"BUT THIS IS WRITING": POST-EXPANSION IN STUDENT-INITIATED SEQUENCES

Christine M. JACKNICK[*]

Abstract: Although conversation analysis (CA) began as a field focused on everyday talk-in-interaction, focus quickly extended to institutional talk (c.f., Drew & Heritage, 1992). Conversation-analytic research on classrooms has yielded an enormous base of knowledge about how the work of classrooms is done in and through language. Language classrooms have received a great deal of focus, with entire monographs dedicated to the subject (Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). Using conversation analysis to examine one type of sequence in classroom talk, this study focuses on the occurrence of post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. In these cases, the traditional three-part exchange is inverted; a student initiates a sequence, the teacher responds, and the student follows-up in the third turn in some way. In particular, both minimal and non-minimal post-expansions are examined not only in terms of their sequential placement, but also in terms of the interactional accomplishments of such turns. By detailing student use of post-expansion, this study demonstrates student use of power-moves in initiating sequences, role reversal, and student-created "wiggle room" (Erickson, 2004) – all of which suggest that the students are agents in their own learning.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, post-expansion, student-initiated sequences, agency, IRE

Özet: Konuşma Çözümlemesi (KÇ) günlük iletişimdeki konuşmaya odaklanan bir alan olarak başlamış olsa da, bu ilgi hızlı bir şekilde kurumsal konuşmalara da yayıldı (c.f., Drew & Heritage, 1992). Sınıflara yönelik konuşma çözümlemesi araştırmaları sınıftaki çalışmaların dil aracılığıyla nasıl yapıldığına dair çok büyük bir bilgi birikimi sağlamıştır. Dil sınıfları tamamiyle konuya adanmış monograflar (Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004) ile büyük bir ilgi odağı olmuşlardır. Konuşma Çözümlemesi kullanarak sınıf içi konuşmadaki ardışımın bir türünü inceleyen bu çalışma, öğrenci girişimli ardışımlardaki art-genişletme oluşumuna odaklanmaktadır. Bu durumlarda, geleneksel üç bölümlü değişim tersine çevirilmektedir; bir öğrenci ardışımı başlatır, öğretmen cevap verir, ve öğrenci üçüncü sırada bir şekilde bunu takip eder. Özellikle hem minimal hem de minimal olmayan art-genişletmeler sadece ardışıklıktaki yerleri bakımından değil, aynı zamanda bu tür sıralamaların etkileşimsel tamamlanmaları bakımından da incelenmektedir. Öğrencinin art-genişletme kullanımını detaylı bir şekilde inceleyen bu çalışma, öğrencinin ardışımları başlatmadaki güç hamlelerini kullanımını, rol değişimlerini ve öğrenci tarafından oluşturulan "esneklik payını" (Erickson, 2004) sergilemektedir; ki bunların hepsi öğrencilerin kendi öğrenmelerinde etken olduklarını önermektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Konuşma Çözümlemesi, art-genişletme, öğrenci-girişimli ardışımlar, etkinlik, IRE

Introduction

Teacher-initiated three-part sequences – alternately called Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF, Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE, Mehan, 1979), Question-Answer-Comment (QAC, McHoul, 1985), "the recitation" (Nystrand, 1997, p. 3), or Initiation-Response-Follow-up (Hall & Walsh, 2002) – have been identified as the basic interactional structure in the classroom. The teacher initiates the sequence, the student responds, and the teacher follows up in the third turn in some way (e.g., with an evaluation). This third turn may be considered a type of post-expansion by the teacher, either accepting and/or assessing the student

---

[*] Assistant Professor, Borough of Manhattan Community College, New York, USA, cjacknick@bmcc.cuny.edu.

response (acting as a "sequence-closing third" (Schegloff, 2007)), or expanding the sequence if the teacher initiates repair[1]. Despite the prevalence of this structure, as Cazden (2001) notes, IRE/F is not the only type of interaction in the classroom, and indeed, as Seedhouse (2004) argues, this sequence is used to vastly different effect depending on the context in which it occurs. This paper examines *student*-initiated sequences involving post-expansion in order to highlight how students utilize this practice to direct the trajectory of sequences in the classroom. While Markee (1995) argues that teachers often use counter-questions to regain control of sequences, this data shows students shaping talk in the classroom, not only by initiating sequences, but by directing their expansion as well. These sequences present an interesting inversion of the typical exchange in the classroom; in these cases, the students initiate, teachers respond, and the students themselves take the third turn to follow up on the teacher's response in some way. This study contributes to conversation analytic research on sequencing in interaction, particularly post-expansion sequences, as well as to research on student participation and agency in the classroom. Given the relevance to these two areas, a brief discussion of post-expansion will be presented, followed by a review of studies on student initiation. I argue that this analysis of post-expansion sequences and student initiation provides a means to closely examine small moments of student agency in the classroom.

Post-Expansion
In their seminal study on the organization of turn-taking in everyday talk-in-interaction, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) identify a bias for the prior speaker to be selected as the next speaker, such that if A speaks first, followed by B, A is the most likely next speaker. This bias can be seen at work in post-expansions, where the speaker of a first turn (the first pair part) takes an additional turn relevant to the sequence following the second turn (the second pair part). A typical example is shown below.

> 1   A: What time is it?
> 2   B: 6 o'clock.
> 3 →   A: Oh.

In this example, A, the speaker of the first pair part, follows the second pair part with *Oh*, suggesting that A did not previously know the time (Heritage, 1984). Schegloff (2007) argues that expansion is possible following all adjacency pairs, but notes that sequences involving preference structure[2] (c.f., Pomerantz, 1984) are more likely to take post-expansion. Schegloff identifies two main types of post-expansion – minimal and non-minimal – and describes several different types of each. Each variant will be briefly described below, but particular attention will be given to the two types of post-expansion identified in this data: minimal post-expansion, and rejection/challenge/disagreement with the second pair part.

---

[1] Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) consider repair to be "a generic term...used...to cover a wide range of phenomena" (p. 57) encompassing all sources of trouble in the talk to which participants orient. Trouble sources can include production trouble (e.g., stumbles or stuttering) and factual errors, among other categories.

[2] Preference refers not to how any speaker would prefer their interlocutor to respond, but to way in which turns are designed to prefer certain responses. An invitation may be designed with different preference structures, such that *Do you want to come over for dinner?* prefers an affirmative response, whereas *You don't want to come over for dinner, do you?* prefers a negative response.

Minimal Post-Expansion

Minimal post-expansion turns are called sequence-closing thirds by Schegloff (2007) because they are "*designed* to constitute a *minimal* expansion after the second pair part [italics in original]" (p. 118), i.e., they represent one additional turn added to the sequence that does not project any further talk. As such, they are much more likely to occur following preferred second pair parts, which generally require less expansion (examples are provided below). Schegloff notes that the most common minimal post-expansions are *Oh*, *Okay*, and assessments, though combinations of these three are also frequent.

The particle *Oh* has received attention in its own right as a change-of-state token (c.f., Heritage, 1984), and Schegloff argues that it is utilized to mark information receipt, particularly when the sequence is focused on information-seeking. *Okay* has likewise received a great deal of analytic focus (c.f., Beach, 1993, 1995), and Schegloff posits that when utilized as a third-turn post-expansion, *Okay* not only accepts the second pair part, but also registers acceptance of the stance of the speaker of the second pair part. This type of post-expansion is most relevant in sequences requiring a responsive action, as in the following hypothetical example:

1	A:	You should let me know when you're done.
2	B:	I will.
3 →	A:	Okay.

Speaker A's *Okay* in line 3 accepts B's response in line 2 as a sufficient second pair part, and accepts B's stance, i.e., as willing to accede to A's indirect request. Assessments, on the other hand, convey the stance of the speaker of the first pair part toward the response of the speaker of the second pair part, as in this hypothetical example:

1	A:	How was the game?
2	B:	It was fun.
3 →	A:	That's good.

Combinations of some or all of these three types of sequence-closing thirds are also possible, as when a speaker says *Oh, okay*, registering both receipt of information and acceptance. The final type of sequence-closing third considered by Schegloff is musings or post-mortems, additions to the sequence "drawing a moral, sympathizing or formulating the result of upshot" (p. 143) of the preceding sequence.

1	A:	How was the game?
2	B:	It was fun.
3 →	C:	It's nice you all had a good time.

The second excerpt included in the Analysis includes several examples of sequence-closing thirds, including *Oh*, *Okay*, and a post-mortem. These minimal post-expansions extend the sequence just one turn further, and so while student use of this practice is of note because it shows students in control of the sequence they initiated, student use of non-minimal post-expansion shows them directing the trajectory of further talk by extending the sequence beyond the third turn. Further, these non-minimal expansions create a judgment of the prior speaker's turn by rejecting, challenging, or disagreeing with that turn. The power to make such judgments

lends credence to the claim that student use of post-expansions demonstrates student agency, and I will argue in the discussion, shows them as agents of their own learning.

Non-Minimal Post-Expansion

While sequence-closing thirds project the end of the sequence, the third turn in non-minimal post-expansion projects a further turn. Schegloff (2007) identifies five types of this practice, including other-initiated repair, topicalization, first pair part reworkings, "disagreement-implicated other-initiated repair", and rejection/challenge/disagreement with the second pair part (p. 151). The first four will be briefly described, but more attention will be given to this last practice, which will be seen in Excerpts 1 and 3 in the analysis.

Other-initiated repair in the third turn relates to problems in hearing or understanding the second pair part. Topicalization works to expand the sequence by marking something in the second pair part as of interest (e.g., "Oh, really?"). Reworkings of the first pair part involve the speaker reformulating their turn following the second pair part, usually in order to secure a different, preferred response from their interlocutor, as in the example below.

1	A:	Do you want to watch the game at our place?
2	B:	Uh, no, I think we'll just hang out here.
3 →	A:	We just got a new big screen TV.

These three practices allow for post-expansion of the sequence with minimal or no misalignment. The final two to be discussed, however, involve disagreement and so may require more expansion to resolve the misalignment.

Disagreement-implicated other-initiated repair, which is found in the data presented in this paper, is used to express disagreement with a (usually dispreferred) second pair part indirectly. By initiating repair, the speaker of the third turn allows their interlocutor an opportunity to "back down" from their dispreferred turn by questioning it.

1	A:	Do you want to watch the game at our place?
2	B:	Uh, no, I think we'll just hang out here.
3 →	A:	Are you sure?

The misalignment between speakers is resolved by one of the parties retreating from their position. In the example above, Speaker B may respond by saying *Well, I guess it's been a while since we've seen you*, thereby backing down from the rejection of the invitation.

While rejection/challenge/disagreement with the second pair part likewise involves misalignment between speakers, in this case, the third turn is used to overtly express disagreement with the second pair part. As such, it represents an extremely dispreferred action. In the language classroom setting, where the teacher has superior interactional rights (i.e., she may take extended turns, select next speaker, etc.) and is theoretically the "expert" in the room, we may not expect students to make such bald, on-record disagreements. However, as the data show, advanced adult learners of English, whether by virtue of their proficiency level or their age (among other factors, e.g., classroom culture, confidence), can affect the unfolding of discourse in this way, rejecting teacher responses to their own questions. The sequences under examination in this study all

involve student initiation, not only of the sequence itself, but also of post-expansion of the sequence. The following section details prior research on the phenomenon of student initiation itself in order to provide background for the current study.

Student Initiation
Despite the prevalence of teacher-fronted interaction in the classroom, as Allwright (1980) notes, "learners are not wholly under the control of the teacher…they have some freedom concerning the nature and extent of their participation in class" (p. 166). Damhuis (2000) argues that student initiation of discourse and/or control of topic "results in ampler and more diverse output" (p. 245), and thus student initiation is worthy of further study from a pedagogical and theoretical standpoint. Particularly within language pedagogy that values student talk, the incidence of student-initiated participation is of great interest. While McHoul (1978, 1985) argues that student initiation is not accounted for in the turn-taking mechanism found in "traditional" teacher-fronted classrooms, both Lemke (1990) and Rampton (2006) discuss the occurrence of student initiation within teacher-fronted activity in secondary schools, noting how students secure interactional space for themselves. Markee (1995, 2000) and Seedhouse (2004) similarly focus on the discourse in language classrooms, highlighting the discursive practices of learners in different contexts within this setting.

In discussing the secondary school science classroom, Lemke (1990) describes a participation structure he calls "student questioning dialogue," in which students initiate (usually questioning) sequences and teachers answer, often following up to ensure that their responses were adequate. An initial questioning sequence from a student often initiates a chain of questions from different students, creating the new participation structure Lemke describes. In this structure, students are in control of the content and the placement of their turns. Interestingly, Lemke distinguishes between exchanges in which students accept teacher responses (which he calls *dialogues*), and those in which students disagree with or challenge teacher responses (which he terms *arguments* or *debates*). Within Lemke's dialogue participation structure, any post-expansions are likely sequence-closing thirds or confirmation checks. In his debate participation structure, post-expansions are non-minimal, either implying or balding stating disagreement.

While Lemke (1990) does not discuss student turns in terms of post-expansion, his discussion of the consequences of such actions is relevant to this study. In particular, he argues that following a challenge, student and teacher jointly control the trajectory of the talk, and "compete for thematic control" (p. 29). Post-expansion sequences thus show the joint construction of classroom discourse, as well as the exercise of student agency. Rampton (2006) likewise examines student participation outside of the traditional IRE/F, and in particular shows that some students appeared to co-opt authority discursively, contradicting or criticizing the teacher. Importantly, Rampton argues that such student actions often functioned to move the discussion forward and contributed to the lessons overall. Post-expansions in student-initiated sequences may thus be seen as an important locus for student-direction (in part) of the trajectory of classroom talk, and thus of lessons.

Similarly to Lemke's (1990) categorization of participation structures, both Markee (2000) and Seedhouse (2004) examine student initiation within particular contexts in the L2 classroom. Markee, for example, distinguishes between an unequal speech-exchange system (involving the teacher and any number of students) and an equal speech-exchange system (student-student

interaction). Seedhouse, rather than discussing participation structure in terms solely of the participants, argues that different pedagogical foci entail different interactional organizations. For example, Seedhouse claims a form-and-accuracy context would entail "extreme asymmetry" (p. 104) and student contributions would be more limited than they might be in regular conversation or a different context in the classroom. Thus, within this framework, student initiation would be discussed in terms of the pedagogical focus at the time. Importantly, Seedhouse notes that these are normative constraints, and thus may be flouted by participants (as is argued in this study when students initiate post-expansions).

Markee (1995) notes that the initiator of a sequence, by default, controls "both the content and the trajectory of the interaction" (p. 87), and thus, student initiations represent occasions where students exercise more control than teachers over these factors. Interestingly, Markee found that when students initiated question sequences, teachers overwhelming responded with counter-questions, a tactic that allowed them to regain control from students. This study, in contrast, examines student-initiated sequences in which the teacher responds rather than deploying a counter-question strategy and in which students initiate post-expansions following the teacher's response. This data thus presents a view of student control not only over the initial sequence, but also of the sequence that follows. These student turns affect the unfolding of the lesson, highlighting problems in understanding and conveying a sense of student stance (i.e., students' feelings or opinions relating to the teacher's responses or the lesson in general).

Methodology
Research site and participants
This conversation-analytic study examines student-initiated sequences in which students also initiate post-expansion in the third turn. The participants in this study include the students enrolled in the highest-level advanced adult ESL course in a community language program during a summer session, and their instructor, a 24-year-old Korean-American female graduate student in TESOL at the end of her first year of study. Most of the students were female (15 of 17), and the vast majority (12) were Asian, with nine Japanese, two Koreans, and one Chinese. The others in the class were from Latin America (2) and Europe (3). Formal instruction in English ranged from none to 10+ years of foreign language study. The students' ages ranged from 20 to 60 years old, and overall, the students had lived in English-dominant contexts for very little time.

Data Collection and Analysis
This study of student-initiated participation is conversation-analytic, but operates within an applied CA framework. Thus, the initial selection of the setting and phenomena was guided by my observation of student participation in teacher-fronted activity in my own classroom. Following the framework of conversation analysis, data consist of video and audio recordings of classes and the transcriptions created. The initial stage of analysis involved a review of all video recordings, including multiple camera angles for each class session. Findings from the line-by-line analysis of transcripts are argued to have relevance to theories of power, and this line of argument will be further pursued in the discussion.
Change of speakership was used to identify excerpts for transcription, and a full inventory of excerpts including student-initiated participation was created. A review of this inventory showed that the vast majority of student-initiated sequences occurred during grammar lessons, and so the focus of this study was limited to that setting. Student-initiated participation was defined as turns

for which students self-selected (i.e., turns where a student was nominated by the teacher were excluded). From the corpus of student-initiated sequences, those involving post-expansion by students were highlighted for this analysis. The data under analysis come from five separate grammar lessons over the course of the five-week semester, which include a total of 68 student-initiated post-expansions. Due to space considerations, the excerpts presented here come from the lesson with the most student-initiated post-expansions (25 in a span of 9:47). The phenomenon under examination here, student post-expansion, is bolded in the transcripts to draw attention to this feature.

Analysis
Student initiations following a teacher response to an earlier contribution by the same student represent an interesting inversion of the traditional initiation-response-feedback pattern in classroom discourse. In this case, the student initiates the sequence, the teacher responds, and the student in effect follows up on the teacher's response (the feedback move). While early accounts of turn-taking in traditional teacher-fronted activity (c.f., McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979) found no *official* place for such student follow-ups, they do conform to the "last-as-next bias" described by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) for the speaker just before the current speaker to take the next turn (p. 708). Thus, while students' right to follow up to a teacher's second pair part may not be expected in classroom discourse, the students in this data appear to orient to the conversational bias for the last speaker to speak after the current speaker by inserting post-expansions.

In the following selection (one long excerpt broken into sections), the class was reviewing sentences from a Grammar Auction activity, in which teams bid for sentences they have decided are correct from a group of mixed correct and incorrect sentences. Once all the sentences were "bought", the teacher reviewed each one in turn, awarding points to the appropriate student teams. Despite the teacher's attempt to move to the next sentence (*Nine?*) in line 1, the focus of these excerpts was the prior sentence: "Yoro suggests you take painting classes because it is a wonderful activity." This excerpt shows several examples of the student-initiated post-expansion phenomenon including rejection/challenge/disagreement with the second pair part (Rodrigo in Excerpt 1 and Yoro in Excerpt 3), and several different types of sequence-closing thirds (Nobu in Excerpt 2). For analytic clarity, the excerpt has been broken into three shorter excerpts, but they follow each other directly as the talk unfolded in the classroom. Excerpt 1 begins as the teacher attempts to move the discussion from sentence eight to sentence nine.

Excerpt 1: Rodrigo's Follow-Up
```
1     T:     K. Nine? i:s (.) correct,=
2     Rod:                          =(Do we need,) (.) like
3            "Yoro su- suggests, (0.4) you to take?" °No?°
4            (0.8)
5     T:     >°Say that one more time?°< "Suggest you,"
6     Rod:   "To: take."
7     T:     "To take." No:.
8     Amel:  It's a gerund?
9     T:     Yeah, remember um,
10    Rod:   {It sounds so weird. – ((sits back and folds arms))}
11    T:     $No, c'mon guys$, we learned this like, hh at
12           the beginning. OK.
```

After Rodrigo prevented the teacher's attempt to move on to number nine (in line 1) by latching on to her utterance with a question in lines 2-3, an insertion sequence followed, allowing the teacher to clarify Rodrigo's question. The teacher negatively evaluated his reformulation by repeating it (*"To take")* and then uttering an extended *No:*. Amelie initiated next, asking the teacher if the right answer is a gerund (given that Rodrigo's negatively evaluated reformulation was an infinitive), and the teacher answered her positively (the teacher's eye gaze was to Amelie). The teacher then appeared to be about to launch into an explanation with *Yeah, remember um,* in line 9, but Rodrigo initiated his post-expansion to the teacher's negative evaluation in line 10 with his assertion that the correct answer *sounds so weird*. This assertion itself acts as evaluation of the teacher's response to Rodrigo's initial question, inverting the traditional teacher-initiated IRE/F sequence. This turn may be seen as an example of the minimal third-party musing described by Schegloff (2007), in which Rodrigo is commenting on the upshot of the entire sequence, including his own question as well as Amelie's. It may also be seen as a rejection/challenge/disagreement post-expansion, in which the speaker conveys a sense of stance related to the second pair part (i.e., the teacher's response), though in this case Rodrigo may be conveying his stance related to the form itself. In either case, his turn in line 10 may be seen as a dispreferred action. This analysis is confirmed by the teacher's response, in which she attempts to resolve misalignment by reminding the students of the previous work they had done together with the subjunctive. The teacher reacts to Rodrigo's assertion by rejecting Rodrigo's musing (*No*) and saying in a smiley voice, *C'mon guys*. Rodrigo may also be argued to "back down" from the misalignment by failing to pursue his challenge. The teacher does not further address Rodrigo's assertion, and continues in Excerpt 2, repeating *Remember* and directing the students' attention to the textbook.

Excerpt 2: Nobu's Follow-Up
```
13              {(1.0) ((T walks over to Clara))}
14      T:      {Remember? um in your textbook, - ((picks up
15              Clara's textbook))} unit seven?
16              {(1.6) ((T flips through textbook))}
17      T:      Speaking in the subjunctive? mode?
18              (0.2)
19      T:      mm-kay? {Remember this, expressing urgency,
20              (0.2) necessity, or advice? – ((holds up page to the
21              class))} Um, "my parents insist that she: study:,"
22              OK, "I not rule out," "I recommend you take,"
23              {OK, so. Um, -((returns book to Clara))} that's where
24              that ↑comes from. K.
25              {(1.2) ((T brushes her hands together, like "job done"))}
26      Nobu:   So we don't use, all the time "that." I mean, "Yoro
27              suggests (.) that."
28      T:      No you [can drop "that." Yeah.]
29      Nobu:         [Unnecessary.  OK.  ] How bout gerund?
30              "Yoro suggests? ↑your taking (.) painting classes."
31      T:      ↑Yeah. [Yeah- ] we went over that. But it's a little
32      Nobu:          [Yeah. ]
33      T:      different, remember.=
```

```
34      Nobu:                           =Ah.=
35      T:                                  =then you're emphasizing
36              the action.
37      Nobu:  Oh.
```

The teacher led the students back to the section of their textbook on the subjunctive, finally concluding her explanation with *that's where that ↑comes from*, and brushing her hands together as if to say, "job done." Following this non-verbal gesture accompanying a 1.2 second gap, Nobu initiated a new sequence, asking the teacher to confirm that "that" is not always present when using the subjunctive. The teacher affirmed his suspicions in line 28, and Nobu overlapped the completion of the teacher's response including the upshot of the teacher's response (even though he had not heard the whole thing). This follow-up of *Unnecessary. OK.* came in line 29. This turn may be seen as an example of Schegloff's (2007) "post-mortem" post-expansion, reformulating the result of the teacher's response with *Unnecessary*, as well as evaluating and approving her response with *OK*. He then capitalized on securing the turn with a new question, *How 'bout gerund?*. Nobu was thus able to provide follow-up to the teacher's positive response to his original question, and to initiate a new sequence. Schegloff notes that sequence-closing thirds close sequences, not turns, and thus the speaker of a sequence-closing turn can launch a new sequence directly following the post-expansion. After the teacher's response to his second question, Nobu again delivers a minimal post-expansion (acknowledgement), repeating the teacher's response of *Yeah* in line 32.

Nobu continued to participate throughout the teacher's response to his second question with *Ah* and *Oh*, minimal post-expansions (sequence-closing thirds) indicating receipt of information and change-of-state (Heritage, 1984). Following the conclusion of the teacher's explanation in line 36 and Nobu's final response of *Oh*, another student, Yoro, self-selects in line 38 to introduce a new reformulation of the target sentence.

Excerpt 3: Yoro's Follow-Up
```
38      Yoro:  So how bout the, "Yoro suggests (0.4) you ↑taking,
39              painting classes" Because "suggest" to take uh, a
40              gerund, right?
41      T:      "Yoro suggests you taking:,"
42              (1.0)
43      T:      [Painting::]
44      Mich:  [(        )] classes
45      Yoro:  No.
46      T:      Yeah I don't-, no it's "Your taking" or "you-" or
47              "take" or "take.
48      Yoro:  When [ do you  ] omit the "that."
49      T:              [It's not-]
50              (1.2)
51      T:      ((Sucks teeth)) ↑Usually, um: when you talk fast?
52              people drop things. Just to say it faster,=
53      Yoro:                              =But this
54              is writing.
55              {(2.0) ((Nobu smiles & chuckles silently, then T starts to
```

```
56            smile just before answering.))}
57    T:      ↑Ye:↓s. Uh huh huh. Um, but {people drop it >in
58            writing too,< - ((turns papers out towards Ss))} as long
59            as {it's like kind of like – ((mimicking writing quickly))}
60            {fast speech, - ((hand open, palm away from face twice,
61            mimicking words coming out of mouth))} you know?
```

Yoro asked a more specific follow-up to Nobu's earlier question about whether "that" is required, asking *When do you omit the "that"?*. The teacher answered that "that" can be dropped *when you talk fast* (line 52)[3]. Often, grammatical questions arise in the advanced ESL classroom that require technical answers not necessarily available to the teacher as declarative knowledge, and thus, insufficient answers are understandably provided to students. Yoro followed this explanation with the post-expansion challenge *But this is writing* (lines 54-55). Schiffrin (1987) presents *but* as a marker that always "marks an upcoming unit as a contrast with a prior unit" (p. 176), and Yoro's turn can clearly be seen to contradict the teacher's explanation. Nobu seems to orient to the challenging nature of Yoro's post-expansion by smiling and chuckling silently, actions which may, in combination with Yoro's turn, lead to the teacher's smile just before answering in line 57. While Nobu's smile and laughter act as a comment on Yoro's turn, the teacher's own smile seems to mark the beginning of her back down from her previous answer.

Yoro's initiation in this slot thus served not only as follow-up to an explanation, but also as evaluation of the account the teacher had just provided (as Rodrigo's turn did earlier). Indeed, the teacher's explanation was insufficient, and in this classroom of advanced adult speakers, students seem willing and able to challenge the teacher when her explanations do not seem believable. The teacher's response to Yoro's post-expansion in lines 57-61seems to do the work of backing down from her original response by providing further justification; as Schegloff (2007) argued, following a challenging post-expansion, one or both of the parties must back away from their position in order to resolve the misalignment. The teacher's smile and hedges mark her attempts to resolve the misalignment, though she ultimately does stick to her explanation. Yoro's back down is seen by her failure to press the issue. While student use of post-expansions highlights their status as agents of their own learning, the teacher's ultimate authority is also clear in the resolution of this misalignment. There may be only so far students can push the issue, even in an advanced course for adults.

Discussion
This examination of post-expansions represents one of the few studies of this phenomenon, particularly in an institutional setting. As such, it adds to conversation-analytic research on sequencing in interaction, as well as research on institutional talk generally. Heap (1997) argues that while "applied CA committed to education tells us what to look at," "[s]traight ahead CA tells us how to look, and what we must do in order to show how the features of institutions, like education, are produced in situ, in real time, interactionally" (p. 223). This study is firmly situated as an instance of *applied* CA, both in that the setting and phenomena under study (student participation) were purposefully chosen, and in that I argue that these findings have

---

[3] The complementizer "that" is not required when the complement phrase is "adjacent to an overt head" (Lightfoot & Fasold, 2006), but is required when other information comes between the head and the phrase (e.g., "I recommend *strongly* that you take this exam" vs. "I recommend you take this exam.").

value not only in our understanding of sequencing, but that they also speak to exogenous theories. Thus, data analysis was completed within a conversation-analytic framework, and findings are argued to have relevance to theoretical discussions of power in classrooms, as well as pedagogical implications. Pre-analytic observations guided me to a particular site for data collection, and analysis proceeded as in any other conversation-analytic study, with line-by-line analysis. Kitzinger (2008) argues for the validity of this approach, and also posits that applied conversation analysts may make post-analytic connections to exogenous theories, as I will with power below. In her talk at the 2009 annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Gabrielle Kasper maintained that the conversation-analytic principle of ethnomethodological indifference to talk-external factors is not violated by such procedures, because analysis of the data proceeds according to "pure" conversation analytic methods. The contribution of conversation analysis to any research, according to Kasper, is its unique capacity to specify theoretical concepts (e.g., power) in interactional terms.

Student-initiations following a teacher response to an earlier contribution by the same student can take several different forms, as seen above. All serve as a kind of post-expansion to the teacher's response, though some contain more evaluative force than others (as in Rodrigo's and Yoro's turns). Depending on the student's stance towards the teacher's response, a variety of utterances are possible, including sequence-closing thirds (Nobu's post-expansions), and direct challenges (Rodrigo's *It sounds so weird* and Yoro's *But this is writing*). Teacher responses in general do not project any next action by a student, and following traditional turn-taking patterns in teacher-fronted activity, the teacher would have the right to select the next speaker or continue (McHoul, 1978). However, as argued above, the bias for last-as-next speaker and the post-expansion practice may have some bearing on the students' ability to initiate a follow-up turn in this environment. Mori (2002) notes that a follow-up turn after an answer is possible, but she argues that post-expansions are not required. This examination of post-expansion in student-initiated sequences contributes to the understanding of this phenomenon within conversation analytic research, but also adds to discursive research on student agency and power in the classroom. In particular, by bridging traditional conversation analysis with applied CA, this study shows what detailed conversation analysis can bring to understanding classroom contexts.

While student use of the post-expansion practice can be examined on its own terms, student initiation in the third turn following a teacher's response to that same student can also be seen as capitalizing on the momentum created by prior student initiations and building on prior talk. Waring (2009) discusses student initiations that break the initiation-response-feedback structure, and by so doing, make "available previously unavailable speaking opportunities for…fellow participants" (p. 811). This type of student initiation represents the newly available speaking opportunities for students following a first break from more teacher-controlled discourse. Teachers can listen and look for these moments where students direct their own learning in directions they need by expanding sequences they themselves initiated. This analysis shows not student-centered learning, but student-*directed* learning, in action. Students in this case act as agents of their own learning by initiating sequences and directing the expansion of those sequences.

Post-expansions in student-initiated sequences represent a demonstration of student agency in the upending of the traditional asymmetry in classroom talk, revealing students' ability to control sequences of talk in the classroom. In their seminal collection of studies on institutional talk,

Drew and Heritage (1992) argued that talk in institutions involves "special and particular constraints" on what some or all participants may contribute (p. 22), and in the case of the classroom, many have argued that this manifests in the classroom through a set of asymmetrical rights and obligations, i.e., that the teacher has *superior* rights and obligations, to nominate speakers, to take several turns uninterrupted, etc. The asymmetrical nature of participant rights and obligations in the classroom setting connects to issues of power and authority. According to Thornborrow (2002), power is a "contextually sensitive phenomenon" operating on both structural and interactional levels (p. 8). Structurally, power in talk relates to the number and type of turns speakers are able to secure; interactionally, power manifests in the *actions* speakers can accomplish with those turns. Thus, while post-expansions structurally demonstrate student power by representing student control of their own sequences, there are differences in how power is interactionally accomplished in minimal and non-minimal post-expansions. Minimal post-expansions may simply retain control of the sequence for students, allowing them to comment on the teacher's response, or to secure an additional turn for a new sequence. Non-minimal post-expansions, however, show students challenging the teacher's response, an action that demonstrates control not only over the sequence, but also a sense of student stance in relation to that response. Lemke (1990) likewise notes that students often end up challenging not only the teacher's initial response, but also their authority and expertise in general.

The exercise of student agency is also connected to issues of power and authority in the classroom, highlighting the variable and shifting nature of both between teacher and students. Rampton (2006) argues that power relations are revealed through an examination of individual agents, and this study shows students acting as agents of their own learning, initiating sequences and directing their expansion. Importantly, as Manke (1997) argues, classroom power relations are "interactive" and "constructivist" (p. 107), as well as "relational" (p. 138); rather than existing within one participant or role, power shifts fluidly between participants, moment to moment. Given the conception of power as shared and shifting, rather than associated with roles, it is likewise more useful to consider participant roles in classroom activity as dynamic and variable. Rather than viewing one role (e.g., the teacher) as the source of power, examination of discursive practices can show how participants make powerful discursive moves. This post-structural notion of classroom discourse reveals the flexibility that exists within institutions, classrooms, and discursive structures. While structures exist that constrain talk, there is "Wiggle room" (Erickson, 2004) that provides an opportunity for innovation, and in this case, agency.

This study highlights how advanced ESL students establish themselves as legitimate speakers within the context of teacher-directed activity. Drawing on Holland, Skinner, Lachicotte, and Cain's (2001) concept of relational/positional identities, which suggests that interlocutors' perception of their relative social position affects what they say and how they say it, students' utterances during teacher-fronted activity can be seen as indexical of students' understanding of their interactional rights and obligations. I argue that even in teacher-directed classroom discussion, students identify themselves as legitimate speakers and directors of discourse by initiating sequences and expanding them. As Holland et al. argue, holding the floor indexes "claims to privilege" (p. 133), and student initiations in teacher-directed activity thus convey students' projection of themselves as entitled to direct the trajectory of teacher-controlled talk.

These findings suggest that in a high-level adult ESL classroom, students demonstrated control of the conversational floor, ultimately affecting the unfolding of the lesson. In particular, by

examining student use of the post-expansion practice both minimally and non-minimally, this study demonstrates how students create "wiggle room" (Erickson, 2004, p. 15), tactical moments of student agency to secure interactional space, within the traditional institutional turn-taking mechanism. Given the value placed on student participation in education broadly, understanding of how students gain interactional space is valuable. The "pure" conversation analysis involved in this study details one way in which students secure interactional space. However, this study aims to go further than simply providing line-by-line analysis; rather, it seeks to speak to questions of power and agency in the classroom. Particularly within language pedagogy that values student talk and correlates opportunities for such talk with student-centeredness, examinations of student initiations in classroom discussion reveal how students and teacher negotiate the terms of participation on a turn-by-turn basis. The student participation described in this study represents more than student-centered learning: in this case, students are driving their own learning.

References

Allwright, R.L. (1980). Turns, topics, and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 165-187). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Beach, W.A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics, 19*, 325-52.

Beach, W.A. (1995). Conversation analysis: "Okay" as a clue for understanding consequentiality. In S.J. Sigman (Ed.), *The consequentiality of communication* (pp. 121-161). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Damhuis, R. (2000). A different teacher role in language arts education: Interaction in a small circle with teacher. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 243-264). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Hall, J. K. & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 186-203.

Heap, J. L. (1997). Conversation analysis methods in researching language and education. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Research methods in language and education* (pp. 217- 225). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Holland, D., Skinner, D., Lachicotte Jr., W., & Cain, C. (2001). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kasper, G. (2009, March). Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. In G. Kasper

(Organizer), Alternative approaches to second language acquisition: A comparative perspective. Colloquium conducted at the meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Denver, CO.

Kitzinger, C. (2008). Developing feminist conversation analysis: A response to Wowk. *Human Studies, 31*, 179-208.

Lemke, J.L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Lightfoot, D. & Fasold, R. (2006). The structure of sentences. In R. Fasold & J. Connor-Linton (Eds.), *An introduction to language and linguistics* (pp. 97-121). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Manke, M.P. (1997). *Classroom power relations: Understanding student-teacher interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elrbaum Associates, Inc.

Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*, 63–92.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McHoul, A.W. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7*, 183-213.

McHoul, A.W. (1985). Two aspects of classroom interaction: Turn-taking and correction. *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders, 13*, 53-64.

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

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 323-347.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreffered turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J.M. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

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

Transcription Conventions
Adapted from Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998)

(1.8)	Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate a pause. The number represents the number of seconds of duration of the pause, to one decimal place. A pause of less than 0.2 seconds is marked by (.)
[ ]	Brackets around portions of utterances show that those portions overlap with a portion of another speaker's utterance.
=	An equal sign is used to show that there is no time lapse between the portions connected by the equal signs. This is used where a second speaker begins their utterance just at the moment when the first speaker finishes.
::	A colon after a vowel or a word is used to show that the sound is extended. The number of colons shows the length of the extension.
(hm, hh, ha, he)	These are onomatopoetic representations of the audible exhalation of air, for example, as laughter.
.hh	This indicates an audible inhalation of air, for example, as a gasp. The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
?	A question mark indicates that there is slightly rising intonation.
.	A period indicates that there is slightly falling intonation.
,	A comma indicates a continuation of tone.
-	A dash indicates an abrupt cut off, where the speaker stopped speaking suddenly.
↑↓	Up or down arrows are used to indicate that there is sharply rising or falling intonation. The arrow is placed just before the syllable in which the change in intonation occurs.
Under	Underlines indicate speaker emphasis on the underlined portion of the word.
CAPS	Capital letters indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalized portion of the utterance at a higher volume than the speaker's normal volume.
°	This indicates an utterance that is much softer than the normal speech of the speaker. This symbol will appear at the beginning and at the end of the utterance in question.
> <	'Greater than' and 'less than' signs indicate that the talk they surround was noticeably faster than the surrounding talk.

(would)   When a word appears in parentheses, it indicates that the transcriber has guessed as to what was said, because it was indecipherable on the tape. If the transcriber was unable to guess as to what was said, nothing appears within the parentheses.

((Eye gaze))   Italicized information within double parentheses provides non-verbal behavior visible on the video recording.

{*((gaze))* - }   Braces surrounding non-verbal double parentheses indicate that the non-verbal behavior coincides with talk. The dash connects the non-verbal double parentheses and the coinciding talk.

"the"   Quotation marks are used to designate meta-talk, specifically talk about focal language from materials of some kind (textbook, workbook, handouts, or the blackboard).

$C'mon$ Dollar signs are used to indicate a smiley or jokey voice.