

# Pedagogical Functions of Sequences Organization of Talk in the EFL Classroom

Jirapa Abhakorn

Graduate School of Language and Communication, National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok,  
Thailand

**Abstract**—Conversational sequences appear to be basically built around a basic pair of adjacent interactional actions; such as a question which makes an answer become relevant next. However, in contexts other than ordinary conversation, there are more complex features of sequential organization needed to be investigated especially those occurred in institutional contexts. This study applied CA to examine the interactional activities of teaching and learning in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in Thailand. The results show that teaching and learning are not planned but contingent activities, and that the pedagogical goal of developing language knowledge is mutually achieved in a micro-context of interaction between the teacher and students mostly in a form of coherent successive and extended elicitation and response sequences rather than series of separated courses of random action sequences. Furthermore, detailed pedagogical implications which manifest itself in the developing of these sequences of talk are uncovered in a turn-by-turn basis. This empirical study provides evidence that inform the teaching practices about how classroom talk should be managed successively in order to achieve pedagogical effectiveness.

**Index Terms**—conversation analysis, classroom interaction, teacher talk, interactional sequence

## I. INTRODUCTION

Talks in general conversation have been conceptualized based on Conversation Analysis (CA) as sequences of actions that have some complex trajectories to them. The *sequence organization* of a general conversation is seen and described in detail by Schegloff (2007), who observes that turns-at-talk in conversation do not occur as series-of-turns hanging together like “identical beads on a string”. Actually, turns-at-talk in an interactional sequence are produced by the interlocutors as parts of a course of coherent actions. This theory of sequence organization is revealed through practices; for example when an act of responding is normatively projected by an interlocutor not only as a retrospective understanding of a previous act of questioning, but also a basis for a prospective relevance of the following act of assessment, and a basis for keeping the sequences going. The pioneer CA studies of sequence organization in a general kind of conversation; such as Schegloff, 1986; Heritage and Sorjonen, 1994, provides valuable ideas for this present research to apply CA to examine the activities of teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in a classroom context, and to uncover how the pedagogical activities are accomplished through sequences of interaction. An organization of sequences can be tracked to uncover what is being done, and why it is being done in that way (Seedhouse, 2004) in the language classroom from an *emic*<sup>1</sup> perspective.

Previous studies on classroom interaction, most of them have narrowed their focuses down to the studies of particular action types (see for example Brown, 1994; Markee, 1995; Suter, 2001; Morell, 2007), and particular sequences structures in the classrooms (e.g. McHoul, 1990; Lee, 2007, 2008). What new and interesting for this field of classroom interactional research is an understanding of the more complex processes through which a teacher and students conjointly produce, interpret and negotiate meanings of actions being done, which manifests itself in the extended structures of interactional sequences or sequences of sequences rather than a building block of initiation–response–evaluation (IRE) sequences. The use of IRE framework to prescribe any classroom interaction would hamper the opportunities to explore complex forms and functions of teacher and student's talk in authentic classrooms, since modern teachers no longer ask overly simple display questions or provide over-scaffold feedbacks all the time (Kibler, 2011). In addition, students sometimes initiate departure that turn classroom talk to ordinary conversation amid classroom teaching process which leads the teachers to constantly endeavor to maintain classroom control (Waring et al., 2016).

To capture classroom talk complexities, this research applies CA to examine the pedagogical relevance of the contingently developed sequence organizations in a Thai EFL classroom. It provides a critical analysis of the ways through which the organization of talk are co-constructed by the Thai EFL teacher and learners in a coherent and meaningful ordering, particularly in a form of teacher elicitation–student response, to achieve pedagogical goals. The results will provide empirical evidence that broaden our knowledge of the sequence organization in an EFL classroom

---

<sup>1</sup> Emic analysis is based on an examination of the understandings and orientations of the participants themselves. The *emic* is perceived by a number of educational scholars as being more relevant in the interpretation of social realities, while the *etic* perspective (external view) can never fully capture what it really means to be part of the society (Olive, 2014).

which are pedagogically developed in such a way that students' initiated acts which show their knowledge state are acted on, and incorporated into the flow of successively developed sequences of teacher's elicitation.

In the sections to come, I begin with a review of the theory and studies on classroom sequence organization followed by the main findings of this study including demonstrations of micro-analysis of data and discussion. Finally, the significances of the study are concluded, and some suggestions for further research are presented.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

While sequential organization is used as a general term to refer to any kind of sequential positioning of utterances or actions in an interaction such as turn taking, adjacency pair, and the overall structural organization of talk, *sequence organization* is a term which is used to describe the ways in which turns-at-talk are shaped or structured to make courses of action take place in sequences of conversation (Schegloff, 2007). In other words, conversational sequence organization describes the process through which turns and also sequences of talk are being organized to be coherent with the prior ones to get some courses of action accomplished, such as actions of request, offer, telling, and announcement. He further analyzes many examples of talk from general conversation and finds some general patterns of sequence organization which people use in order to organize stretches of talk and produce courses of actions. First, the expanded sequence is manifested in a pattern of a single base sequence of adjacency pair, and additional turns which are generally placed in three different positions: (1) before the first pair part as pre-expansions; (2) between the first and the second pair part as insert-expansions; and (3) after the second pair part as post-expansions. The other pattern concerns several sequences which have some ties of relevance, coherence, and organizational relatedness of a stretch of talk beyond the boundaries of a single base sequence and its expansions. To look closely at these connected action sequences in a general conversation, there are two main types of relationship that exist among them. The first takes the form of a series of sequence, that is, two or more sequences of action are connected as reciprocal sequences or as action-types series. The other type takes the form of successive sequences of action which the second initiated sequence seeks to act on the outcome achieved from the prior sequence and to develop extended sequences of interaction.

Apart from the work of Schegloff (ibid), there are a few studies which helps reveal that principles of sequence organization are more complex than just those centered on the notions of adjacency pair per se. Among the few studies, Heritage (2012) uncovers the role of *territories of knowledge* as the factor that underpin the sequence organization in general conversation. He describes about the role of territories of knowledge in a sequence organization as follows:

“First, speakers can position themselves in a relatively unknowing (K-) position relative to others concerning the matter at hand, thereby initiating sequences by inviting or eliciting information a projectedly more knowing (K+) recipient. Alternatively, knowing (K+) speakers can simply initiate talk concerning the matter at hand, thus launching a sequence, finding a warrant for this conduct by projecting their recipients to be in a relatively unknowing (K-) position.” (Heritage, 2012, p. 33)

The imbalance territories of information or knowledge state (K+ and K-) was also noticed by McHoul (1990) as a key driving element that motivate sequence organizations in a classroom. In McHoul's study, the focus is on the analysis of how teachers organize repair trajectories to achieve a pedagogical goal of initiating students' self-correction. The results show that the elicitation sequences are developed in a distinctive ways comparing to those occurred in ordinary conversation. That is, the teacher who initiates the elicitations most of the times does not take the unknowing position. Instead, the teacher, as presumably a more knowledgeable person comparing to the students, is found regularly withhold giving information while initiating students' self-correction through various methods of talk. These methods including clueing, question redirecting, question reformulations, and tentative corrections are used to mark the students as knowing recipient (Goodwin, 1979; as cited in Netz, 2016) and to pursue the sequence(s) of elicitation. The elicitation sequences are terminated through the provisions of responses which show a knowledge state of the student, and an assessment from a teacher as a “sequence closing third” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 123) which shows that the teacher has the information of a matter at hand (K+) while she is eliciting information from the student. In fact, a sequence can be expanded beginning from this third turn position.

The other research which considers the organization of successive sequences of elicitation is Lee's (2007) study on third turn position in teacher talk. What he suggests is that, during the successive sequences of elicitations, students are initiated to provide bits of information related to the same topic focus. This information is subject to evaluation and reflection by the teacher and by other students. Successive sequences and their trajectories are thus the record of the trajectories of bits of related information provided by students which can be used as information sources for student cohorts and for the teacher to proceed from one elicitation sequence to the next related sequences. This organization of elicitation sequence is similar to Schegloff's (2007, p. 213) description of “successive parts of a course of action” in that knowledge information gained from the students is the key element that drive classroom interactional sequences. Similarly, Netz's (2016) study of *Designedly Incomplete Utterances* (DIUs) used in ESL classes of gifted students in USA, found that the teachers embedded the recent given information into the DIU turn design in order to provide a clue that urge the students to give the answer that meet the teacher's expectation, and to restore elicitation sequence when there was a problem in interaction.

Among the few studies which have been conducted to provide analyzes of how interactional sequences are developed pedagogically in an EFL classroom, they focus on finding out the reason that drive the interaction and identifying

functions of the teacher's third-turn position which tend to extend the sequence of interaction. None of them use Schegloff's (2007) theory of sequence organization to examine the courses of successive structures of action sequences in the EFL classroom. Comparing to the studies which only describe the normative pattern of classroom interaction (such as IRF pattern), or identify functions of third-turn position, this study on sequence organization will provide extensive understanding of the discursive works that the teacher and students collaboratively do through talk to develop courses of pedagogical actions in the classroom, and to develop shared knowledge of classroom instruction.

### III. THE STUDY

In the present research CA approach is used as a tool to: (1) to characterize classroom interaction from an emic perspective; and (2) to trace the developing process of sequence organizations, that is, how they are organized and accomplished. The data presented in this research are drawn from naturally occurring classroom interaction co-constructed by a Thai teacher and learners in a mainstream English class at a public secondary school in the Northern Province of Thailand. The main focus of this English course is to teach general English, particularly grammar, to beginners. The teacher is a female Thai teacher of English who has an undergraduate degree in Education from a university in Thailand. She has more than 10 years' experience in teaching English to students at primary and secondary school levels. The students were 37 Thai students in Mattayom 2<sup>2</sup>. There were 25 female and 12 male students, all around 14 to 15 years old. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study, the video recording, and they were asked to ignore the camera and to perform as usual. The English lessons from this class were observed and videotaped for further analysis inductively based on the framework of CA and language classroom ethnographic research. The corpus of 16 classroom lessons (approximately 16 hours of interaction) is transcribed using transcription convention (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984) (Appendix). It is then analyzed in detail to describe the sequence organizations of teacher elicitation and the process through which these organizations were accomplished.

### IV. RESULTS A DISCUSSION

To overcome constitutive presuppositions of teaching activities, CA reveal knowledge constructing on a turn-by-turn basis rather than merely describing recurrent patterns. After several times reviewing the videos and transcripts, it is clearly observable that the instructional processes which are achieved in different patterns of successive and extended elicitation which are analyzed and discussed in detail in the following sections. These patterns of sequence organization are found, more than 50 occurrences in 16 lessons.

#### A. Successive Sequences of Elicitations and Responses

This section examines sequences of elicitation successively connected or interlocked as parts of a course of language instruction through the language pedagogical topics of vocabulary and meaning, and grammar. These successive structures are constructed when one elicitation sequence is completed, the teacher then makes use of the language knowledge which is shared with the students in this sequence of interaction to produce and make a connection to the next elicitation.

In Extract 1 the teacher uses "a question with known answer" (Macbeth, 2004) or a display question to begin sequences of teaching and learning about *Wh*-question.

#### Extract 1:

1. T: *Ē:w àrəj i:k*  
(What else?)
2. S1: [Why
3. Ss: [Who::=
4. T: =Who
5. (2.0)
6. T: → Who *pĕe: wā:*  
(Who means-)
7. Ss: [*k'raj*  
(who)
8. T: → [*k'raj* (.) *tə'én* who is your English teacher?  
(Who, for example who is your English teacher?)
9. Ss: Miss Pat Parasri=
10. T: =*tə'ə hāj k'ru: pən na tsá:w t'áj māj t'áj* Miss *ní:a*  
(So you want me to be miss, using Miss do you?)
11. Ss: Mr[s.
12. Ss: [Mrs.
13. T: Mrs. Pat Parasri

<sup>2</sup> Mattayom 2 is the Thai system of standard education which is equal to Grade 7 in the Western educational system.

In line 1 the teacher continues eliciting and assessing the students' knowledge of examples of *wh-questions* by designing a question turn, "What else?". Although two possible answers "why" and "who", are provided by S1 in line 2, and by some other students in line 3, the teacher initiates an assessment turn to complete the first sequence. The assessment turn unit starts with a repetition of only the answer "who", and a confirmation "yes" which shows that this is the teacher's preferred answer. She then uses this answer as an input resource to start a new elicitation sequence. The new sequence is designed by the teacher to be incomplete or DIU (Koshik, 2002; Netz, 2016). She forms it by echoing the students' response "who", and providing an incomplete elicitation turn unit in the first language (L1) before stopping and initiating the remainder from the students. The students complete this turn by giving the meaning of "who" in L1 in line 7. In line 8, this multi-unit turn is composed of one turn construction unit (TCU) which repeats the answer from the previous sequence to confirm receipt of the answer, and the other TCU which starts a new sequence and gives an example of using "who" in a question sentence in English. The students' answer, giving the name of the teacher, in line 9 implies that they perceive the teacher's previous turn as an act of elicitation which is used to ask for teacher-known information, that is, the teacher's own name. The feedbacks in lines 10 and 13 which focus on the students' knowledge of English rule of the use of Ms. and Mrs. show the teacher's orientation to this question as a resource for assessing language knowledge rather than an authentic question which ask for knowledge of her name.

It seems that the three consecutive sequences are positioned serially (Schegloff, 2007, p. 197), that is the next sequence beginning in the turn after the previous sequence is closed. However, the three questions, though perform different functions by initiating different types of response, are not merely new questions in a question series. Instead, they are successively developed as parts of a course of elicitations because the teacher uses the student's answers to initiate a new elicitation sequences.

The following extract also provides an example of the organization of successive questions with known answer sequences. The difference is that in this extract the students' knowledge of one grammatical form is used as a resource for the teacher to start a new elicitation which calls for knowledge of the next related grammatical form. Extract 2 shows the teacher teaching how to answer yes/no questions, and about subject-verb agreement in English.

Extract 2:

1. T: → *tæ: māj tɔ'ɔj yes I am (.) tɔ'ɔj māj k'á pen yes áraj*  
(It's not yes I am, is it? It should be yes what?)
2. Ss: I do=
3. T: → =Yes I do (.) yes they do f'á: pen yes he tɔj pen yes he áraj  
(Yes I do, yes they do. For yes he, it should be yes he what?)
4. S1: He does=
5. T: =Yes he does á:: ná  
(Yes he does that's right.)

The first elicitation in line 1 is composed of a question series on how to answer yes/no questions. The teacher designs the turn unit as a question tag to first give the information that the answer is not "yes I am", and then asks "is it?". She initiates the new elicitation to elicit the students' knowledge about the format of the yes/no answer "it should be yes what?". The students reply "I do" in line 2 shows how they orient to the second question as a real question, whereas the first one is oriented to as a clue giving resource. In line 3 the teacher recasts the students' response "Yes, I do". This practice shows that the answer is correct but incomplete since, in the same turn, she provides an example of another subject-verb agreement "yes, they do" then successively elicit the students' knowledge about verb agreement with "he". This elicitation in line 3 shows how the teacher provide an example of a similar form of verb agreement (they do), but eliciting knowledge of the different forms of verb agreement "For yes he, it should be yes he what?".

This practice of providing additional turn constructional unit and starting a new question to call for the different form of verb agreement demonstrates how successive sequence of action are used pedagogically in this occasion to give hints to students while asking them for a knowledge of the language form. The more units added, the more resources the students have in order to make sense of relevant responses. Through the structuring of successive sequences of elicitation, the students' knowledge is also developed successively. The students are led to construct knowledge of the first question before they are asked to provide the answers to the questions in the subsequent elicitation sequences. The students' knowledge of vocabulary and meaning, and grammar becomes a resource for the teacher to deliver the next elicitations and for the students to provide answers to the new elicitations.

### B. Extended Sequences of Reformed Elicitation

This section discusses sequence organization of teacher's reformed elicitations. When there is evidence of a delay on the turn of the students, the teacher reformulates and reworks the elicitation to initiate the students' provision of the answers. The teacher's reformulations are in the forms of: (1) changing elicitation types; (2) providing clues; and (3) revising the language of the elicitation. By constructing different turn designs, the same reply is still relevant but more interactional resources are given based on the students' delayed in responding. The first example is shown in Extract 3. It is taken from the activity of answering question in the worksheet.

## Extract 3:

1. T: → What does your mother want you to be now? *mǎj k'wəm wǎ:*  
(It means-)
2. Ss: (5.0)
3. T: → *plée sǐ məé k'wǎn k'un (1.0) tǐn kǎn hǎj k'un*  
(Translate it. What does your mother want you to-)
4. S1: → *t'am ǎraj*  
(To do)
5. T: *Pen ǎraj* yes that's right  
(To be)

After the students' silence in line 2 which implies that they may have difficulty giving the L1 meaning of "What does your mother want you to be now?" the teacher re-elicits. However, the elicitation is changed into a form of DIU that invites completion by the students, that is, the teacher provides parts of the answer "your mother wants you to-", and S1 fills in the rest of the answer "to be". According to Nerz (2016, p. 65), silence is a deviant act that departure from pedagogical trajectory which is normatively re-acted by the teacher using DIU to restore classroom talk and to urge students to respond.

There is another technique used to handle the silence, Extract 4 is taken from the teaching of "have, has" and how to use these words in interrogative and informative sentences. The extract shows evidence of the teacher's reformulation of the elicitation by switching language and extending the turn-constructural unit to include an unfinished list construction in order to deal with delayed response.

## Extract 4:

1. T: Have dinner
2. Ss: Have dinner
3. T: → *mǎj k'wəm wǎ: ǎraj* what does it mean?  
(What does it mean? What does it mean?)
4. Ss: (3.0)
5. T: → Have dinner *plée: wǎ: ǎraj (.) mǔ:an kǎp* have breakfast have lunch *plée: wǎ:*  
(Have dinner what does it mean? It is similar to have breakfast, have lunch. It means-)
6. (2.0)
7. T: → *a thǎ:n*  
(Meal)
8. Ss: *Jen=*  
(Evening)
9. T: *=a thǎ:n jen* that's right  
(Evening meal, that's right)

In line 3, the teacher elicits the students' knowledge about the equivalent L1 meaning of "have dinner". The elicitation is conducted in Thai, followed by the equivalent meaning in second language (L2). After three seconds of silence, the teacher elicits the students' knowledge of the meaning again. However, the elicitation in line 5 is reformulated by using L1 as the language of communication, while L2 is embedded in the Thai sentence. This new elicitation in line 5 is successively produced by referring to the phrase in line 1 (have dinner), and giving some examples of similar phrases (have breakfast, have lunch) before eliciting for the meaning of "have dinner".

The elicitation is not in the form of a question, but the teacher provides "incomplete list construction" (Jefferson, 1990; Lerner, 1995) which initiate a word search from the students. "A list in progress furnishes recipients with the characteristics and form of a proper list item and a site for it to be issued" (Lerner, 1995, p. 118). However, as it is shown in line 7, the students still keep silent. In line 8 the teacher adds more information "meal" and gives turn to the students to provide the remainder of the phrase, which may be the part of the answer she wants to elicit from the students the most. The students realize that the word "meal" is provided to prompt them to answer with the rest of the expression, which is "evening" in line 9, and this answer is followed by the teacher's positive feedback in line 10. The data also reveal that the teacher reformulates the elicitations in a form of switching between L1 and L2, and gives parts of the answer, until almost all the information needed is given. She provides the answer that "dinner" is a meal, and the only information the students have to add is that it is the meal "in the evening".

The extracts presented in this section illustrate the contingent process of developing reformed elicitations to serve as an instructional tool. The teacher's designs of elicitation further reveal the opportunity given for the students to search for semantically and syntactically tying subsequent utterances to a prior turn as an extension of it. To be more specific, the structures in extracts 3 and 4 provide examples of sequentially achieved process of "scaffold" (Ellis, 1999) in the language classroom. Instead of giving the answer directly, the teacher keeps prompting the students to provide the answer that meets her expectation. Although the students are able to respond with the correct answer, it is not clear whether they have the content knowledge, or they actually are able to guess the teacher's expected answer from the kind of "cue elicitation" (Edwards and Mercer, 1987) initiated by the teacher.

### C. Successive Sequences of Elicitation and Students' Self-correction

This section describes features of elicitation sequences which the new elicitation is successively initiated by the teacher based on a problem in the students' answer to the previous question. Similar to the way the teacher reacts to the students' silence, she also uses the second initiated elicitation to prompt students' self-correction by helping the students to notice the problem in a response and to find out what is correct or incorrect about it. As shown in Extract 5, the teacher is instructing on the formats of questioning and answering in English. While withholding her feedback, the teacher gives the students the opportunity to provide answers in more than one turn in lines 2 to 4, before a feedback is provided in line 5.

Extract 5:

1. T: Verb to can *š'én* (.) can you speak English?  
(The verb can for example can you speak English?)
2. S1: Ye[s]
3. S2: [Y[ə]
4. S3: [Ye[s]
5. T: → [Yes *árǝj lá tǝp* Yes *hú:an rǝj*: Yes *árǝj k'á* Yes I (1.0) [can  
(Yes what? Yes only? Yes what? Yes I can)
6. Ss: [can
7. T: Yes I can.

In line 1 the teacher gives an example of a question starting with a helping verb “can”. At the same time this question is perceived as a question which performs the function of eliciting the students' response. Although the “Yes” answers given in lines 2 to 4 are correct, they are not in the correct form of language the teacher expects. This can be proved in line 5, when the teacher repeats the students' responses and accounts for what is missing. In one turn, she provides three different types of verbal prompt. One is a yes–no question “Yes only?” which gives the students a hint to notice whether only “yes” is a correct answer or not. Then she repairs the question “Yes what?” that prompts the students to produce the missing parts which should follow “yes”. Finally she provides a designedly incomplete turn “Yes I”, followed by a one-second pause to prompt the students to complete it. The students fill in the word “can” at the overlap with the teacher's turn. The teacher confirms the complete form of the answer “Yes I can” in line 7. The elicitation series in line 5 are constructed to extend the students' previous answer without correcting it, and to elicit a further correction of that answer from the students. This finding is parallel to Netz's (2016) finding that “DIU is used a last resort after all other elicitation forms have failed. It provide so much information that the missing item becomes completely transparent” (p.66). Although DIU may neither authentic in nature nor successfully engage students in learning (Mercer, 1995), the reason that it is used here maybe because it is a subtle way to let students notice their mistake without discouraging to further respond.

Extract 6 shows another form of how the teacher initiates new elicitation in the third turn to successively prompt the students' self-correction. It is taken from the textbook-based questions and answer activity.

Extract 6:

1. T: *á: k'á: sǝŋ*  
(Number two)
2. Ss: *Di:d Mary buy* ((unintelligible)) ((reading))
3. T: *tǝp wá: árǝj=*  
(What is the answer?)
4. Ss: =No↑ he does
5. T: → No↑ he *rú: she=*  
(No he or she?)
6. Ss: =she
7. T: she *Ná k'á Mary pen p'ú: jǝŋ* no she didn't  
(She that's right. Mary is a woman. No she didn't)

In line 3 the teacher elicits the students' knowledge of the response to the question “Did Mary buy a blue shirt?” in the textbook. After the students' response in line 4 “No he does”, the teacher initiates a correction of it using a new elicitation in line 5. The elicitation includes the students' response (“no, he”) and the teacher's choice of response (“or she”). The elicitation functions as not only calling for information, but also pinpointing what is not correct in the students' reply in the previous turn. In line 6, the students select the response, “she”, from the choice given. In line 7, the teacher repeats the response and offers an explanation that *she* is used because Mary is a woman. The data shows that, unlike natural conversation, classroom correction is routinely other- (or teacher-) initiated and students' self-correction. The teacher, having a professional identity comparing to the students, often provides prompts to help learners develop their knowledge state by themselves (McHoul, 1990).

## V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this article has examined the processes through which elicitation sequences were organized in the Thai EFL classroom. Structures of successive and extended elicitation sequences have been identified and described in detail. The proposal to make here is that the sequences are not simply constructed as a series of connected elicitations. Instead, different features in elicitations are creatively designed to act on or implement the outcome from the prior sequence and to elaborate language knowledge co-constructed in teacher and students interaction. Even students' silence and mistake were acted on to control pedagogical goal of language classroom. According to Waring et al., (2016), the problems in classroom talk should rather be treated in such a way that conductive participation can still be encouraged. In the result and discussion section, I have discussed that the structures of successive and extended sequences of elicitation are pedagogically and interactionally developed as a process through which the teacher uses questions, each one is designed in a specific way, to steer the sequences of interaction as well as to develop language knowledge among learners in a particular direction.

The sequence directions or organizations have been shown to be motivated by the imbalance of information as suggested by Heritage (2012). However, the distinctive features are revealed in a form of the teacher, who is in a more knowledgeable position comparing to the students, uses display and cued elicitations to help students construct their own knowledge. The findings challenge the belief that the extensive use of questions with known answers could be a waste of time (Brock, 1986; Nunan, 1991; Brown, 1994; Suter, 2001; Morell, 2007). Instruction is actually accomplished through the successive sequences of questions with known answers. However, what teachers should concern is that when a designedly incomplete turn and an elicitation with choices of response is initiated to prompt students' self-correction, additional information is given as a prompt to obtain a correct reply. The use of elicitation with choice of response and added information may result in students correcting their answers from the information or choices given, rather than from their content knowledge.

According to this limitation, Cristoph and Nystrand (2001) suggest that teachers and students should engage more in authentic discussion and learning. The use of elicitation with no choice provided may encourage students' higher-order thinking to provide their personal opinions since there is no choice provided and they have to find out the answer by themselves. It could also be effective to prompt the students to answer in different ways, such as asking them to go through textbooks and find the answer by themselves, instead of providing parts of the answer and leaving them to fill in the remaining parts.

In sum, the distinctive organizations of successive sequences of elicitation have been studied to make understanding of what is being done in this Thai EFL classroom, and to inform teaching practice, teacher training, and research on the effectiveness of teacher talk, particularly the teacher practice of elicitation. This study is not an end in itself. Rather, it paves the way for a study of more complex successive sequences of different action types in language classrooms. In addition, most previous research on teacher elicitation has not considered how teachers structure elicitations in terms of code-switching in the language classroom. The data obtained from this classroom context provide evidence of the teacher using L1 as an interactional resource for constructing meanings and to prompt responses from the students. This feature could be valuable data of analysis for further research which aim to gain insight into EFL classroom interaction and learning.

## APPENDIX. TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

T	Teacher
Ss	More than one student
S1	Single student
::	lengthening of the preceding sound.
↑	higher pitch in the utterance
◦	utterance quieter than surrounding talk
(Unintelligible)	indicates unintelligible utterances
(.)	micro-pause
(2.0)	number in parentheses indicates seconds of silence
((Gesture))	non-verbal actions
?	rising intonation
<u>Underline</u>	speaker emphasis
=	the second speaker followed the first speaker without discernible silence between them
-	Abrupt cut-off
[ ]	point of overlap
→	A line of a particular interest in the discussion
<i>Translations</i>	
<i>English</i>	English translation of Thai speaking
English	English speaking
<sup>th</sup> əj	International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) with Phonemic Tones
( <i>Thai</i> )	English Translations

## REFERENCES

- [1] Atkinson, M., Heritage, J. (eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [2] Brock, C. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL quarterly*, 20, 46-58.
- [3] Brown, D. H. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall Regents.
- [4] Christoph, J.N., Nystrand, M. (2001). Taking risks, negotiating relationships: one teacher's transition towards a dialogic classroom. *Research in teaching of English*, 26(2), 249-286.
- [5] Edwards, D., Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: the development of understanding in the classroom*. London: Routledge.
- [6] Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. John Benjamins B.V., Philadelphia.
- [7] Heritage, J. C. (2012). The epistemic engine: sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on language and social interaction*, 45(1), 30-52.
- [8] Heritage, J. C., Sorjonen, M.L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: and-prefacing and a feature of question design. *Language in society*, 1, 1-29.
- [9] Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and interactional resource. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Interactional competence*. University Press of America.
- [10] Kibler, A. (2011). "Casi nomás me dicen qué escribir/they almost just tell me what to write": a longitudinal analysis of teacher-student interactions in a linguistically diverse mainstream secondary classroom. *Journal of education*, 191(1), 45-58.
- [11] Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: a pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on language and social interaction*, 35, 277-309.
- [12] Lee, Y. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39, 1204-1230.
- [13] Lerner, G. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse processes*, 19, 111-131.
- [14] Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevancy of repair for classroom correction. *Language in society*, 33, 703-736.
- [15] Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in applied linguistics*, 6(2), 63-92.
- [16] Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: talk amongst teachers and learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- [17] McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in society*, 19, 349-377.
- [18] Morell, T. (2007). What enhances EFL students' participation in lecture discourse? student, lecturer and discourse perspectives. *Journal of English for academic purpose*, 6, 222-237.
- [19] Netz, H. (2016). Designedly incomplete utterances and student participation. *Linguistics and education*. 33, 56-73.
- [20] Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. Prentice Hall, New York.
- [21] Olive, J.L. (2014). Reflecting on the tensions between emic and etic perspectives in life history research: lessons learned. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 15(2). Retrieved: August 20, 2015 from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2072/3656>.
- [22] Schegloff, E.A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human studies*, 9, 111-151.
- [23] Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [24] Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- [25] Suter, C. (2001). *Exploring teachers' questions and feedback*. University of Birmingham, Birmingham.
- [26] Waring H.Z., Reddington, E., Tadic N. (2016). Responding artfully to student-initiated departures in the adult ESL classroom. *Linguistics and education*, 33, 28-39.

**Jirapa Abhakorn** received a PhD in Education, Communication, and Language Sciences from Newcastle University. She is currently an Assistant Professor at the Graduate School of Language and Communication, National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, Thailand. Her research interests lie in the field of analysis of discourse, language teaching methodology and policy.