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CHAPTER 5

Gesture, gaze and laughter: teacher conduct facilitating whole-class discussions among students
ABSTRACT
This article analyses teacher conduct around episodes of subsequent student contributions during whole-class discussions. We scrutinised the teachers’ facilitating role in these episodes by systematically analysing their verbal as well as bodily conduct before, during and after the episodes, unearthing the teacher behaviour leading to and maintaining the discussion and the conduct bringing the discussion to an end. Our analysis reveals a large repertoire of conduct and proves that the teachers, while often refraining from verbal contributions, nonetheless actively foster the discussion by bodily means such as gestures, gaze and even laughter.

Keywords: Classroom interaction, Whole-class discussions, Teacher conduct, Conversation analysis, Discussion framework.

This chapter constitutes a slightly modified version of a paper accepted for publication as:
At the time of printing this thesis, the paper has (almost) been published in the online journal. Please find the online publication to view the videos.
5.1 Background

This article reports on conversation analytic research into teacher conduct around episodes of discussion among several students during whole-class discussion lessons. These lessons constitute an educational setting that is less prevalent than teacher-fronted interaction and that has received less scholarly attention accordingly. However, teacher conduct in this setting is particularly interesting as the teachers have another, more facilitating role, encouraging students to produce longer stretches of talk and respond to each other in subsequent turns. This article investigates the types of teacher conduct surrounding, and possibly effecting, these episodes of discussion among the students.

In most classroom interactions, the teacher typically takes every other turn at talk and is in charge of the turn-allocation (Fasel Lauzon & Berger, 2015; Koole & Berenst, 2008; Mazeland, 1983; McHoul, 1978; Mortensen, 2008; Sahlström, 2001). Whole-class discussions entail a different participation framework (Goffman, 1981a; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Gosen et al., 2009, 2015) in which teachers have a facilitating role and the turn-taking pattern is rather T-S-S-S than T-S-T-S (Cazden, 1988; Myhill, 2006; Van der Veen et al., 2015). Hence, the students can contribute to the discussion via self-selection with initiations and responses to each other.

In order to effect such a discussion framework certain teacher conduct is necessary. Until now, research has mainly focused on questions that might ignite longer stretches of student talk. Open-ended or authentic questions have often been mentioned as a means to do this (Myhill, 2006; Nystrand, 1997; Soter et al., 2008). A fine-grained analysis of such questions has revealed that these are actually multiform and result in student contributions of different shape and length, with more open invitations most likely leading to discussion (Willemsen et al., 2018). Apart from open-ended questions, first assessments are also identified as a means to open the floor for discussion: these assessments convey an opportunity to share opinions and produce second assessments (Gosen et al., 2015).

Once the students have taken the floor, the question is how their talk can be extended. Previous research has suggested that opportunities for elaboration and uptake are important for promoting student discussions (Myhill, 2006; Soter et al., 2008). Willemsen et al. (2019b; 2019a) have analysed the teachers’ provision of these opportunities in detail by investigating the teachers’ invitations for elaboration (inviting the same student to produce more talk) as well as their pass-on turns (inviting other students to respond to). It was found that these types of teacher conduct can take different shapes, some leading to longer stretches of student talk than others.

To date, most research has focused on teachers’ verbal conduct. However, some studies do mention teachers’ bodily conduct during whole-class discussions.
Willemsen and colleagues (2019b, 2018) have observed that teachers can invite and maintain the discussion framework merely by means of gestures and gaze. On the other hand, Haldiman, Hauser and Nell-Tuor (2017) have shown that teachers can also use gaze aversion to maintain the discussion framework. When students raise their hands to self-nominate, the teachers’ gaze aversion can be understood as encouraging a discussion in which students self-select, as it demonstrates the teachers’ unavailability in the typical role of turn allocator and head of the interaction (McHoul, 1978). This constitutes an interesting contrast with Mehan’s identification of “the work of doing nothing” as a mild sanctioning device for students’ out-of-turn contributions in teacher-fronted interaction (1979a, p. 111). The findings on bodily conduct in whole-class discussions suggest that while teachers may take on a more facilitating role, this does not mean that they are passive (cf. Van Leeuwen & Janssen, 2019). Rather, it seems that teachers are actively fostering the discussion by means of several types of bodily conduct, of which only a few have been identified so far.

The endings of episodes of discussion among several students have, again, received little scholarly attention until now. Nonetheless, Gosen et al. (2015), have demonstrated that teachers can bring discussion frameworks to an end by asking a known-information question. In this way, they take back control as the head of the interaction and install an instructional framework. One reason to do this might be to provide students with a notion or explanation. Known-information questions are undoubtedly not the only way in which discussion episodes come to an end. One could imagine, for example, a discussion episode coming to an end because new contributions are not forthcoming.

Aiming to bridge the gaps in our knowledge on teacher conduct in whole-class discussions, in this study we systematically scrutinised episodes of discussion among the students themselves. Where previous research has mainly focused on verbal, initiating teacher conduct, we also analysed the teachers’ repertoire during and after these episodes. Furthermore, we considered both spoken interaction and bodily conduct. This will provide us with a better understanding of what teachers do around episodes of discussion that possibly instigates and fosters the discussion framework and what brings the episodes to an end.

### 5.2 Data

Our data set consists of 11 history lessons given in two different fourth grade classrooms in the north of the Netherlands. The length of these lessons varies from 37 to 57 minutes and is 48 minutes on average. The students are around 10 years old. The first author of this paper made the video-recordings by means of three cameras.
In synchronised compositions of these videos, the teacher and the students are all (almost) continuously visible.

Typically, history lessons in Dutch primary school consist of reading texts from a textbook and then filling out questions in an exercise book. Therefore, in order to be able to study whole-class discussions, we asked the participating teachers to hold such discussions with their students. The teachers and students still read the curricular texts, but instead of using the exercise books, they were seated in a circle and discussed the texts by means of discussable questions: questions without an immediate predetermined right answer (e.g. “What do you think it was like for X to Y during Z?”). Basing our instructions on general findings in the literature (Cazden, 1988; Myhill, 2006; Soter et al., 2008), we asked the teachers to refrain from being dominant and acting as a primary respondent (as described for teacher-fronted interaction by McHoul, 1978). Instead, we invited them to give the students space to take the floor for extended periods of time (Cazden, 1988; Soter et al., 2008) and to encourage collaborative reasoning by letting the students respond to other students’ contributions and verbalise their own thinking (Damhuis et al., 2004; Soter et al., 2008; see also Mercer, 1995 on educated discourse). As we did not provide the teachers with detailed instructions and asked them to implement this type of interaction rather than teaching them new skills, we do not consider our approach to be interventionist (Antaki, 2011). We gave the teachers rather general instructions which they were free to implement as they saw fit.

The two classrooms in the present study used different history textbooks, but the chapters covered the same subjects. We selected the lessons covering the chapter on the emergence of the steam engine. As the number of lessons per chapter was six for one of the textbooks and five for the other, this resulted in 11 lessons. This selection enabled us to look at the lessons in detail and inventory the teacher conduct around episodes of discussion among the students. We made a collection of fragments in which the teacher acts as a facilitator and leaves the floor to the students for some time. As we were looking for episodes of discussion among several students rather than a back and forth between two students, we selected the fragments in which at least three students participated in the discussion. Another criterion for selection was that the students were not just producing subsequent (or even simultaneous) contributions, but actually responded to each other’s contributions. Verbal teacher contributions were considered the end of the discussion episodes (with the exception of minimal responses). The selection resulted in 38 fragments of which 10 originate from one classroom (6 lessons) and 28 from the other (5 lessons).

In previous studies, we based our collections on teacher conduct and analysed how the teachers performed a certain action and what interactional effects these
actions resulted in (Willemsen et al., 2019b, 2019a, 2018). In the present study, we based our collection on student behaviour. However, our interest still lies in the teacher conduct: our objective is to inventory the teachers’ repertoire around these episodes of discussion. Our bottom-up analysis enabled us to categorise the teachers’ conduct occurring in the phases before, during and after the episodes. With the term ‘phase’, we merely refer to the temporal aspect of the notion in this paper.

The collection items were transcribed following Jefferson (1986). In the extracts presented in this paper, we transcribed multimodal information at moments relevant for our analysis (see Transcription conventions for an adaptation of Mondada, 2016). For each extract, the video is provided as well. Both the transcripts and videos have been anonymised.

5.3 Analysis

In our collection of 38 fragments, we have identified various types of teacher conduct taking place before, during and after the episodes of student discussion. In the following sections, we will discuss each of the three phases separately. For our discussion of all three phases, we will use the same fragment, as the teacher conduct in this fragment is representative of most of the teacher conduct in the collection. This exemplary fragment will however be complemented with extracts from other fragments in order to show the variety present in the data.

5.3.1 Before the discussion episode

In the phase before the discussion episode, teachers do several things resulting in multiple subsequent student contributions. Often, they explicate the rules applying to the discussion setting, formulate an open invitation to the students (Willemsen et al., 2018) and/or focus the attention to one student’s contribution, for example by inviting repetition and/or elaboration by the same student or responses by the other students (Willemsen et al., 2019b, 2019a). Next to the verbal conduct, the teachers also demonstrate several types of bodily conduct, such as inviting to take a next turn by gesturing and lighthouse gazing (Björk-Willén & Cekaite, 2017), and displaying recipiency by nodding and leaning back, often with folded arms.

In Extract 1, the first part of our exemplary fragment is displayed. As we will see, the extract contains several of the above-mentioned elements of teacher conduct that precede episodes of discussion. The extract starts right after the teacher has paused a television programme about the steam train shown to introduce the topic. In the video of the extract, the pausing is included. The extract is cut off after the first student contribution of the discussion episode (which will be further discussed in section 3.2).
Extract 1. Before the discussion episode (2016S1.L3.F5.0:10:07.2 part 1)

1  Tch: nou. voordat hij %al les gaat verklappen, well. before he is %going to give it all away,
    Tch: %gazes at students
2  Res: *hmhm= ((laughter)) *gets up and starts walking to chair in the circle
3  Sve: =klappe=.
    =away=.
(0.6)
4  Tch: of ver & klappen hè want dan gaat ie van alles or give it %away right because then he is going
    Tch: %arrives at and grips chair
tellen (en dan zeg) je tja ja dat klopt en dat to tell all kinds of things (and then you say) *yes
7  klopt
   yhes that’s *right and that’s *right
8  $(0.4)
   $sits down
9  Tch: wil ik graag jullie eh reactie?
   I would like your uh response?
10  dit gaat *gebeuren* je bent eh (1.0) een jaar of nou this is *happening* you are uh (1.0) at the age of
   Tch: *open palms
11  %zo oud als je nu bent, en opeens eh *hoor je van je well %as old as you are now, and suddenly uh you
     *hear from your
   Tch: %shrugs one shoulder, looks left
12  vader of *moeder of van de buurman *goh* d’r is nu father or *mother or from the neighbour *gosh* now
   Tch: %looks right
13  een machine, grote ijzeren machine (0.3) en die there is a machine, big iron machine (0.3) and it
   Tch: %can go up to forty kilometers per hour_
14  %goes forward
15  *(0.4)
16  Mar: *raises hand
17  Tch: *phew ((breathes in with whistle sound)) *raises and lowers hand, looking in Mark’s direction
18  (0.3)
19  Thi: %coo[:][:]::*:1,*
20  Tch: %quick head movement and spreads arms, palms up
21  Tch: %goed?
22  Tri: [go]od?
23  Tch: *dat:=
    [well *that:=
19  Tch: *crosses arms
20  Kar: *raises hand
21  Pim: *raises hand
22  Tch: =JE $react[ie.
23  Tch: =YOUR $res[ponse.
25  Tch: *crosses ankles
26  Mar: [no][u
27  [we][l
28  Pim: [NOU= [WELL=
After pausing the video and accounting for this action (l. 1-7), the teacher announces an invitation to respond (l. 9) and then introduces a hypothetical situation based on the historical event of the invention of the steam train (l. 10-14). Simultaneously, he takes a seat in the circle, uses an open-palm gesture and looks at various students consecutively. His response cry (Goffman, 1981c) stressing the notability of the situation (l. 16), is aligned to by Thijs with “cool” (l. 18). Through “good?” (l. 19) the teacher subsequently produces an open invitation (Willemsen et al., 2018) that projects the production of an assessment by the students. This invitation is accompanied by a quick head move, another open-palm gesture and the crossing of his arms and ankles (l. 18, 20). The gesture seems to stress the invitation to contribute to the discussion (Kendon, 2004; Müller, 2004) and Tristan, seemingly ready to respond already in line 16, demonstrates he understands it as such, as he starts to speak directly afterwards.

Leaning back and/or crossing arms happens in a little over a quarter of the fragments. This posture also stresses that the students may take the floor. Indeed, following the onset of this bodily behaviour two students raise their hands (l. 20). Through this, they self-nominate for a turn, albeit by waiting for the teacher to allocate the turn to them. In line 21, the teacher makes his invitation more explicit (“your response”). When two students start speaking more or less simultaneously (l. 22-24), he refrains from allocating the turn to either of these students. Instead, he lets them sort it out themselves and refers to the rules applying to the discussion setting, possibly instigated by Pim’s quick head movements (l. 26-27). Mark self-selects for a second time (l. 28) and continues the turn he started earlier. In section 3.2, we will discuss the discussion episode in which this extract results.

Our exemplary fragment showed a lot of the teacher conduct identified in our data as occurring before a discussion episode. Other types of teacher conduct include pass-on turns and invitations for elaboration (Willemsen et al., 2019b, 2019a) as well as expressions of low epistemic stance (Heritage, 2010) and shouldershrugging that (combined with other conduct) all result in episodes of discussion among the students. In some cases, however, not much is needed in terms of teacher conduct to instigate an episode of discussion. A case in point is Extract 2.
**Extract 2.** Before the discussion episode (201652.L2.F3.0:20:35.8)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dex: [for (voorlezend)] door al die rook was de lucht in de stad vies en ongezond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tch: [for (reading aloud)] because of all that smoke the air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dor: [gazes at teacher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tch: → [looks up]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dor: [gazes down]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tch: → [looks around, only with his eyes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dor: [gazes at teacher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dol: [gazes at teacher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dol: [ja:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gee: [ma::r als (ze) vroeger, dan was je denk ik-]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this extract, Dex just reads aloud the last sentence of a piece of text (l. 1-2). A gap of 1 second follows in which the teacher is still looking at the paper (l. 3). He is, hence, not (yet) looking around or verbally inviting the students to take the floor. In that same gap, Dorian looks up at the teacher. He self-selects and comments on the text while gazing down (l. 4) and then gazes at the teacher again (l. 5). At this point, the teacher looks around, but without moving his head (l. 5). With this, he seems to invite other students to take the floor. This time, Dolando gazes at the teacher before producing an affiliative response and turning his gaze to Dorian (l. 6-7). It seems that both Dorian and Dolando gaze at the teacher to check whether they can self-select. After Dolando’s turn, Nomar and Geeke also take the floor with (dis)affiliative responses. The teacher’s behaviour in this extract is evidently very different from the teacher’s verbal, vocal and bodily conduct in the previous extract. However, the gaps and gazing apparently are enough for the students to self-select and take the floor.

### 5.3.2 During the discussion episode

One might think that during episodes of subsequent student contributions the teachers take on a passive role. Haldimann et al. (2017) have already shown, however, that teachers can actively use gaze aversion and bodily conduct to refuse their role
of turn-allocator and foster the discussion framework. Our data show similar, but also different types of conduct with which the teachers stay on the sideline while fostering the discussion simultaneously. In the majority of the discussion episodes, the teachers display recipiency by gazing at the speakers (Heath, 1984). Other interactional conduct includes nodding, employing the lighthouse gaze (Björk-Willén & Cekaite, 2017), raising eyebrows, responding to a contribution by means of facial displays (M. H. Goodwin, 1980) or mouthing “oh”, looking at the texts, crossing arms (and leaning back) and/or gesturing to students. When the turn allocation is somewhat problematic, the teachers sometimes smile or laugh instead of interfering to resolve the problem. Incidentally, the teachers produce a minimal response functioning as a continuer during the discussion episode.

In Extract 3, we display the continuation of our exemplary fragment (see Extract 1, a few lines are repeated here). Again, the fragment shows many elements of the above-mentioned teacher conduct taking place during the episode of discussion.

**Extract 3.** During the discussion episode (2016S1.L3.F5.0:10:07.2 part 2)

26 Tch: ],
27 eerste[,
fi[:rst
28 Mar: ],[ was dat be- eh ging dat wel snel.=want
29 [it was qui- uh it went quite quickly.="because
data was" wel het snelste voertuig in &die tij:ød,
it was" PRT the fastest vehicle at &that ti:me,
Tch: -
30 )
31 Mar: (eh nu eh als) wij hier zijn dan- *hh eh denk ik nu
(uh now uh if) we are here then- *hh uh I now think
dat gaan sloom,
that goes slowly,
*0.4)
32 *nods
Tch: -
33 "nods
34 Mar: en mensen konden veel sneller *(weer naar een)*
and people could *(go to an)" :au:nt much faster
35 *ta:nte >zou ik ook wel< leuk *vin[den_>
*I would also< like *tha[t_
Tch: -
36 Tch: -
37 Tri: ]ja=
38 Tri: ==sja allee+t
39 Tri: =yes bu[+t
Tri: %leans forward while looking at the teacher
40 Pim: [+als het- (.) %oh [hh ((lacht))
41 [+if it- (.) %oh [hh ((laughs))
Pim: +looks at Tri
42 %looks at teacher
43 Tri: [(nou) het $1ij==
44 Tch: -
45 ]%smiles at Pim, eyebrows raised
While Mark’s contribution unfolds, the teacher still has his arms crossed (see Extract 1, l. 20). He gives a few minimal responses, first by nodding and later on also by producing “yes”. The nods in lines 29 and 33 function as continuers, while the “yes” in line 36 may indicate a pre-shift signalling a topical shift as well as the teacher’s “imminent speakership” (Jefferson, 1984). Interestingly however, the teacher no longer takes any turns after this “yes”. When Pim produces a turn in overlap with a classmate and withdraws for a second time, this is treated as a laughable (see Glenn, 2003) by Pim and the teacher (l. 37-40). The teacher’s laughing signifies his adopted role of facilitator. When, both Tristan and Pim gaze at the teacher in lines 37-38, apparently orienting to him as head of the interaction (McHoul, 1978), the teacher could have stepped in and allocated the turn to either of the boys. Instead, he refrains from doing so (see also Haldimann et al., 2017, pp. 8–9), leaves it to the students and laughs back
at Pim. In the remainder of the episode, the teacher regularly gazes to other students in the circle, during gaps as well as during talk, thereby inviting them to take a turn (l. 47, 50) (C. Goodwin, 1981; Kendon, 1967) or affirming their self-selection (e.g. l. 44, 48, 51). Tristan seems to orient to this by looking at the teacher and then taking the next turn in (l. 50-51).

The teacher’s conduct during this discussion episode is exemplary for all the episodes in the data set. Another type of conduct that occurs more often in the data set is responding through facial expressions, as is shown in extract 4.


1  Tch:  "thee: je "zei kom je net van school. ik heb- 'k heb
2  geen i:dee.
3  hav- I have no i:dea.
4  Lie:  »ja maar< [als ]je-
5  Pim:  yes but< [ if ]you-
6  "[well [{
7  Tri:  [misschien (werkte je) wel in de
8  [maybe (you worked) PRT in the
9  Pim:  ]}]
10  Tri:  fabric en *dat [je] vana%vond dat je vanavond pas
11  Jam:  factory and *that [only]~toni%ght that only tonight
12  Tch:  [alleen-
13  *raises eyebrows and chin]
14  %gestures to Tristan
15  with book
16  Tri:  thuis komt om e:h zeven uur of zo.
17  you come home at u:h seven o'clock or so.
18  Lie:  & als je- als je &
19  & if you- if you &
20  Tch:  &mouths "oh", head reverted, eyebrows raised&
21  Lie:  bijvoorbeeld wilt slapen dan moet je wel met drie
22  for example want to sleep then you PRT have to
23  mensen in één bed "slapen"
24  sleep with three people in one "bed"

In this extract, the teacher does not respond to the students’ contributions verbally or vocally, but uses his face and body. During and after Tristan’s contribution, he raises his eyebrows, points to Tristan with his book and mouths “oh”, thereby drawing attention to Tristan’s turn without interrupting the discussion episode just commenced.

Some other types of teacher conduct in our data include shrugging shoulders, looking at the time and drinking coffee. Sometimes, these types of conduct take place at moments relevant for turn transition. For example in the extract below, the teacher drinks coffee at a transition relevance place.
Extract 5. Drinking coffee during the episode (2016S2.L5.F19.0:01:19.1)

1 Ami: het *ging ook een beetje over fabrieken en
it *was also a bit about factories and such
Tch: *takes sip
2 Ami: zo en de arbeiders en: fabrikanten hoe
and the labourers and: factory owners how
3 die leefden en *h dat fabrikanten heel anders
they lived and *h that factory owners lived very
differently from labourers *( + )*.=
4 &leefden dan arbeiders *( + )*.=
Tch: 5 positions mug at lips
Mil: -(en %dat)° mensen inne in de stad naar de
=(and %that)° people in the in the city
Tch: 5 tilts mug, takes sip, still looking at Amila
5 Mil: -(en %dat)° mensen inne in de stad naar de
=(and %that)° people in the in the city
Tch: went to the city to %look for a job
6 Mil: stad gingen om $w:erk te zoeken
Tch: %gazes mid-distance
7 Dor: (0.4)
8 maar ze kregen *toch weinig geld.

Speaking at a lower volume, Amila completes her turn in line 4. Here, a transition relevance place arises. By taking a sip of coffee, the teacher demonstrably refrains from next speakership and maintains the listener role (cf. Hoey, 2018), which is underscored by his continued gaze at Amila. Mila, on the other hand, does self-select (l. 5), but only after briefly looking at the teacher with his mug positioned at his lips. Her self-selection shows that she understands the teacher’s drinking as doing being a listener, and she formulates her contribution as a continuation of Amila’s turn.

5.3.3 After the discussion episode

As this study’s focus is on episodes of several subsequent student contributions, we considered verbal teacher contributions as the end of the episodes. The fragments in our data set can be roughly divided into two types of endings. One type constitutes the teacher taking a turn when the discussion comes to a natural end: the students cease to produce any more contributions or their conversation develops into noise. In the other type, the teacher takes a turn in overlap with a student and thereby intervenes in the discussion episode. In both types of endings the teacher turns typically install a more instructional framework (Gosen et al., 2015). However, the teacher turns following a natural ending sometimes comprise a reinitiation of the discussion. Our exemplary fragment illustrates this: after a gap following some simultaneous student talk, the teacher self-selects and verbally invites the students to take the floor again.
Extract 6. After the discussion episode (2016S1.L3.F5.0:10:07.2 part 3)

51 Tri:  
52 Tri:  
53 Kar:  
54 Ss:  
55 Tch:  
56 Tch:  
57 Tch:  
58 Tch:  
59 Tch:  
60 Kar:  
61 Tch:  
62 Tch:  
63 Kar:  
64 ???:  
65 Tch:  
66 Kar:  

In this extract, Kars’s turn is overlapped by multiple students speaking at the same time. After a 1-second gap in which student contributions are non-forthcoming, the teacher produces a formulation of Kars’s turn (l. 58). Together with the teacher’s pointing to Kars (l. 58) and looking at the other students (l. 57-59), this is interpretable as a pass-on turn: the teacher invites the other students to respond to Kars’s contribution (Willemsen et al., 2019b). However, the teacher’s conduct does not end up functioning as a pass-on turn, as Kars initiates repair indicating a hearing problem (l. 60). The teacher repeats his turn, but in a modified way, now specifically addressing Kars with “you” (l. 61). Subsequently, he shrugs one shoulder while looking at Kars. Hence, the pass-on turn seems transformed into an invitation to elaborate addressed to Kars (Raymond & Stivers, 2016; Willemsen et al., 2019a). The teacher’s verbal and bodily
conduct in this extract (l. 56-59, 61-62) is understandable as reviving the discussion and inviting the students to take the floor again. Indeed, following this extract the discussion continues, the start of which can be seen in the video (from 00:18).

In the other type of discussion episode endings, the teacher produces a turn in overlap with a student and thereby intervenes in the discussion. Extract 7 demonstrates an example of this. Interrupting a student, the teacher asks a known-information question and hence installs an instructional framework in which he is the head of the interaction (Gosen et al., 2015; McHoul, 1978). Often in such cases, the teacher conduct near the end of the discussion episode already signals his/her imminent speakershers. This too is shown in Extract 7, in which the students talk about children helping their parents harvest. Dolando compares this to his own current situation.

**Extract 7.** After the discussion episode (2016S2.L4.F14.0:23:48.5)

1. Dol: ik moet %afwassen en de vuilnisza- eh zak doen, I have to %do the dishes and the garbage ba- uh bag, Tch: %looks at Dolando
2. maar ’k krijg geen vijf cent=ik krijg heemaal ni:ks but I get no five cents=I get nothing at all
3. Gee: nee maar &zi[.] k r egen %ook helemaal ni*ks no but &the[y g o t ] nothing at all ei*ther
   Tch: %looks at Geeke
4. ???: [%>stoms<%]
5. Tch: [%>stupid<%]
6. Dol: $ge’mee::n
5. Tch: $(0.4)
7. Dol: $mea::n
8. Tch: %$(0.2)
9. Tch: $uncrosses arms, starts leaning forward
10. Tch: $uncrosses ankles, takes paper and looks at it
11. Ami: %%(maar d’r [kwamen-]”
12. Tch: %%(but there [came-]”
13. Tch: $looks in Ami’s direction, sorts paper on left knee
14. Tch: %en die kinderen *die in de fa*brie
15. Tch: %[and those children *who worked in the factory then]*
16. Tch: %%rests arms on legs
17. Tch: werkten dan=$kregen die niks,
18. Tch: %did they get nothing,
19. Tch: $sorts paper on right knee

The teacher’s bodily conduct in this extract signals his imminent intervening: while looking at Dolando, (l. 4-6) he uncrosses his arms and starts leaning forward (l. 6). He then looks at his paper and, simultaneously with Amila starting a new turn, he goes on to sort it on his knee and looks in Amila’s direction (l. 8). Interrupting Amila, he then poses a question to the students. Through his known-information question, the
teacher changes the topic from working at home to working in factories and launches an IRE-sequence (Mehan, 1979b; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), thereby putting himself back into first and third position.

As the extracts in this section have illustrated, teachers take a turn when the episode has come to a natural end or bring it to an end themselves by interrupting a student. In both cases, the teacher turns typically install an instructional framework (Extract 7), but sometimes the teacher turns following a natural ending do the opposite and reinitiate the discussion framework (Extract 6).

5.4 Concluding discussion
This paper has reported on teacher conduct during episodes of discussion among students in the relatively under-researched setting of whole-class discussions. In these episodes, the students take subsequent turns while the teacher adopts a more facilitating role, as was suggested by the literature (Myhill, 2006; Soter et al., 2008; Van der Veen et al., 2015). We scrutinised this facilitating role by inventorying and analysing both verbal and bodily teacher conduct occurring before, during and after the discussion episodes, where previous research has mainly focused on verbal, initiating conduct (Myhill, 2006; Nystrand, 1997; Soter et al., 2008).

Our rather general instructions to two teachers to act like a facilitator have resulted in a large repertoire of conduct employed around episodes in which students indeed take subsequent turns. Before the episodes, the teachers use previously observed conduct such as open invitations and open-palm gestures (Gosen et al., 2015; Willemsen et al., 2018), but also make use of additional types of conduct (as well as different combinations) to invite their students to the floor. During the episodes, the teachers display mostly bodily conduct, e.g. nodding, gesturing and displaying recipiency by gazing at the speakers. Only seldom, the teachers produce vocal or verbal minimal responses during the episodes, and when they do so, these often function as continuers. The endings of the episodes are characterised by the teacher taking a turn after a natural end or in overlap with a student. These turns are used to bring back the focus or initiate a new topic while installing an instructional framework, for example by asking a known-information question, or to reinitiate discussion. This means that the teacher turns we considered the end of the discussion episode can very well constitute the beginning of a new episode.

Particularly interesting is the teachers’ conduct during the episodes, as the analysis of this phase has yielded a number of somewhat unexpected types of bodily conduct by means of which the teachers foster the discussion framework. For example, they maintain a listener role by drinking coffee around places relevant for turn transition. Their smiling and laughter at moments of overlap further signify their
role of facilitator instead of head of the interaction and turn allocation (Gosen et al., 2015; Willemsen et al., 2018).

Although we started our analysis by collecting episodes of subsequent student contributions, our primary focus in this paper was on the teacher conduct surrounding them. Of course, a more detailed analysis of the student contributions in these episodes will be of much interest as it complements the present study and provides a more complete view of what discussions among students look like. Another interesting direction for future research would be to further discern when and why teachers intervene in discussion episodes and how teachers’ reinitiations affect the ensuing interaction.

The present study has contributed to our knowledge of teacher conduct in the setting of whole-class discussions. By starting out with episodes in which students produce subsequent contributions, we were able to not only unearth the types of teacher conduct that lead to these episodes, but also the conduct that maintained them. The bodily as well as verbal repertoire reported in this paper proves that a facilitating teacher role does not mean a passive role: the teachers make use of several types of bodily conduct to maintain the framework and hence foster the discussion. Even when teachers eventually do take a turn, these can also function as a means to reinitiate discussion.
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