comfortable. Students were required to work in groups, and, in all classes, they moved their tables to sit in clusters.

As explained, the pre-designed activity triggered different kinds of interactions in the classrooms, thus, allowing for elicitations to emerge not only during whole-class-interaction, but also during groupwork, as teachers checked students' progress. The task was designed in terms of the organisation of activities and not the sequences that develop on a turn-by-turn basis; thus, despite its pre-designed features, interactions that develop are naturalistic. Furthermore, as the aim was to explore the ways in which teachers and students manipulated teaching materials, the need arose to provide teachers with such objects. As mentioned, however, teachers were not given a script to follow, or a list of questions, or any instruction that could have a consequence upon the interactions that developed in each classroom. Therefore, the research design aligns with a CA approach.

3.2 Transcription, data representation, and ethics

The transcription conventions for the verbal conduct are those developed by Jefferson and common to CA (Sacks et al., 1974). It must be noted, however, that transcriptions are only depictions of the data and represent a limited and partial representation of the interactions (Ashmore & Reed, 2000). To capture multimodal practices, an adaptation of the system proposed by Mondada (2014) was used, especially since it depicts detailed information about the onset of embodied productions and their alignment with the verbal means. Data analysis and identification of verbal and embodied practices was done through ELAN (MPI, 2018). Modalities were annotated separately; audio was turned off when annotating embodied aspects.

Manual gestures (`$` symbol on the multimodal transcript) were annotated following Kendon's (2004) gesture units of preparation: (`prep`), stroke (`str`) and retraction (`retr`), along with optional stages of holding, pre-stroke and post-stroke (Kita, 1993). For the transcription of gaze (`%` symbol), following Goodwin (1980), gaze shifts were labelled with regard to the beginning of the trajectory and landing (to x) and duration (at x). Mutual gaze alignment between individuals can, thus, be easily observed on the transcriptions.

All participants were briefed about the study before deciding to participate. They were informed that the focus was on participation in the language classroom in general; they were not informed about the focus on embodied practices in order not to influence their behaviour. All participants that can be observed on the recordings signed the appropriate informed consent forms. Although students were 16/17 years of age at the time of the recordings, only one of the participating schools required letters to be sent to parents. Other schools had already asked parents for consent to do recordings as they do

this regularly. Those students that did not provide consent to be recorded and their image to be used, were placed in one group outside of the camera's field of vision. They participated in the activity, as this was part of their regular classes, but their image was not used in the study.

4. Analysis

The multimodal practices explored in the dataset correspond to gestures, analysed in terms of their types and temporality; gaze shifts, explored in terms of direction and alignment; and teachers' manipulation of the teaching materials (TMs). The aim of the study is not to evaluate teachers' and students' performance, but to identify teachers' practices to mobilise students' responses. Thus, the collection reported corresponds to non-pursued designedly incomplete elicitations (18 cases).

Results show that these are interactional and instructional practices for turn-taking, for the orchestration of choral responses, for providing semantic information, and for the projection of the turn-completion through the representation of iconic aspects of the item being elicited. As such, they occur during the initiation turn and at transition-relevant-places (TRPs) (Schegloff, 2007). As noted, however, these are not regular places of transition, but it is the ways in which these turns are produced which sets up the conditional relevance for students to produce the next action.

In the first extract, a student from the cinema screen group has just finished reading their sentences (lines 100-102). The teacher (Tea) recaps the last sentence and elicits the word "screen" through a designedly incomplete turn (lines 103-106), with the incomplete TCU in line 106 (as marked by the arrow on the transcript). Student 2 completes the suspended turn (line 108) and the teacher confirms the appropriateness of the answer. During the entire excerpt the teacher's gaze is directed towards St4.

Extract 1: A-00_18_51-Screen_B_whole_class

```
((St2 is reading the sentences written by him and his group))
100   St4:  final. eee:hm
101         (1.2)
102   St4:  going to cinema screen
103   Tea:  ookay. he passes-
104   Tea:  he's (.)chased    $ by the police   $ and
      Thnd: >> RH prep        $ RH str          $ RH prep >>

105         they$ walk jus#t (0.3) $ in front of     $
      Thnd: >>  $RH 2 strokes       $ RH retr        $
                          #fig.1
```

[Fig.1]

```
106 →       $the (.)  c $ine  $ma:  #$
      Thnd: $LH prep    $ str $ hold $
                                   #fig.2
```

[Fig.2]

```
107         $(0.3)$+(0.1)
      Thnd: $prep $ str >>

108   St4:  [ehscre $   [en
109   St2:  [scree#en
110   Tea:              [sc   $ ree:n yes very good
      Thnd: >>      $ LH retr $
                   #fig.3
```

[Fig. 3]

As shown by the multimodal transcript, the teacher produces an iconic gesture to represent the cinema screen and the action of running in front of the screen (right open palm sliding gesture (fig.1) when paraphrasing the student's sentence. Then, Teacher A produces the elicitation which is designed as a compound-noun; he produces the first noun but withholds the second. He mobilises the turn completion through a combination of practices: he puts the verbal turn on hold, as signalled by the lengthening of the vowel at the end of "cinema" (line 106) and does forward-gesturing (Jurgen Streeck, 2009) towards the selected student with his left open pal. This gesture is extended further at TRP (fig.3). St4 orients to the practice and produces the elicited item in overlap with this last gesture (line 108). Teacher A confirms the correct answer.

A second example is Teacher C who is recapping the names of the events of the story during whole class interaction. She prompts the museum group in extract 2 with the incomplete clause "your story is the ___" (line 93) and holds a deictic gesture towards them.

Extract 2: C-00_46_16-H-Then_your_story_is_the

```
93 → Tea:      THE$N your$ story is the-#
     Tgze  >> at museum group          >>
     Thnd  >> hold$ beat $ hold        >>
                                        #fig.4
```

[Fig.4]

```
94          (0.3) $
     Tgze  >>
     Thnd >>     $

95   St6:  the museum
96   Tea:  the museum.
```

This elicitation sequence occurred in the context of a round robin; and, as exposed by Mortensen and Hazel (2011) these sequences are characteristic because they set up a routine that students can orient to. Teacher C prefaces the elicitation turn with gaze directed to the group and the preparation stage of her deictic gesture (not pictured above). She produces and holds the first stroke (line 93); St6 orients to this and gazes up towards her. Teacher C establishes recipiency in beginning position (Mortensen, 2009) by means of embodied practices, not through a verbal address term (c.f. Kääntä 2010). She holds the deictic gesture (fig.4) while maintaining gaze alignment with St16 and produces the incomplete TCU in which she includes the article of the noun phrase, but the noun is withheld (line 93). This combination of practices, and the position of the elicitation within a wider sequence, makes the completion of the ongoing turn a relevant next action by the group. St16 responds "the museum" (line 95) and the teacher

confirms the response with a repeat of "the museum" (line 96).

Extract 3 occurs during groupwork. Teacher B is providing the group with feedback and elicits the noun "police". She rearranges the TMs, points at one picture, taps, gazes up towards St4 and pans her gaze through the group. The temporality of the teacher's gaze panning is displayed in the multimodal transcription (% symbol) and in figure 4 below:

Extract 3: B-00_25_07-T-G6-A-Police

```
53 →  Tea:  and %he   $WAS (.) running$ from $ the:
      Tgze      %      at pictures on her R         >>
      Thnd  >>RH to TM$ moves TM to R $ point$ holds >>

54          (0.2)#%$ + (0.4)  % +(0.5)#% + (0.3)#%
      Tgze  >>    %  to St4   % at St4 % to St1  %
      Thnd  >>     $ at TM tapping                  >>
            fig.5#a                   #b       #c

55    St3:  %poli #%    [ce
56    St4:              [poli ¤ce   %
      Tgze  %to St2%  to St3        %
                  #d
```

[Fig. 5]

In this elicitation, the syntactically incomplete TCU consists of the particle "from" and the determiner "the" as part of the prepositional phrase "from the police" (line 53). In this initiation turn (line 53), Teacher B gazes at the picture and moves them to her right, as shown on the multimodal transcription. She points at the picture and holds the gesture alongside the production of the lengthened vowel in the article. She shifts her gaze from the TM at TRP (fig.4a) to St4 (fig4b) and taps on the TM (line 54). She then shifts her gaze to St1 (fig.4c) during the gap and, lastly, to St2 (fig.4d) to acknowledge and confirm the responses provided by St3 and St4 (line 55 and 56).

It is the combination of these practices which sets up the conditional relevance for students to complete the turn. The teacher's pointing, looking at, and tapping on the

materials index their relevance for the completion of the suspended turn, while her gaze shifts display orientation to an open participation framework. These practices strengthen the opportunity for students to self-select and to provide a completion to the designedly incomplete elicitation.

In the next extract, Teacher B is talking to the shopping centre group and is helping them construct their sentences in past continuous. She traces the direction of the character's movement on the teaching materials (line 10), points at the relevant picture (line 11), and elicits the action "going upstairs" through an incomplete verbal turn "Alf was ___" (line 12), which is then followed by a pantomimic gesture representing the action of going upstairs: she alternates her right and index fingers with an upwards movement (line 13, figure 5).

Extract 4: B-00_15_16-T-G6-Upstairs

```
10    Tea:  okay so now you h$ave to say
      Tgze  >> at TM                        >>
      Thnd  >> tracing TM    $ prep         >>

11          (0.2) $ + (0.2)
      Tgze  >>
      Thnd  >>    $ str pointing >>

12 →  Tea   A $L F  w a:$s    $
      Tgze  >>
      Thnd  >>$ RH to R $ hold$
      St1g  >>

13          $(0.2)% +(0.4)% + (0.4)#
      Tgz3  >>    % to St2% at St2 >>
      Thnd  $RH index and mid f. alternate up>>
                                  #fig.6
```

[Fig. 6]

```
14    St1:  going [up
15    Tea:        [going upstair:s=
16          =<was going upstair> (.) past continuous
17          (0.4)
18          <was going upstairs>
```

In this excerpt, Teacher B prefaces the elicitation with the instruction "so now you have to say" (line 10). She layers this turn by indexing the relevance of the TMs through deictic gestures with her right index finger, pointing and tracing it. The stroke of her pointing gesture is produced at the onset of the incomplete TCU "Alf was" (line 12); she slides her right finger to the right, holds it in the relevant section of the image and projects the completion of the turn through a pantomimic gestural production which represents the action of the character not produced verbally. Her gaze follows her right-hand movements through the TMs and pantomimic gesture; when reaching the TRP, Teacher B shifts her gaze towards St2 and then to St1 upon St1's candidate answer (line 14). Although the verbal turn is suspended, the embodied actions continue beyond it, providing the verbally incomplete turn with a multimodal projection (Mondada, 2007). The students orient to the practice as their gaze follows the teacher's hand. St1 produces a candidate answer; the teacher acknowledges it through head-nods, repeats it in the third turn, and clarifies that it is the past continuous.

The last excerpt corresponds to one of the deviant cases[1] identified on the data set of designedly incomplete elicitations. Teacher C is eliciting the vocabulary "running" and

[1] In CA, deviant cases are commonly used to explore the phenomenon in other sequential environments and also to highlight certain characteristics of the phenomenon itself by showcasing moments in interaction that also present similar characteristics, but do not conform to the main collection (Kasper & Wagner, 2014).

does so in a similar way to Teacher B in the previous excerpt. She projects the completion of the turn "he continue[s] ___" (line 183) through a pantomimic gesture; however, she self-completes the ongoing turn, making this a deviant case. Nonetheless, students orient to the practice and produce candidate answers in partial overlap (lines 185,186). As can be seen in figure 7, the gestural completion is done with both hands in fists with upward and downward movements.

Extract 5 Deviant case: C-00_46_16-Running

```
182   Tea:  THEN (0.3)  #
      Tgze  >> at g1 >>
      Thnd  >> prep  >>
                  Fig.7 #a

183 →       he$# cont   #inue
      Tgze  >>
      Thnd  >>$ LH RH alternate up down >>
               #b       #c
```

[Fig. 7]

```
185   Tea:  runni [ng
186   Sts:        [ run [ning
187   Stx:              [run to the park
```

Although this example does not conform to the type of cases presented because the teacher self-completes the elicitation, it shows two main points about the phenomenon: first, the relevance of the TRP for students' completion of the turn; and, second, students' orientation to the practice.

In the first place, the fact that the teacher provides a completion of the turn herself shows that a turn-completion was made relevant in that slot. In the second place, the saliency of the phenomenon is visible in that students produce completions as well. They even provide an expanded version of the completion "run[ning] to the park", showing that they orient to the turn-transition made-relevant by Teacher C. The

concluding discussion below will shed more light into the phenomenon as well as identify this study's contributions to the current state of knowledge of the phenomenon.

5. Discussion

As explained above, turn-design is one of the key features for the success of the phenomenon as this kind of turn narrows down the possibilities for students' participation. The five cases presented showed the variety of resources that teachers deploy in mobilising student turn-completions: gaze at the selected next-speakers or panning in open participation frameworks, gestures which layer the teachers' turns, gestures for turn-taking, manipulation and orientation to the teaching materials, and gestural completions. Through these practices, teachers make student next-action relevant in the next sequential slot. This section discusses the findings we have presented above in relation to the practices that teachers deploy to manage turn-allocation and to display recipiency, to project turn completions and to index the relevance of the teaching materials.

5.1 Managing turn-allocation and recipiency

Findings show that the resources used to mobilise student-next action and allocate turns are tightly linked with the kinds of participation frameworks that teachers establish. In open frameworks, teachers deploy gaze shifts and gaze panning to strengthen students' opportunity to self-select (Goffman, 1974) (extracts 3, 4). This action of giving up the floor is also visible in teachers' body positions as they display orientation to everyone and not just one particular student or group. These different resources are oriented to by students who self-select and provide candidate completions.

In closed frameworks, teachers produce deictic gestures along with gaze towards the selected speakers (extracts 1, 2, 5). They display recipiency by holding gaze alignment with the selected speakers when they take the turn (extract 1), by maintaining their gaze directed towards the selected speaker so they look up (extract 2), and by holding their forward-gesturing (Jurgen Streeck, 2009) until a response is obtained (extracts 1, 2). It is the teacher who displays orientation to the student or group of students as the one/ones accountable for producing the next action.

Similar to Kääntä's (2010) findings, teachers also hold motionless body-postures when displaying orientation for students to self-select (extracts 2, 5). They hold their pointing gestures towards the selected student (extracts 1, 3, 5) or group acting as a collective (extract 2) while orienting to the candidate answers (extracts 1, 2, 3). Similar to Waring and Carpenter's (2019) findings, teachers also switch between frameworks through gaze shifts when, for example, when other students than the selected speaker provide candidate answers, as was the case of extracts 2 and 5. As can be noted, the practices deployed by teachers when doing syntactically incomplete elicitations help them secure turn-transition as they signal to students that they are accountable for producing the next action.

5.2 Projecting turn completions

As presented, findings show that teachers accompany their initiation turns with gestures which project the item being elicited. Iconic and pantomimic gestures during initiation turns and at TRPs aid teachers in moving their pedagogical projects forward. These practices not only ground or provide context and semantic information to the ongoing initiation turns but, in some cases, are key in providing students with the interactional space to produce the next action. For example, in extract 1, Teacher C uses

his right hand to provide semantic information along with the initiation turn and switches to his left hand to signal to the student that he is the selected speaker. This 'two-handedness' (Azaoui, 2015) clearly shows this teacher's carefully coordinated actions. In the case of Teacher B in extract 4, she repeats the 'going upstairs' gesture until a student self-selects. These practices not only show that the teacher's ongoing actions are put on hold, but also narrow down the possible completions by providing semantic information. Teachers' embodied practices are carefully coordinated with the initiation turns (Lazaraton, 2004; van Compernolle & Smotrova, 2017). Furthermore, students display attentiveness and understanding to the unfolding contingencies by completing the relevant actions.

5.3 Indexing the relevance of the teaching materials

Results show that indexing the relevance of TMs is mainly accomplished through gaze shift to the materials, deictic gestures and the manipulation of the flashcards. These practices are deployed in different sequential positions: before the initiation turns to ground the elicitation sequences (extract 3), at the onset of the initiation turn (extract 4), or at the moment upon reaching the TRP.

Similar to Tulbert and Goodwin's (2011) concept of choreographing social actions, the teachers in the study manipulate, point at or trace the materials in order to index the their relevance. Sequences of action are not only formulated through verbal conduct (Goodwin, 2000; Streeck, Goodwin and LeBaron, 2011; Mondada, 2011, 2013).

For example, in extract 3, Teacher B points towards the TM, rearranges them on the table within the students' field of vision and holds the pointing gesture while shifting her gaze up to pan across the students. Students orient to these practices as they gaze towards the materials, and then towards their teacher. Another way of indexing the

relevance is by tracing the trajectory of the character on the picture and by animating the actions shown, as was the case of the 'screen' iconic gesture, and the 'going upstairs' and 'running' pantomimic gestures. Teachers animate the central elements shown in the TM. This expands Mortensen and Hazel's (2009, 2019) findings as the materials in the present study do not have text on them. Teachers inscribe them as relevant for the progression of the sequence through talk and through the embodied conduct.

6. Conclusions

This article has presented teachers' practices to mobilise student-next action in designedly incomplete initiation turns. The study consisted of teachers' application of a picture-story task with stages of whole class and group interactions. Data analysis followed a multimodal conversation analytic approach with focus on the initiation turns of the elicitation sequences. Findings showed that teachers produce not only gestures to provide students with the turn, but also to index the relevance of the materials and to project turn-completions.

The present study is a contribution to the current state of knowledge on designedly incomplete elicitations as it is not constrained to exploring the phenomenon in repair sequences (Koshik 2002) and explores the combination of verbal and embodied practices with teaching materials which are not designed as incomplete (Hazel & Mortensen, 2019). It also presents a contribution to the analysis of gestures in classroom settings through an interactional perspective. In particular, it backs previous studies of teachers' manipulation of and orientation to material objects in the classroom

(Chazal, 2015; Hazel & Mortensen, 2017, 2019; Kääntä, 2010; Mortensen & Hazel, 2011) and the use of gestural and embodied practices to mobilise student participation. Finally, contribution is also made by identifying teachers' effective practices in mobilising student-next action. This constitutes a step forward to the application of the research findings back into the classroom (Whong, Gil, & Marsden, 2014), as identifying practices constitutes the first step in understanding the intricacies of classrooms talk.

Acknowledgements

We want to thank the teachers and students who were part of the study and kindly provided us with access to their classrooms. We also want to thank Dr Merran Toerien and Dr Spencer Hazel for their comments as examiners of Katherina's PhD thesis.

Funding

This work was supported by the BecasChile CONICYT scholarship for postgraduate studies: PFCHA/Doctorado en el extranjero. Becas Chile/2014 - 72150154.

References

Ashmore, M., & Reed, D. (2000). Innocence and Nostalgia in Conversation Analysis: The Dynamic Relations of Tape and Transcript. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *1*(3).

Author. (2019). xx.

Azaoui, B. (2015). Polyfocal classroom interactions and teaching gestures: An analysis of nonverbal orchestration. In *Gesture and Speech in Interaction Conference*. Nantes, France.

Balaman, U. (2015). ScienceDirect Collaborative construction of online L2 task accomplishment through epistemic progression. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*, 604–612.

Belhiah, H. (2009). Tutoring as an embodied activity: How speech, gaze and body orientation are coordinated to conduct ESL tutorial business. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(4), 829–841.

Belhiah, H. (2012). Gesture as a resource for intersubjectivity in second-language learning situations. *Classroom Discourse*, *4*(2), 11–129.

Belhiah, H. (2013). Using the Hand to Choreograph Instruction: On the Functional Role

of Gesture in Definition Talk. *Modern Language Journal*, *97*(2), 417–434.

Campisi, E., & Ozyürek, A. (2013). Iconicity as a communicative strategy: Recipient design in multimodal demonstrations for adults and children. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *47*(1), 14–27.

Chazal, K. (2015). *Pedagogical Artifacts in Teacher-Initiated Response Pursuits: A Conversation Analytic Study of Interaction in the French Foreign Language Classroom*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Co-Author. (2000). *xx*.

Dupasquier, P. (1996). *The Great Escape*. Walker Books Ltd.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. US: Northeastern University Press.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievement of a State of Mutual Gaze at Turn-Beginning. *Sociological Inquiry*, *50*(3–4), 272–302.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*, 1489–1522.

Goodwin, C. (2011). Contextures of Action. In Jürgen Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World* (pp. 182–193). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the Roles of Correction and Repair in Research on Second and Foreign Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(4), 511–526.

Hall, J. K. (2019). *Essentials of SLA for L2 Teachers: A Transdisciplinary Framework*. New York: Routledge.

Hall, J. K., & Looney, S. D. (2019). The Embodied Work of Teaching. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hazel, S., & Mortensen, K. (2014). Embodying the institution-Object manipulation in developing interaction in study counselling meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *65*, 10–29.

Hazel, S., & Mortensen, K. (2017). The classroom moral compass–participation, engagement and transgression in classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(3), 214–234.

Hazel, S., & Mortensen, K. (2019). Designedly Incomplete Objects as Elicitation Tools in Classroom Interaction. In D. Day & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Objects, Bodies and Work Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Heath, C., & Luff, P. (2013a). Embodied action and organisational interaction: Establishing contract on the strike of a hammer. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *46*(1), 24–38.

Heath, C., & Luff, P. (2013b). Embodied Action and Organizational Activity. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 283–

307). US: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, *32*(1), 79–104.

Hindmarsh, J., & Heath, C. (2000). Sharing the Tools of the Trade: The interactional constitution of workplace objects. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *29*(5), 523–562.

Jewitt, C. (2013). Multimodal methods for researching digital technologies. *The SAGE Handbook of Digital Technology Research*, 250–265.

Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective*. *Jyväskylä studies in humanities*. Academic dissertation, Faculty of Humanities, University of Jyväskylä.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 171–212.

Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica*, *26*, 22–63.

Kendon, A. (2004). Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kita, S. (1993). *Language and thought interface: A study of spontaneous gestures and Japanese mimetics*. University of Chicago.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *35*(3), 277–309.

Koshik, I. (2010). Questions that convey Information in teacher-student conferences. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlick (Eds.), *Why Do You Ask?: The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse* (pp. 159–186). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and Speech in the Vocabulary Explanations of One ESL Teacher: A Microanalytic Inquiry. *Language Learning*, *54*(1), 79–117.

Lee, Y. (2006). Respecifying Display Questions: Interactional Resources for Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(4), 691–713.

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

Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text*, *13*(2), 213–245.

Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities. *Discourse Processes*, *19*, 111–131.

Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, *32*(02), 177–201.

Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *43*(4), 315–345.

McHoul, Alexander. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom.

Language in Society, *7*, 183–213.

McHoul, AW. (1990). The Organization of Repair in Classroom Talk. *Language in Society*, *19*(3), 349–377.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. MA: Harvard University Press.

Mikkola, P., & Lehtinen, E. (2014). Initiating activity shifts through use of appraisal forms as material objects during performance appraisal interviews. In M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Heinemann, & M. Rauniomaa (Eds.), *Interacting with Objects. Language, Materiality, and Social Activity. Amsterdam* (pp. 57–78). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, *9*(2), 194–225.

Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 542–552.

Mondada, L. (2013). Embodied and spatial resources for turn-taking in institutional multi-party interactions: Participatory democracy debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *46*(1), 39–68.

Mondada, L. (2014). Conventions for multimodal transcription. Retrieved July 7, 2016, from https://franzoesistik.philhist.unibas.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/franzoesistik/mondada_multimodal_conventions.pdf

Mondada, L. (2016). Multimodal resources and the organization of social interaction. In A. Rocci & L. de Saussure (Eds.), *Handbook for verbal communication* (pp. 329–350). Berlin: De Gryuter.

Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing recipiency in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes*, *46*(5), 491–515.

Mortensen, K., & Hazel, S. (2011). Initiating Round Robins in the L2 Classroom: Preliminary observations. *Novitas-ROYAL: Research on Youth and Language*, *5*(1), 55–70.

MPI. (2018). ELAN (Version 4.9.1) [Computer software] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive. Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive. Retrieved from https://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan/

Omaggio Hadley, A. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Park, Y. (2013). The Roles of Third-Turn Repeats in Two L2 Classroom Interactional Contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(2), 145–167.

Philp, J. (2015). Eliciting oral production of target forms in peer interaction: Challenges and options. In A. Mackey & E. Marsden (Eds.), *Advancing Methodology and Practice: The IRIS Repository of Instruments for Research into Second Languages* (pp. 149–175). New York: Routledge.

Reed, D., & Szczepek-Reed, B. (2013). Building an Instructional Project: Actions as components of musical masterclasses. In B. Szczepek Reed & G. Raymond (Eds.), *Units of Talk - Units of Action* (pp. 313–342). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Richardson, E., & Stokoe, L. (2014). The order of ordering: Objects, requests and embodied conduct in a public bar. In M. Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T., & Rauniomaa (Ed.), *Interacting with Objects. Language, Materiality, and Social Activity. Amsterdam* (pp. 31–56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rossano, F. (2012). *Gaze Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction*. Universiteit Nijmegen.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696–735.

Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist*, *70*(6), 1075–1095.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sert, O. (2011). *A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms*. Newcastle University School.

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

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing Response. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *43*(1), 3–31.

Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (2011). Embodied Interaction in the Material World: An Introduction. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World* (pp. 1–26). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Streeck, Jurgen. (2009). Forward-gesturing. *Discourse Processes*, *46*(2–3), 161–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530902728793

Szczepek Reed, Beatrice. (2017). Creating space for learner autonomy: an interactional perspective. *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(2), 175–190.

Tulbert, E., & Goodwin, M. H. (2011). Choreographies of Attention: Multimodality in a Routine Family Activity. In Jurgen Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World* (pp. 79–92). New York: Cambridge University Press.

van Compernolle, R. A., & Smotrova, T. (2017). Gesture, meaning, and thinking-for-teaching in unplanned vocabulary explanations. *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(3), 194–213.

Walper, K. (2019). An exploration of EFL teachers' interactional practices in feedback provision. In I. Galhano, E. Galvão, & A. Cruz (Eds.), *Recent perspectives on gesture and multimodality*. New York: Cambridge Scholars Publishing Ltd.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. New York: Routledge.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (initiation-response-feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning*, *59*(4), 796–824.

Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(1), 57–67.

Waring, H. Z., & Carpenter, L. B. (2019). Gaze shifts as a resource for managing attention and recipiency. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Whong, M., Gil, K.-H., & Marsden, H. (2014). Beyond paradigm: The "what" and the "how" of classroom research. *Second Language Research*, *30*(4), 551–568.