

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Hand-on-shoulder touch as a resource for constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework

Heinonen, Pilvi

2020-04

Heinonen , P , Karvonen , U & Tainio , L 2020 , ' Hand-on-shoulder touch as a resource for constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework ' , Linguistics and Education , vol. 56 , 100795 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100795>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/342821>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100795>

cc_by_nc_nd

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Hand-on-shoulder touch as a resource for constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework

Pilvi Heinonen, University of Helsinki, pilvi.heinonen@helsinki.fi

Ulla Karvonen, University of Helsinki, ulla.r.karvonen@helsinki.fi

Liisa Tainio, University of Helsinki, liisa.tainio@helsinki.fi

Abstract: Hand-on-shoulder touch as a resource for constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework

This article explores tactile practices in pedagogical settings by focusing on one specific pedagogical touch type: hand-on-shoulder touch. Drawing on multimodal conversation analysis, the present study examines variations in teacher-initiated hand-on-shoulder touch as well as the relationship between these variations and the pedagogical functions of touch, specifically as they relate to the construction of a pedagogically relevant participation framework. The datasets consist of video recordings of naturally occurring classroom interaction in Finnish schools. From this, three types of hand-on-shoulder touch are described (serial, sustained, and delimiting) and their characteristics outlined (e.g., duration, force, body posture). Hand-on-shoulder touch is also discussed as a conventionalized touch type with multifaceted pedagogical potential and variable use in coordinating and orchestrating student participation and engagement in classroom settings. This study thus contributes to both conversation analytical research on tactile practices and pedagogical research on classroom management.

Keywords: Tactile practices; Classroom interaction; Multimodal conversation analysis; Pedagogical touch

1. Introduction

In a classroom environment, many activities call for haptic interaction, that is, touching each other. Haptic sociality between participants in interaction (see e.g., Cekaite 2015, 2016; Goodwin 2017; Goodwin & Cekaite 2018), as well as embodied, intercorporeal and tactile aspects in human communication (Meyer, Streeck & Jordan 2017; Katila 2018) is a growing area of research in the field of conversation analysis. However, while there are some studies on professional touching in institutional settings (see e.g., Nishizaka 2007, 2016; Marstrand & Svennevig 2018; Mononen 2019), there is still a need for further research on touching and touch practices in pedagogical contexts especially in the field of education. Although there is some research on teacher-initiated touches and its functions during pedagogical activities (see e.g. Guéguen 2004; Cekaite 2016; Bergnehr & Cekaite 2018), the detailed analysis of different types of touches related to classroom management and pedagogical practices is still sporadic.

The underlying reason for the scarce number of educationally oriented studies on touch(ing) may be due to the complex nature of touch and touching (Kinnunen & Kolehmainen 2018), especially of intergenerational touching in pedagogical settings (e.g. Fletcher 2013). Touch is an ambiguous phenomenon and a sensitive topic for educators and teachers, which is manifested both in some teachers' attitudes (Andrzejewsky & Davis 2008; Hedlin, Åberg & Johansson 2018) as well as in national policies and guidelines regarding touch in school context carried out in some countries and schools (Öhman & Quennerstedt 2017; Jones 2004; Piper & Smith 2003). However, in Finland The Ethical Committee for the Teaching Profession has aligned that "School should not be a sterile and formal environment where physical touching is not allowed", stressing though that touching is a sensitive issue (OAJ 2015).

In classrooms, teachers are responsible for creating and maintaining a supportive environment for students' academic and social-emotional learning (Evertson & Weinstein 2006). The concept of classroom management refers to actions that teachers take in order to establish order, engage students in meaningful learning activities and gain their cooperation (e.g., Emmer & Stough 2001). According to Korpershoek et al. (2016), it is important to distinguish between proactive and reactive classroom management strategies. Proactive strategies aim to reduce the likelihood of unproductive behaviour in the classroom; these practices operate as creating caring and supportive relationships between teacher and students, as well as among the students, developing clear rules and procedures, maintaining students' attention, encouraging their engagement in academic tasks and promotion of their social skills and self-regulation (e.g., Reupert & Woodcock 2010; Safran & Oswald 2003). Reactive strategies, in turn, emphasize methods for intervening effectively in unproductive student behaviour and thus restoring classroom order. While proactive strategies are considered to be more effective in creating an orderly classroom environment (e.g., Herrera & Little 2005; Lewis & Sugai 1999), teachers also need tools to intervene in unproductive student behaviour during instruction. These tools include linguistic resources such as directives (see e.g., Hyytiäinen 2017; Dalton-Puffer & Nikula 2006; Kääntä 2004; Minick 1993) and reproaches (e.g., Jakonen 2015; Macbeth 1990; Margutti 2011; Tainio 2011), as well as non-verbal practices such as gaze, gestures, physical proximity and touch (Geng 2011; Levin & Nolan 2007; Little & Akin-Little 2008).

In this article, we use micro-analytical methods to analyse in detail one specific touch type teachers frequently use in classrooms: hand-on-shoulder touch. These touches are produced using body parts

that are (cross-culturally) considered neutral: hand, shoulder and arm (Suvilehto et al. 2015; Cekaite & Kvist Holm 2017). In our data, hand-on-shoulder touches serve variable functions. Occasionally, they are accompanied by verbal praises or encouragement and thus appear as means to prompt or reinforce desired behaviour. More frequently, however, they are produced as a response to inappropriate or disturbing behaviour, often accompanied for instance by verbal request or reproach. In this article, we focus on this latter type of hand-on-shoulder touches that, according to our interpretation, function as methods for reactive classroom management.

In the analysis, we aim to determine first which types of touches are observable as variations of hand-on-shoulder touch in terms of duration of the touch, parts of the body that touch and are touched and the toucher's and touch addressee's body positions. Secondly, we also examine how variations of this specific touch-type are tied to the pedagogical functions of touch, specifically those related to constructing a pedagogically reasonable participation framework. Our study contributes to both conversation analytical research on tactile practices and pedagogical research on classroom management, by showing how different variations of hand-on-shoulder touch are used in order to guide (disruptive) students' attention and behaviour in learning situations, and thus to maintain and construct a pedagogically relevant participation framework (on participation framework, see Goffman 1981; Goodwin C. 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin 2004).

Types of participation frameworks in the classroom (see e.g., O'Connor & Michaels 1996; Appel 2010; Lehtimaja 2012; Lerner 1993) vary from a dyadic form, that is, between teacher and student collective or individual student, to multiparty conversation. The type of pedagogically relevant participation framework depends on the degree of formality or informality of the learning situation as well as how the learning situation is interactionally organized and what the on-going activity type is (e.g., plenary teaching, classroom discussion, group work, individual work). However, in hectic classroom interaction, the boundaries between formal and informal situations, different activity types and participation frameworks are not clear-cut but rather vary along the continuum. In addition, in classroom interaction it is quite typical that participation frameworks intertwine so that the students engage in parallel activities and simultaneously manage orientation to a teacher-led "central activity" (Koole 2007; see also Karvonen, Heinonen & Tainio 2018). In this article, we will analyse how teachers use tactile resources to co-ordinate and orchestrate competing participation frameworks and guide students' attention in the context of different activity types in the classroom.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we introduce the data and method used in this study. Next in section 3, we provide a background for the study with an overview of previous studies on touching in pedagogical settings. In section 4, three hand-on-shoulder variations that teachers use in constructing collective, parallel and private participation frameworks during learning situations are analysed. Section 5 concludes with the discussion and pedagogical implications of our study.

2. Data and method

In this article, we use multimodal conversation analysis as a method for analysis (see e.g., Goodwin 2000; Norris 2004; Mondada 2006a, 2009; Heath & Luff 2012; Mortensen 2012; Deppermann 2013). A conversation analytical approach enables a micro-analytical perspective on social interaction. The focus of the analysis is on participants' orientations: how they co-construct their interaction and activities on a moment-by-moment basis. From the multimodal point of view, the focus is on how participants exploit multiple modalities of communication to achieve their interactional goals. In this article, we are particularly interested in tactile modalities in interaction added to vocal and visuo-spatial modalities such as gaze, gestures, body postures (Stivers & Sidnell 2005), focusing especially on touching practices and touch-types. In the analysis, we rely on Charles Goodwin's (2013) idea of co-operative logic of human interaction and particularly on the concept of "laminated organization of action-building", which refers to the range of semiotic fields that the participants simultaneously utilize in interaction in order to construct different types of actions. In accordance with this view, we understand that participants' actions are constructed by combining different kinds of resources, such as lexical items, prosody, gestures and tactile practices, within configurations where each contribution is mutually elaborated by others (Goodwin 2013).

The data consists of 62 lessons of video-recorded naturally occurring classroom interaction in Finnish comprehensive schools. Part of the data (14 lessons) were collected in monolingual classrooms with students in grade 6 (aged approximately 12 years). The number of students per class in these classrooms varies between 17 and 25. The rest of the data (48 lessons) was collected in multilingual classrooms that use Finnish as the medium of teaching. The number of students in these classrooms varies between 5 and 10, and the students are aged between 7 and 11. Seating arrangements in classrooms vary: in some lessons, students sit individually at their desks, while in

other lessons, student desks are organized into pairs, rows or groups, or students sit around a large table. None of the data used in this study was originally collected for studying tactile practices¹.

All participants (the teachers and students), as well as students' caregivers gave an informed consent for the collection of video data and its use for research purposes. All participants in the excerpts are anonymized and all visual illustrations are blurred to ensure confidentiality. Our data is part of the classroom interaction data corpus used for the analytic purposes of the project *Touch in school* (see <https://blogs.helsinki.fi/koskettavakoulu/touch-in-school/>). This project aims to explore interactional practices, meanings and norms of touching in Finnish classroom settings. It focuses on analysing, how teachers and students touch and become touched in classroom, and what kind of meanings touches convey in classroom interaction.

For the purposes of this article, we collected all interactional sequences that involved teacher-initiated hand-on-shoulder touch in this data set. Altogether, our data collection includes 83 such episodes. We transcribed all these episodes following conversation analytical methods, complemented with multimodal transcribing conventions (e.g., Hepburn & Bolden 2012; about transcription of multimodal practices, see Mondada 2006b). Furthermore, we categorized episodes into two groups based on the duration of the touch (38 long-term + 45 short-term touches). We excluded cases where the teacher touches the student's fore or upper arm (19 long-term + 28 short-term) as well as cases where the teacher shepherds (cf. Cekaite 2010) students by touching the student's upper back or shoulder with both hands (26 + 23 touches).

3. Pedagogical touch in classroom interaction

Interaction in institutional settings is inevitably connected to the institutional goals, objectives and roles of the situation (Drew & Heritage 1992). Classroom interaction, as a representative of institutional interaction, has its own institutional goals and objectives (i.e., a pedagogical agenda) and the participants' activities, including embodied and tactile interaction, are produced and interpreted as delivered in the institutional roles of Teacher and Student (e.g., Freebody & Freiberg 2000). While students' activities are more often produced also as "side-talk" that has little or

¹ Data collected from multilingual classroom was originally collected for the purposes of examining newly arrived students' language learning in a research project XXX. The rest of the data was originally collected for the purpose of exploring teaching and studying practices, especially those related to learning to learn skills, in schools located in metropolitan areas. Data collection was administered by Center for Educational Assessment in the University of Helsinki.

sometimes nothing to do with teacher's pedagogical agenda (e.g., Jones & Thornborrow 2004), teacher's activities are almost unavoidably considered by students as delivered in the institutional role of Teacher (Freebody & Freiberg 2000). Thus, also teacher-to-student touches are typically by participants interpreted as pedagogical touches – touches that are used to achieve the pedagogical goals in the interaction.

Pedagogical touch is partly parallel with tactile practices in other professional contexts (e.g., Nishizaka 2011; Öhman & Tanner 2017; Marstrand & Svennevig 2018; Mononen 2019), regarding participants' asymmetrical roles in interaction, as well as the task-oriented nature of the touch and touching practices. Thus, it seems to be sensible to define pedagogical touch as a subtype of professional touch. In classroom settings, we have identified two types of professional touches, first, those practically-oriented pedagogical touches that aim to help students to perform the instructed tasks, such as teachers demonstrating work positions to students in handicraft or guiding students in school physical education (e.g., Ekström & Lindvall 2014). Second, there are pedagogical touches that are oriented to social-relational work, that is, touches that are aimed to help students to concentrate on on-going activities or to calm down and direct their attention to the learnable (e.g., Cekaite 2016). In this article, we understand hand-on-shoulder touches as representatives of the social-relational touches. The cases analysed are considered as pedagogically motivated touches that aim to help students attend to the intended pedagogical activity. Usually both practically and social-relationally oriented touches are teacher-initiated but they can occur also between students, i.e. as manual guiding actions that serve as re-configuring and managing collaborative task in peer-to-peer-interaction (Kääntä & Piirainen-Marsh 2013).

Previous studies have shown several types of functions for social-relational teacher-initiated touches during pedagogical activities: e.g., encouraging (Guéguen 2004); controlling (Cekaite 2016); prompting (Burdelski 2010) and soothing (Cekaite & Kvist Holm 2017). In addition, Bergnehr & Cekaite (2018) have coded and categorized functions of adult-initiated touches in the pre-school context and examined frequencies of touches in relation to activity type as well as pre-schooler's gender and age. According to Bergnehr and Cekaite (2018: 329), the most typical functions of adult-initiated touches during pre-school activities were controlling, showing affection and controlling with affection. All in all, conversation analytical studies on the functions of social-relational teacher-initiated touches in pedagogical settings indicate that touching is used in controlling and shepherding touch addressees (Cekaite 2016; Bergnehr & Cekaite 2018; see also, Cekaite 2010) as well as showing affection and comforting them (Cekaite & Kvist Holm 2017;

Bergnehr & Cekaite 2018). Cekaite (2016) has shown that in adult-child-interactions, adults may use sustained control touch in multi-tasking situations to monitor the child's participation and attention or to modulate the on-going participation framework. Both Cekaite's (2016) study on the interactional functions of touch, as well as Bergnehr & Cekaite's study (2018) on diverse types of functions of teacher's touches resonate with our findings. However, in our study we will concentrate on one specific, observable and identifiable touch type, its variations and functions as well as its role in constructing pedagogically relevant participation framework: the hand-on-shoulder touch. What follows next, is a detailed analysis of three variations of social-relational hand-on-shoulder touch that we have identified in the data.

4. The role of hand-on-shoulder touch in constructing a participation framework

In this section, we will first briefly characterize hand-on-shoulder touch, its attributes and pedagogical functions. After that, we analyse the ways in which teachers use hand-on-shoulder touch to construct and maintain parallel participation frameworks in on-going pedagogical interaction. In our data, we have identified three types of variations of sequence-initiating hand-on-shoulder touch, where the toucher is a teacher, touch is produced by using one hand and the touch-addressee is a student. We call these types serial touch, sustained touch and extended touch. In addition, a fourth touch type that is also produced touching the shoulder or upper back, is identified, namely the shepherding touch (see Cekaite 2010). According to Cekaite (2010), tactile shepherding is typically used as an embodied directive practice in relocating the touch-addressee from one place to another. In our data the shepherding touch was typically produced by using both hands and, unlike other analysed touch types, it required the addressee's physical movement. As this touch type clearly differs from other three types regarding its form and pedagogical function, we excluded further discussion of this touch type from this article.

There are some key differences between the three hand-on-shoulder touch variations with regard to the duration of the touch, the part of the arm used in touching (for example fingers, palm or arm), toucher's and touch-addressee's body positions as well as the type of participation framework that is constructed by using a specific touch-variation:

- 1) **SERIAL:** Serial touch is a soft touch produced with tips of fingers or part of palm. The touch is short-term and it occurs as recurrent touches, which means that it is directed to several students one by one. During the touch, the students sit still and the teacher is on the move. By means of this touch type, the teacher constructs a collective participation framework.
- 2) **SUSTAINED:** Sustained touch is a semi-heavy touch produced with palm. The touch is long-term and static, and it is directed to an individual student. During the touch, both student and teacher are still. By means of this touch type, the teacher constructs and manages parallel participation frameworks.
- 3) **EXTENDED:** Extended touch is a heavy touch produced with a hand and an arm. The touch is semi-long-term and it is directed to an individual student. During the touch, both student and teacher are still. By means of this touch type, teacher constructs a “private” participation framework.

In all three hand-on-shoulder variations, the sequence-initial location of the hand-on-shoulder touch is tied to its function as a reactive practice for classroom management: the hand-on-shoulder touch initiates the side sequence in which the teacher intervenes in the student’s on-going activity and directs the student’s attention in order to re-organize the on-going participation framework. Thus our understanding of sequential organization relies on the multimodal conversation analytic idea of treating the embodied resources as an equivalent with linguistic resources in sequential flow and action formation (see e.g. Mondada 2006a, 2018; Rossi 2014). In the following sections, we analyse one example of each touch type in detail to show how these touch types are used to construct pedagogically relevant participation frameworks.

4.1 Serial touch as constructing a collective participation framework

Our first excerpt illustrates a variant of hand-on-shoulder touch that we call serial touch. A serial touch is short in duration and it is typically produced by touching the recipient’s shoulder lightly and gently by palm or fingers. As the name indicates, serial touches are produced in succession: the teacher touches two or more students relatively quickly one after another without making eye contact or communicating verbally with the touch-addressees.

In the following excerpt 1 (for transcription conventions, see Appendix A), the language (L1) and literature education lesson in a 6th grade classroom has already begun but some of the students are

still chatting with each other or are busy with something that seems to be an off-task activity. After using other directive resources (imperative verb form, line 4; silence and gaze, lines 3 and 5), the teacher uses a serial hand-on-shoulder touch to get students' attention focused on the on-going pedagogical activity and to calm them down (lines 6-8).

Excerpt 1: Starting the lesson

- 1 Teacher: *tota ↑äidinkielestä; (0.5) alotetaan (.) ensiks ihan.*
so the Finnish language lesson (0.5) we'll begin (.) first
- 2 *↑kertaamalla (0.5) ensimmäinen,*
by going through some things (0.5) the first
- 3 *(2.5) ((Teacher stands still, looks at students))*
(2.5) ((Teacher stands still, looks at students))
- 4 Teacher: *Eikka paa se lakki pois pääl- (.) päästä äkkiä? meil on äikän tunti menossa,*
Eikka, please quickly take off your- (.) your cap now; we have a Finnish language lesson going on
- 5 *(15.0) ((Commotion, students look for their books))*
(15.0) ((Commotion, students look for their books))
- 6 Teacher: *shh***T1 --**
shh
T1=TOUCHES RED-SHIRT STUDENT'S SHOULDER
- 7 Teacher: **STOPS BY AND TOUCHES ANOTHER STUDENT**
- 8 Teacher: *Jaakko* **T2 --**
T2=TOUCHES BLACK T-SHIRT STUDENT'S SHOULDER (Figure 1)



Figure 1: Teacher touches a student's shoulder lightly with his fingertips

The teacher begins to introduce the first activity but cuts off his turn before reaching the transition relevant place (lines 1–3). After standing still and looking at the students for some time, he addresses an individual student by name and produces a directive turn (*Eikka, please quickly take off your cap now*, line 4). During the 15 seconds silence that follows, the students do not show any signs of re-orienting themselves to the teacher. Hence, the teacher moves from the front of the

classroom and begins to walk around the classroom; he visits three students one after another, touching each of them on the shoulder lightly with his fingertips (lines 6, 8, see Figure 1). When approaching the first of these students, the teacher produces a *shh* sound, which has a conventional meaning of silencing (see Hyytiäinen 2017; Sahlström 2008). In this excerpt, the purpose of the activity, that is, quieting and calming the students, is achieved by using several linguistic and embodied resources, including linguistic means (imperative verb form), a phonetic sign (*shh*) and the tactile resources (touches), both simultaneously (line 6) and successively (lines 4- 6). This illustrates the lamination of resources in action-building (Goodwin 2013, 11–12).

While the teacher concretely touches only some of the students, his action is visibly available to other students as well. Consequently, to construct a collective participation framework for pedagogic purposes (here, to start plenary teaching), only requires touching (accompanied with other resources) some of the students. This excerpt illustrates, that the serial, quickly (1 sec.) and lightly produced hand-on-shoulder touch allocated to few students seems to work pedagogically reasonably: the student that was touched first, sets aside unrelated books he has on his desk and the student that was touched last, hands the teacher the scissors he has been playing with just a bit earlier. Immediate responses from the touched students and the mutual re-orientation to the on-going activity indicate that the participants have interpreted the meaning of teacher-initiated touch collectively in an unproblematic way: they orient to serial hand-on-shoulder touch as a routine way to intervene in their off-task activity and to direct their attention to on-going pedagogical activity. While serial hand-on-shoulder touch is directed to the student collective in order to construct a pedagogically relevant collective participation framework, the following two types represent touch types which are directed to individual students.

4.2 Sustained touch constructs a parallel participation framework

The second excerpt is from a multilingual classroom. It illustrates a variant of hand-on-shoulder touch that we call sustained touch. Sustained touch is long in duration (in this case 13 seconds) and its intensity is higher than that of the serial touch. It is typically produced by touching the recipient's shoulder with the whole palm. In this excerpt, the teacher and the students are playing a guessing game. The teacher has chosen an animal and the students should figure out which animal it is by asking her questions such as "is it white?" During the activity, one student, Rolan, begins to drum the table with his fist, wherefore the teacher uses a sustained touch to stop this disruptive behaviour.

Excerpt 2: Collective playing

- 1 Eimar: *siili,*
a hedgehog
- 2 Teacher: *ei ole siili, Ei↑mar*?*
no it's not a hedgehog Eimar
Rolan-TA: * **DRUMMING THE TABLE WITH FIST**
Eetu: ? **STARTS DRUMMING ALONG WITH ROLAN**
- 3 Teacher: **WALKS NEXT TO ROLAN, T1**
T1=PUTS HER PALM ON THE SHOULDER (Figure 2)
- 4 Rolan-TA: @auuu::@
Ow
T1-----
- 5 Eetu: *onko: tä↑mä valkoinen,*
is this white?
T1-----
- 6 Teacher: %↑voi olla%
it may be
T1-----T1 Θ
- Teacher: % **LOOKS AT THE PAPER IN HER HAND**
T1= HAND ON ROLAN'S SHOULDER
% **GAZE TOWARDS EETU**
T1 Θ= SLOWLY REMOVES HAND



Figure 2: Teacher stays behind student and keeps her hand on his shoulder

In the beginning of the excerpt, Eimar produces an answer that is treated as incorrect by the teacher (lines 1-2). Hereupon, Rolan begins to drum his desk with his fist and immediately Eetu, sitting next to him, joins the drumming. The teacher directs her gaze towards the students, walks behind them and places her hand on Rolan's shoulder (line 3; Picture 2). As a response, Rolan produces a

stylized voice (@*auuu*::@, line 4), a kind of response cry (Goffman 1978), while he stops drumming. However, the teacher remains behind Rolan and keeps her hand on his shoulder while answering Eetu's question (line 6, Figure 2). In this case, by using sustained hand-on-shoulder touch the teacher reacts to the student's disrupting embodied behaviour, but also ensures the continuation of the pedagogical task. By making use of different layers of modalities, the teacher manages to continue the whole-class instructional activity while simultaneously intervening in the disturbing behaviour of an individual student. In this excerpt, linguistic resources and embodied resources serve different purposes, while the activities or teacher-led "central activity" (Koole 2007) and student-initiated parallel activity are intertwined. Performing these two activities simultaneously enables the teacher to construct and manage parallel participation frameworks: first, completing the question-answer-sequence initiated by Eetu and managing the participation framework with the student collective, and second, focusing Rolan's attention on the whole-class activity and managing parallel participation framework with an individual student (cf. Cekaite 2016, 39–40).

At the end of the excerpt, the teacher slowly removes her hand (line 6) but stays in place, as if to make sure that Rolan does not begin drumming when the touch expires. After a short while, she moves back to her original place in front of the table. In this excerpt, sustained hold enables the teacher to intervene in one student's disturbing behaviour without suspending the ongoing pedagogical activity. In addition, the excerpt shows how touch may in some interactional contexts function as a primary resource to produce a directive. Reprimanding Rolan (and Eetu) for distracting the others by the noise they make would have interrupted the guessing game and actually disturbed its progress even more than the drumming itself. In this excerpt, disturbing student behaviour consists of fist banging on the table, and the teacher's choice to intervene in it by touching on the student's shoulder could thus be understood to be motivated by the type of disturbing behaviour. In our data, however, hand-on-shoulder touch is frequently used by teachers to intervene in other kinds of disturbing behaviour as well.

4.3 Extended touch constructs a private participation framework

Our last excerpt is again from a multilingual classroom and the participants are the same students we met in the previous excerpt. In this case, there are five students working around a table and two teachers: the assistant teacher (T1) stands next to the table and the teacher (T2) sits next to the touch-addressee student, Rolan. This excerpt illustrates the hand-on-shoulder-touch type that we

call extended touch. Extended touch is a gradually constructed, long-lasting touch. By using this touch type, the teacher may construct a private participation framework with an individual student.

Excerpt 3: Working around the table

- 1 Radimir: [*gimme terotin*
gimme sharpener
- 2 Rolan: [*ha haa*
ha haa
- 3 Radimir: *дайме мне теротин гимме*
give me terotin gimme
- 4 Teacher 2: *älä nyt Eetu jemmaa sitä terotinta&*
Eetu don't monopolize the sharpener
Teacher 1: **& SITS DOWN**
- 5 Rolan-TA: *ест у меня (--)***T1a** -----
I have
Teacher 1: **T1a= PUTS HIS HAND ON ROLAN'S UPPER BACK (Figure 3a)**
- 6 Rolan-TA:[(--)
- 7 Teacher 1: [*Rolan Rolan***T1b**-----
Rolan Rolan
- 8 Teacher 1: **T1b= MOVES HIS HAND ON ROLAN'S SHOULDER (Figure 3b)**
- 9 Rolan-TA: **GAZE TOWARDS TEACHER T1b**-----
- 10 Teacher 1: [*kunnolla (--)* -----**T1b Θ (Figure 3c)**
behave yourself (--)
Teacher 2: [*luokassa matkan jälkeen*
in the class after the trip
Rolan: **SHAKES HIS HEAD**
- 11 Teacher 1: *missä sä olit reissussa*
where did you go on a trip
- 12 Rolan: *↑mm*
mm
- 13 Teacher 1: *mis sä olit matkalla*
where did you travel
- 14 Rolan: *mä en muista sitä,*
I don't remember



Figure 3a: Step 1: Teacher puts his hand on Rolan's upper back

In this excerpt, we can see a gradually constructed hand-on-shoulder touch. The first step is when the teacher puts his hand on Rolan's upper back (T1a, line 5, Figure 3a). Rolan has just begun to speak in Russian something that is apparently not related to the pedagogical agenda (*ест у меня/I have*, line 5). However, after the first step of the teacher's touch, Rolan keeps on talking to the student sitting next to him. As a response, the teacher addresses Rolan twice (line 7) and simultaneously continues his hand-on-shoulder touch, indicating the lamination of multiple modalities, which now clearly serves to guide the student's attention and renew the participation framework.

The teacher takes the second step of the touch by next moving his arm to Rolan's opposite shoulder (T1b, line 7, Figure 3b), making the touch even more effective. In addition, he seeks face-formation with the student apparently in order to finalize the effect of this touch and to ensure its impact, as well as to construct a private participation framework with Rolan.



Figure 3b: Step 2: Teacher moves his hand to Rolan's opposite shoulder

In the second picture (Figure 3b) we can see that the extended hand-on-shoulder touch is produced by the teacher's whole arm, which makes it heavier than the two other touch types: serial and sustained. However, compared to the long-term sustained hand-on-shoulder touch, the extended touch is semi-long-term (4 sec.). On grounds of the participants' bodily orientations and dyadic face-formation, the touch is clearly directed somewhat privately to an individual student. However, concerning the participants' body postures, the face-formation is only partial (cf. Kendon 1990): in this case, face-formation is constructed so that the participants sit side-by-side, while only their upper bodies are situated diametrically. However, with this type of hand-on-shoulder touch, the teacher is able to construct a pedagogically reasonable private participation framework that enables him to manage Rolan's behaviour and guide his attention and to allow the teacher to indicate a willingness to start a dyadic discussion.

In the last picture (Figure 3c), we can see that at the end of the touch-sequence, Rolan turns his gaze towards the teacher. Right after that, the teacher re-formulates linguistically his request (*behave yourself*, line 10), after which he removes his hand from Rolan's shoulder (T1b Θ , line 10).



Figure 3c: Rolan turns his gaze towards teacher

By a gradually constructed extended touch, the teacher finally succeeded in constructing a private, dyadic participation framework that enables him to begin a conversation in Finnish with Rolan. Obligating or guiding students to code-switch is a typical practice in language-learning classes in

which speaking the target language is the main goal of instruction (Jakonen 2015). The teacher formulates a question, which is directed exclusively to Rolan by using a personal address term (*where **did you** go on a trip*, line 11). After a minimal response (*mm*, line 12), the teacher reformulates the question by using a simpler expression (*where did you travel to*, line 13), which gets a response in Finnish from Rolan (*I don't remember*, line 14). Right after that, Rolan re-orient himself to the task on which he has been working.



In this excerpt, extended hand-on-shoulder touch finally enabled the teacher to guide the student to pedagogically motivated code-switching. We consider, however, the linguistic orientation as only one aspect of this multi-layered touch-sequence and its pedagogical functions. Our data sets, as well as the detailed analysis of hand-on-shoulder variations in different types of classrooms (monolingual and multilingual), indicates that the forms and functions of this tactile practice are more often related to managing situational classroom organization and on-going pedagogical activities overall than, for instance, orienting to linguistic asymmetries and their impact in the classroom.

4.4 Summary

In the analyses of the excerpts, we have demonstrated the distinctive features of three different hand-on-shoulder touch types. The most visible differences between these touch types are found in the duration and force of the touch, as well as the part of the hand that is used in producing the touch. While serial touch is short-term, quick and lightly produced (see Excerpt 1), sustained and extended touches are long-term or semi-long-term; the former is semi-heavy and the latter is heavy in force (see excerpts 2 and 3). While serial touch is produced with fingers or part of the palm, sustained touch is produced typically with the palm, and extended touch typically occurs with the whole arm or even using the whole upper body, depending on teacher's and student's bodily positions and orientations during the touch-sequence; for instance, this may vary depending on whether both teacher and student are sitting or the teacher is standing and the student is sitting.

In addition, serial touch is targeted to the student collective, even if concrete touches are directed to a couple of students, while sustained and extended touches are directed to an individual student. Face-formation between toucher and touch-addressee is sought and achieved or partially achieved

only in the extended touch. Finally, these touches differ from each other regarding the participation framework that is constructed by utilizing these touches. In the case of serial touch, a collective teacher-led participation framework is constructed. In the case of sustained touch, a parallel participation framework is constructed with an individual student along with the collective participation framework, meaning that there are simultaneously a framework where the teacher and student collective are involved and another framework where the teacher and an individual student, the touch-addressee is involved. In the extended touch, the participation framework is constructed privately between the teacher and the individual student. The following summary demonstrates the key differences between touch types:

<p>SERIAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short-term, quick • light, produced with fingers or palm • synchronized with move and talk • directed to collective (possibly represented by some students) • serial • no F-formation • collective participation framework 	
<p>SUSTAINED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • long-term • semi-heavy, produced with palm • directed to individual student • static • no F-formation (teacher's gaze towards collective) • concurrent with talk • parallel participation frameworks 	

EXTENDED

- semi long-term
- gradually constructed
- heavy, produced with whole hand/arm (in some cases, with whole upper body)
- directed to individual student, individually focused
- synchronized with talk
- static
- F-formation (at least partial)
- private participation framework



5. Conclusion

In this article, we have analysed three types of social-relational hand-on-shoulder touch: serial, sustained and extended, from the point of view of constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework. Through the analysis, we have shown the characteristics of each touch type (i.e., duration and force of the touch and participants' body postures) and illustrated the multifaceted pedagogical potential of this teacher-initiated touch, as well as demonstrated its variable uses in co-ordinating and orchestrating participation and students' attention in classroom situations. In this task, the lamination of multiple modalities during tactile action-building either simultaneously or in stages is significant vis-à-vis (re-)constructing and managing a pedagogically relevant participation framework. The focus of our analysis on the relation between hand-on-shoulder forms and pedagogical functions enabled us to draw a more nuanced picture of directive and controlling functions (cf. Bergnehr & Cekaite 2018; Cekaite 2016) of one specific teacher-initiated touch type. Furthermore, our analysis indicates the pedagogical potential that tactile practices convey: through the hand-on-shoulder variations teacher may re-organize the on-going participation framework in a situationally reasonable and pedagogically justified way into collective, parallel or private participation frameworks.

Our data included both monolingual and multilingual classrooms, but we did not find linguistic diversity salient regarding tactile practices. However, the spatial organization of the classroom and spatial installations of the participants are crucial when it comes to the potential for a student to be touched and, in particular, the manner in which students are touched in classroom situations. In excerpts 1 and 2, where serial and sustained touch types occurred, the student desks were arranged in group settings and the teacher was situated in front or beside the student group. Correspondingly, in excerpt 3, where extended touch type occurred, all the students were in a mutual group setting and the teacher was sitting among the students and next to the addressed student. Thus, spatial organization together with other contextual factors, may affect the extent to which the teacher is able to intrude into student's personal space (cf. Rossano et al. 2015; Stokoe & Wallwork 2003).

As mentioned before, in the field of classroom interaction studies as well as in the traditional view of classroom management practices, little attention has been paid to embodied and particularly tactile practices during pedagogical activities. Since hand-on-shoulder touch is prototypically used as teacher's intervention in an on-going, typically disruptive or otherwise unproductive activity, it clearly mirrors the institutional relations between participants. The institutional asymmetry between participants is visible in the sequential placement of teacher-initiated hand-on-shoulder touch, as the main sequential context of this touch is initiating a sequence (Tainio, Karvonen & Heinonen 2018). As exemplified in our excerpts, the hand-on-shoulder touch is typically used as an intervention into students' on-going activity to manage disrupting or competing activities of the touched student; thus, it maintains a pedagogically reasonable participation framework. However, the hand-on-shoulder touch can also be used in other sequential contexts, such as a closing of a sequence, where it often serves as an appreciation of the students' preceding activities, or as comforting and encouraging the student.

Due to current public discussions on touching, the complexity of touching as an interactional and pedagogical resource in a school context has been acknowledged. Furthermore, as we have shown in another study based on teacher interviews, teachers recognize the hand-on-shoulder touch as a typical and natural way of touching the students to calm them down, and thus use touching as a pedagogical tool, but they also make sense of the acceptability of touch between teachers and students by verbalizing the boundaries of appropriate touch particularly concerning the gender and age of the students (Tainio, Heinonen, Karvonen & Routarinne 2019). However, in this article we have shown that behind this heated debate on the ambiguous phenomenon of touching in educational contexts, there lies plenty of pedagogically motivated, ordinary touches with neutral

participants' responses in classroom interaction. In these cases, the professional and pedagogical framework of the touch justifies teachers' use of touch as a pedagogical resource. Consequently, through pedagogically motivated touches, participants may re-negotiate in implicit ways the boundaries between neutral and violating touches (i.e., abuse or sexual harassment) in a classroom context and learn to avoid unnecessary preconceptions about touching as a phenomenon that should unquestionably be avoided in institutional contexts.

References

- Andrzejewski C.E. & Davis, H.A. (2008). Human contact in the classroom: Exploring how teachers talk about and negotiate touching students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 779–794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.013>
- Appel, J. (2010). Participation and instructed language learning. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 206–224). Palgrave Macmillan, London. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1057%2F9780230289772.pdf>
- Bergnehr, D. & Cekaite, A. (2018). Adult-initiated touch and its functions at a Swedish preschool: controlling, affectionate, assisting and educative haptic conduct. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 26(3), 312–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2017.1414690>
- Burdelski, M. (2010). Socializing politeness routines: Action, other-orientation, and embodiment in a Japanese preschool. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1606–1621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.007>
- Cekaite, A. (2016). Touch as social control: Haptic organization of attention in adult–child interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 92, 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.11.003>
- Cekaite A. (2015). The Coordination of Talk and Touch in Adults' Directives to Children: Touch and Social Control. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(2), 152–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1025501>
- Cekaite, A. (2010). Shepherding the child: embodied directive sequences in parent–child interactions. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 30(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2010.001>

- Cekaite, A. & Kvist Holm, M. (2017). The comforting touch: Tactile intimacy and talk in managing children's distress. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 50(2), 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2017.1301293>
- Dalton-Puffer, C. & Nikula, T. (2006). Pragmatics of content-based instruction: Teacher and student directives in Finnish and Austrian classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 241–267. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml007>
- Deppermann, A. (2013). Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1), 1–7.
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ekström, A. & Lindwall, O. (2014). To follow the materials: the detection, diagnosis and correction of mistakes in craft education. In M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Heinemann & M. Rauniomaa (Eds), *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity* (pp. 227–248). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Emanuelsson, J. & Sahlström, F. (2008). The price of participation: Teacher control versus student participation in classroom interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 52(2), 205–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830801915853>
- Emmer, E.T. & Stough, L.M. (2001). Classroom management: a critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5
- Evertson, C.M. & Weinstein, C.S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C.M. Evertson & C.S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Management: research, practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 3–17). Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fletcher, S. (2013). Touching practice and physical education: deconstruction of a contemporary moral panic. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(5), 694–709. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2013.774272>
- Freebody, P. & Freiberg, J. (2000). Public and pedagogic morality: The local orders of instructional and regulatory talk in classrooms. *Pragmatics and beyond New series*, 141–162.
- Geng, G. (2011). Investigation of teachers' verbal and non-verbal strategies for managing attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) students' behaviors within a classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(7), 17–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n7.5>
- Goffman, E. (1978). Response cries. *Language*, 54(4), 787–815.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization. Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00096-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X)
- Goodwin, M.H. (2017). Haptic sociality. In C. Meyer, J. Streeck & J. S. Jordan (Eds.), *Intercorporeality: Emerging socialities in interaction* (pp. 73–102). Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. (2004). Participation. In A. Duranti (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 222–243). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Goodwin, M.H. & Cekaite, A. (2018). *Embodied family choreography: Practices of control, care, and mundane creativity*. Routledge.
- Guéguen, N. 2004. Nonverbal encouragement of participation in a course: the effect of touching. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7, 89–98. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/B:SPOE.0000010691.30834.14>
- Heath, C. & Luff, P. (2012). Embodied action and organizational activity. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation analysis* (pp. 281–307). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hedlin, M. Åberg, M., & Johansson, C. (2018). Fun guy and possible perpetrator: an interview study of how men are positioned within early childhood education and care. *Education Inquiry*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2018.1492844>
- Herrera, M. & Little, E. (2005). Behaviour problems across home and kindergarten in an Australian sample. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 5, 77–90. <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/journal/ajedp/>
- Hyytiäinen, J. (2017). *Anvisningar och uppmaningar i klassrumsinteraktion: Lärarens direktiv i svenskundervisningen i finska skolor*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-3022-8>
- Jones, A. (2004). Social anxiety, sex, surveillance, and the ‘safe’ teacher. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569032000155935>
- Jones, R. & Thornborrow, J. (2004) Floors, talk and the organization of classroom activities. *Language in Society* 33, 399–423. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505043047
- Jakonen, T. (2016). Managing multiple normativities in classroom interaction: Student responses to teacher reproaches for inappropriate language choice in a bilingual classroom. *Linguistics & Education*, 33, 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.11.003>
- Karvonen, Ulla; Heinonen, Pilvi & Tainio, Liisa (2018). Kosketuksen lukutaitoa. Konventionaalistuneet kosketukset oppilaiden välisessä vuorovaikutuksessa. [Literacy of touching. Conventionalized touches in interaction between students.] *AFinLA Year Book* 75(1), 159–183. <https://doi.org/10.30661/afinlavk.69257>
- Katila, J. (2018). *Tactile intercorporeality in a group of mothers and their children: A micro study of practices for intimacy and participation*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tampere. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-0892-6>

- Koole, T. (2007). Parallel activities in the classroom. *Language and Education*, 21(6), 487–501. <https://doi.org/10.2167/le713.0>
- Korpershoek, H.; Harms, T.; de Boer, H.; van Kuijk, M. & Doolaard, S. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic, behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes. *Review of Educational Research* 86(3), 643–680. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654315626799>
- Kinnunen, T. & Kolehmainen, M. (2018). Touch and affect: Analysing the archive of touch biographies. *Body & Society*, 25(1), 29–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1357034X18817607>
- Kääntä, L. (2004). No need necessarily to show off!: directives as situated activity in L2 classroom interaction. Master's thesis. University of Jyväskylä.
- Kääntä, L. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2013). Manual guiding in peer group interaction: a resource for organizing a practical classroom task. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(4), 322–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2013.839094>
- Lehtimaja, I. (2012). *Puheen suuntia luokkahuoneessa: oppilaat osallistujina yläkoulun suomi toisena kielenä-tunnilla*. [Directions of talk in the classroom: student participation during Finnish as a second language lessons in secondary school.] Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-7583-4>
- Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text-Interdisciplinary journal for the study of discourse*, 13(2), 213–246. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1993.13.2.213>
- Levin, J. & Nolan, J. F. (2007). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model*. Boston: Pearson.
- Lewis, T.J. & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive schoolwide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 31, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.17161/foec.v31i6.6767>
- Little, S. G. & Akin-Little, A. (2008). Psychology's contributions to classroom management. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(3), 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20293>
- Macbeth, D. H. (1990). Classroom order as practical action: the making and un-making of a quiet reproach. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(2), 189–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569900110205>
- Margutti, P. (2011). Teachers' reproaches and managing discipline in the classroom: When teachers tell students what they do 'wrong'. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(4), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.02.015>
- Marstrand, A. K. & Svennevig, J. (2018). A preference for non-invasive touch in caregiving contexts. *Social Interaction. Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.7146/si.v1i2.110019>

Meyer, C., Streeck, J. & Jordan J. S. eds. (2017). *Intercorporeality: Emerging socialities in interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minick, N. (1993). Teacher's directives: The social construction of "literal meanings" and "real worlds" in classroom discourse. In Chaiklin, S. & J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding practice. Perspectives on activity and context* (pp. 343–374). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511625510.014>

Mondada, L. (2006a). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8, 117–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059561>

Mondada, L. (2006b). Video recording as the reflexive preservation and configuration of phenomenal features for analysis. In H. Knoblauch, J. Raab, H.-G. Soeffner & B. Schnettler (Eds.), *Video analysis* (pp. 51–68). Bern: Lang.

Mondada, L. (2009). Emergent focused interactions in public places: a systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1977–1997.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.019>

Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(1), 85–106.

Mononen K. (2019). Embodied care: affective touch as a facilitating resource for interaction between caregivers and residents in a care home for older adults. *Linguistics Vanguard: multimodal online journal*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2018-0036>.

Mortensen, K. (2012). Conversation Analysis and Multimodality. In J. Wagner, K. Mortensen & C.A. Chapelle (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1061–1068). Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell, DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0212

Nishizaka, A. (2016). Syntactical constructions and tactile orientations: Procedural utterances and procedures in massage therapy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 98, 18–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.04.004>

Nishizaka, A. (2011). Touch without vision: Referential practice in a non-technological environment. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 504–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.07.015>

Nishizaka, A. (2007). Hand touching hand: Referential practice at a Japanese midwife house. *Human Studies*, 30(3), 199–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-007-9059-4>

Norris, S. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction: A methodological framework*. New York: Routledge.

O'Connor, M. C. & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 63–103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peräkylä, A. (2011). A psychoanalyst's reflection on conversation analysis's contribution to his own therapeutic talk. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis* (pp. 222–242). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Peräkylä, A. & Vehviläinen, S. (2003). Conversation analysis and the professional stocks of interactional knowledge. *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 727–750.
- Piper, H., & Smith, H. (2003). ‘Touch’ in educational and child care settings: dilemmas and responses. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(6), 879–894.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192032000137358>
- Reupert, A. & Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers’ use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(6), 1261–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.03.003>
- Rossano, F., Fiedler, L. & Tomasello, M. (2015). Preschoolers’ understanding of the role of communication and cooperation in establishing property rights. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(2), 176–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038493>
- Rossi, G. (2014). When do people not use language to make requests. *Requesting in social interaction*, 26, 303–334. John Benjamins.
- Safran, S., & Oswald, K. (2003). Positive behaviour supports: Can schools reshape disciplinary practices? *Council for Exceptional Children*, 69, 361–373.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290306900307>
- Sahlström, F. (2008). Ssh!: om hyssjanden i klassrum. *Kasvatus: Suomen kasvatustieteellinen aikakauskirja*, 39(5), 456–467. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ELE-1483856>
- Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the hill backwards: On interactional constraints and affordances for equity-constitution in the classrooms of the Swedish comprehensive school*. Doctoral dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2005). Introduction: multimodal interaction. *Semiotica*, 156, 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2005.2005.156.1>
- Suvilehto, J. T., Glerean, E., Dunbar, R. I., Hari, R. & Nummenmaa, L. (2015). Topography of social touching depends on emotional bonds between humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(45), 13811–13816. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1519231112>
- Stokoe, E.H., & Wallwork, J. (2003). Space invaders: The moral-spatial order in neighbour dispute discourse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(4), 551–569.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603322595275>
- Tainio, L. (2011). Gendered address terms in reproach sequences in classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(4), 330–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2010.09.004>
- Tainio, L., Karvonen, U. & Heinonen, P. (2018). Hand-on-shoulder touch in classroom interaction. Presentation in NERA Conference. Oslo, 9.3.2018.
- Tainio, L., Heinonen, P., Karvonen, U. & Routarinne, S. (2019). ”Siin varmaa niinku raja ylitty”. Opettajien käsitykset koskettamisen normeista ja rajoista. [Teachers’ perceptions of norms and boundaries concerning touch in school.] *Sukupuolentutkimus – Genusforskning* 3, 5–23.

Öhman, A., & Tanner, M. (2017). Creating space for students' concerns: Embodied feedback practices in hairdressing education. *Learning, culture and social interaction*, 14, 79–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.04.005>

Öhman, M. & Quennerstedt, A. (2017). Questioning the no-touch discourse in physical education from a children's rights perspective. *Sports, Education and Society*, 22(3), 305–320.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1030384>

APPENDIX A: Transcription Conventions

.	Falling intonation
,	Level or slightly rising intonation
?	Rising intonation
↑	Upward intonation pattern
↓	Downward intonation pattern
:	Sound stretch
<u>really</u>	Stressed syllable
(.)	Pause, less than 0.3 seconds
(0.5)	Length of pause
[]	Overlap
((laughs))	Transcriber's descriptions or comments, contextual information
(--)	Indecipherable
*/&/?/%	Point and DESCRIPTION of embodied action
T1	Starting point of the touch
Θ	Ending point of the touch
-----	Duration of the touch
TA	Touch addressee

