Asking for more

Willemsen, Annerose; Gosen, Myrte N.; Koole, Tom; de Glopper, Kees

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Asking for more
Teachers' invitations for elaboration in whole-class discussions

Annerose Willemsen

Linköping University, Sweden
annerose.willemsen@liu.se

Myrte Gosen

University of Groningen, the Netherlands
m.n.gosen@rug.nl

Tom Koole

University of Groningen, the Netherlands
tom.koole@rug.nl

Kees de Glopper

University of Groningen, the Netherlands
c.m.de.glopper@rug.nl

This paper addresses the ways in which teachers in whole-class discussions invite students to elaborate their previous turn. Our conversation analytic study uncovers that the teachers' invitations are prompted by elicited as well as spontaneous student turns of both subjective and factual nature.

equinox
www.equinoxpub.com

equinoxonline

While giving the students the space to expand on their previous turn, most invitations nevertheless steer towards a specific type of response, namely an account or explanation. Only incidentally, the invitations simply solicit a continuation. The fact that the invitations follow not only teacher-initiated, but also student-initiated contributions reflects the teachers' attempts to foster an actual discussion framework in which they partly hand over control and in which the student contributions are taken up for further consideration.

Introduction

In this paper, we show the different ways in which teachers in whole-class discussion settings ask their students to continue speaking and elaborate their previous turn. In these whole-class discussion settings in our data, the teacher and all the students in the classroom talk about curricular texts during history and geography lessons. Prior literature on fostering classroom discussions states that teachers should act as facilitators and promote a discussion participation framework, but does not provide much more detail. Our fine-grained analysis of teachers' invitations for elaboration will focus on one means to promote a discussion framework and answer the question of how exactly teachers encourage students to take the floor for extended periods of time and elaborate a prior turn.

Background

Although discussions (often referred to as dialogic instruction, Nystrand, 1997) are not commonly practiced in the classroom (Cazden, 1988; Nystrand et al., 2003), the benefits of discussions for learning are manifold. One of these benefits is that students' individual reasoning improves, as they exchange ideas and perspectives and practice to produce explanations (Murphy et al., 2009; Reznitskaya et al., 2009). In order to realize this type of development, it is often suggested that teachers should encourage their students to produce longer turns (Damhuis et al., 2004; Soter et al., 2008).

Moreover, the literature on discussion settings in the classroom repeatedly states that teachers should act as facilitators rather than to dominate the interaction (Myhill, 2006; Soter et al., 2008; Van der Veen et al., 2015). This entails a deviation from their normal practice in the classroom, often

referred to as monologic or teacher-fronted classroom interaction (e.g. Garton, 2012; McHoul, 1978). In these teacher-fronted settings, teachers typically take every other turn at talk by launching IRE-sequences (Cazden, 1988; McHoul, 1978). They often use the third turn to both reply to the students' response and move the interaction forward, for example by launching another IRE-sequence (Lee, 2007). In whole-class discussion settings, however, teachers are expected to facilitate interaction among the students. In order to do this, they need to partly hand over control to the students (Schuitema et al., 2018) by asking open-ended questions as well as letting the students respond to each other and produce longer stretches of talk in comparison to their short turns in response to known-information questions (Mehan, 1979). In other words, the teachers are expected to enable a different *participation framework* (Goffman, 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Gosen et al., 2015) which provides students the opportunity to produce more and longer turns (Damhuis et al., 2004; Soter et al., 2008): a discussion framework.

To date, suggestions or instructions to teachers for implementing such a framework in which they are no longer the 'head' of the interaction (McHoul, 1978) but rather a facilitator have remained somewhat vague. Although several studies have been conducted to specify particular teacher practices in whole-class discussion settings (Willemsen et al., 2018, 2019, 2020), to our knowledge no fine-grained study has analysed the exact ways in which teachers encourage their students to take longer turns and produce elaborations. Not only could these encouragements lead to a more discussion-like participation framework, they also challenge students to verbalize and explain their thinking which can increase their understanding and development of new perspectives (Bargh & Schul, 1980; Soter et al., 2008; Webb, 2009). Using a conversation analytical approach, we aim to answer the question of how exactly teachers invite their students to elaborate a prior turn. A sequential perspective (Schegloff, 2007) on these invitations for elaboration enables us to discern the types of student contributions that prompt them and the interactional effects they have. As teachers' turns have an immediate influence on the students' response options, it is interesting to lay bare these norms contained in the teachers' invitations regarding both content and form of the projected responses (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

In this study, we scrutinized teacher invitations for elaboration that follow student responses to an initiation by the teacher as well as invitations

for elaboration following student initiatives. The latter type of student contributions is relatively unexplored, as '[p]revious research has primarily shown how classroom interactions are initiated and managed by teachers' (Solem, 2016, p. 737). The setting of whole-class discussions allows for more student initiations. In our data, these initiations are indeed produced and moreover followed by teachers' invitations for elaboration. Whether the invitation follows a student initiative or a student response to a teacher initiative, we analysed the invitation formats and the types of responses the invitations solicit. Furthermore, we identified the types of student contributions that prompt the invitations and the student responses these invitations result in. We will show that, while giving the students the space to elaborate a previous turn, most invitations steer towards a specific type of response. Only incidentally, the invitations simply solicit a continuation.

Method

To uncover the details of teachers' invitations for elaboration, we made use of conversation analysis (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). With this method of research, we were able to conduct a fine-grained analysis of the invitations and distinguish between different types. In addition to this bottom-up categorization of the invitations, the method of analysis allowed us to identify the types of student contributions that precede and follow the invitations.

Our data set comprises 39 video-recorded history and geography lessons. These lessons were given by four teachers in four different fourth grade classrooms in the north of the Netherlands. For this study, a sample of 12 lessons was used in order to equalize the number of lessons per classroom. As for two of the classrooms the data set contained only three lessons each, we randomly selected three lessons from each of the other two classrooms as well. The length of the lessons is 45 minutes on average and varies from 30 to 64 minutes. The students are around ten years old. The first author of this paper was present at the lessons to make the video-recordings by means of three cameras. In synchronized compositions of these videos, the teacher and the students are all (almost) continuously visible.

Typically, history and geography lessons in Dutch primary school consist of reading texts from a textbook and then filling out questions in an exercise book. Therefore, in order to be able to study whole-class discussions, we asked the four participating teachers to hold such discussions with their

students. The teachers and students still read the curricular texts, but instead of using the exercise books, they *discussed* the texts by means of discussable questions: questions without an immediate predetermined right answer (e.g. 'What do you think it was like for X to Y during Z?'). Basing our instructions on general recommendations in the literature (Cazden, 1988; Myhill, 2006; Soter et al., 2008), we asked the teachers to refrain from being dominant and acting as a primary respondent (as described for teacher-fronted interaction by McHoul, 1978). Instead, we instructed them to give the students the space to take the floor for extended periods of time (Cazden, 1988; Soter et al., 2008) and to let them expand their own contributions in order to encourage them to verbalize their reasoning (Damhuis et al., 2004; Soter et al., 2008; see also Mercer, 1995 on educated discourse). We gave the teachers these rather general instructions without suggesting specific moments or promoting any specific practices. Hence, the teachers were encouraged to go unscripted and implement our instructions as they saw fit.

With our research, we aim to uncover how exactly the teachers employ the discussion recommendations as put forth by the literature and to establish the interactional effects of these practices. For the current study, we scrutinized the 12-lesson sample and made a collection of instances in which the teachers return the right to speak to the student who produced the preceding turn and invite this student to extend that turn. We identified these invitations for elaboration as invitations that encourage students to expand and unpack their previous turn. This is the case for instances in which teachers ask for more (in-depth) discussion of the same topic. Teachers' follow-up questions and other turns that shifted the topic were excluded from the collection, as these steer the discussion into a new direction. In most cases, the invitations for elaboration follow the contribution of one specific student, but in some cases the invitations follow simultaneous contributions by several students. Through the invitation, the teacher then addresses all of those students (e.g. 'one at a time please, but tell me why or why not') or allocates the turn to one specific student.

In the data sample of 12 lessons, 70 instances could be identified as invitations for elaboration (IfEs). Our analysis enabled us to distinguish different types of IfEs and scrutinize their characteristics. Furthermore, we analysed the preceding student contributions as well as the interactional effects of the IfEs by studying the students' responses to them. All

collection items were transcribed following Jefferson (1986) and names have been anonymized. The extracts presented in this paper were chosen on the basis of their representativeness of each category. In these extracts, we transcribed multimodal information at moments relevant for our analysis of the IfEs (see Appendix for an adaptation of Mondada, 2016). As our focus in this paper is on the teacher, we cut off most extracts once the student response to the IfE is clear. This means that, for reasons of space, the student response or the subsequent teacher's response is not fully included in every extract. For these cases, however, we did of course include the ensuing interaction in the description of the extract.

Analysis

In our dataset, we have identified three types of teachers' invitations for elaboration. All invitations encourage the student addressed to produce another, more elaborate turn, but they vary in the *kinds* of elaboration they solicit from the student. The first type, constituting the vast majority of all IfEs, solicits an account of the previous utterance (e.g. through 'why?'). The second type of IfEs solicits an explanation of the previous turn (e.g. through 'what do you mean?'). The third type occurs only incidentally and can be characterized as simply soliciting a continuation: the student is encouraged to continue speaking more or less incrementally without being steered into a specific direction. All three types of IfEs will be discussed in this section. For each type, we have also identified the types of student contributions that precede the IfEs and characterized the student responses following the IfEs.

Soliciting accounts

The largest category of invitations for elaboration, constituting more than two thirds of our collection, consists of instances in which the invitation solicits accounting. These IfEs typically follow students' assessments and expressions of assumptions, both elicited and produced spontaneously. Many of these student contributions are formatted as short stand-alone assertions. While most IfEs in this category appear to be prompted by the 'bareness' of these contributions, some follow more elaborate student contributions. In both cases, the teacher provides the students with an opportunity to produce (more) accounts. The IfEs are produced through 'why'-questions as well as more off-record variants.

Extract 1 presents an example of an IfE formatted as a 'why'-questions in response to a student's rather 'bare' assessment. The lesson revolves around the beginning of the Second World War in the Netherlands.

Extract 1: Soliciting an account – 'why'
(33.2016S1L8.0.18.52)

```
1    Tch:    ((voorlezend)) en *de koning↑in +(.) die gaat naar
             ((reading aloud)) and *the ↑queen +(.) she goes to
     Tch:                           *looks up, right
                                               +slow gaze to front+
2            engeland.+
             england.+
3    Mir:    (dat's) echt stom.
             (that's) really stupid.
4            *(0.6)
     Tch:    *still gazes in front
5    Tch:    ↑NOU.=ja.
         →   ↑well.=yes.
6        →   +(0.5)
     Tch:  → +directs gaze to Mirjam
7    Tch:    w:aarom.
         →   wh:y.
8            (0.4)
9    Kar:    [(vluchten) ]
             [(flee)           ]
10   Mir:    [ze laat dan] *gewoon ze laat dan gewoon: het hele land
             [she then just] *leaves she then just: leaves the whole
     Tch:                   *crosses arms
11   Mir:    in de +steek.=dat is echt niet goed.
             country in the +lurch.=that really isn't good.
     Tch:                   +distinctly nods once
12   Tch:    okee.
             okay.
13           *(0.2)
     Tch:    *directs gaze to other students
14   Tch:    +rea$geer.
             +res$pond.
     Tch:    +open-palm gesture
                  $retracts gesture
```

Directly after the teacher has finished reading aloud the text (lines 1–2), Mirjam self-selects without a gap and shares her strong negative assessment of the Dutch queen's behaviour: 'really stupid' (line 3). After a gap in which Mirjam does not elaborate on this 'bare' assessment (line 4), the teacher first aligns with it in a rather dispreferred way (lines 5–6). Subsequently,

the teacher invites Mirjam to elaborate by projecting the production of an account through 'why' (line 7). In response to this IfE, Mirjam supports her assessment by stating that it is bad to leave a whole country in the lurch (lines 10–11). The teacher's conduct in this excerpt seems to promote a discussion-like participation framework in which spontaneous student contributions are ratified and even encouraged to be elaborated. In addition, after having accepted Mirjam's account, the teacher opens the floor to the other students to respond (lines 13–14, see Willemsen et al., 2020).

As shown in Excerpt 1, the students' bare assessments are sometimes formulated in such a way that they may trigger the teacher to produce the invitation for elaboration. The strongly negative formulation 'really stupid'(line 3) is an example, as well as nuanced utterances that already allude to an account (such as: 'on the one hand yes, but on the other hand no'). In most cases, however, the bare assessments, other than being bare, carry no additional characteristics prompting an IfE.

Apart from overt invitations formatted as 'why (not/do you think)' and similar 'why'-questions, the IfEs that solicit accounting also occur in other formats, such as yes/no interrogatives and declaratives constituting a formulation of the student's turn. Extract 2 shows an example of an account invitation formatted as a declarative sentence. The fragment occurs approximately seven minutes before Extract 1 in the same lesson on the beginning of the Second World War in the Netherlands. The IfE follows responses to the teacher's initiating yes/no interrogative targeting the students' assumptions about everyday life in the Netherlands during the German occupation.

Extract 2: Soliciting an account – 'you think that you do go to school' (27.2016S1L8.0.12.03)

```
1   Tch:    zou je *gewoon e:::hm naar school kunnen of +zo.
            would you *just u:::hm be able to go to school or +so.
    Tch:           *gazes around the room                    +to Sum
2   Sum:    [nee.
            [no.
3   Kar:    [ik denk$ ik i-=
            [I think$ I I-=
    Tch:         $directs gaze to Kars
4   Sum:    =ik denk dat ze n[iet
            =I think that they [do not
5   Kar:                     [ik denk dat je wel *naar ↑school gaat.
                             [I think that you do *go to ↑school.
```

```
      Tch:                                              *tilts head left
6   ???:      [ja
              [yes
7   Tch:      [jij denkt dat je wel naar school gaat.=
          →   [you think that you do go to school.=
8   Kar:      =wa[nt    [ik bedoel eh ja:.
              =bec[ause  [I think uh ye:s.
9   Sum:         [ik den[k
                  [I thin[k
10            (0.4)
11  Kar:      h:elemaal zeg maar de eerste: (0.3) paar m:aanden of
              e:specially like the fi:rst (0.3) few m:onths or
12            weken_ •h dan dan dan dan: wee- dan is het zeg maar van
              weeks_ •h then then then then: you kno- then it is like
13            ↑aah_ dan (0.5) ben je bang voor de oorlog en dan ga je
              ↑aah_ then (0.5) you are afraid of the war and then you
14            veel binnen zitten lijkt mij.
              go and sit inside a lot I think.
15  Tch:      ↑ja_
              ↑yes_
16  Kar:      en dan ga je met de gordijnen dicht zitten, wachten
              and then you go and sit with the curtains closed, waiting
17            totdat de oorlog zou afgelopen zijn,=maar •H later denk
              until the war would have come to an end,=but •H later
18            je toch wel (.) ↑nou. [ik
              you PRT do think (.) ↑well. [I
19  Sum:                           [°ik zou°=
                                    [°I would°=
20  Kar:      =denk dat ik maar beter naar school kan gaan.
              =think I'd better go to school.
```

When the teacher asks whether the children would go to school during the war, Sumaya and Kars more or less simultaneously answer this question by expressing their own assumptions on the issue ('no' and 'yes' respectively, lines 2–5). Here again, the students do not elaborate on these assertions; they are 'bare'. The teacher then tilts his head and utters a formulation of Kars's turn (line 7) and thereby produces a request for confirmation in a declarative format. As Raymond and Stivers (2016) have argued, such requests for confirmation are an off-record way of soliciting an account for opinions and the like (cf. my-side tellings, Pomerantz, 1980). After all, the requested information is already known to the requester, which makes the request likely to be understood as soliciting an account rather than just a confirmation (Raymond & Stivers, 2016). Nonetheless, as Raymond and Stivers argue, the provision of an account in response to an off-record solicitation is voluntary, as a confirmation also suffices as

an answer to the request. Furthermore, compared to 'why?', requests for confirmation of known information convey a shallower epistemic gradient (Heritage, 2010, 2012, 2013) and present understanding as 'very nearly shared' (Raymond & Stivers, 2016, pp. 348–349). In this way, these IfEs reflect the teachers' attempts to exercise less control over the interaction and move from teacher-fronted interaction which is inherently asymmetrical (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979) to a more discussion-like participation framework. In line with Raymond and Stivers's analysis, Kars's response in Extract 2 immediately shows an orientation to the teacher's turn as projecting accounting: latching his turn to the teacher's turn and starting with 'because' (line 8), Kars produces an elaborate account including counterarguments (lines 11–14, 16–17, 18–19) that reaches beyond this extract. Hence, in this instance the teacher's IfE was clearly effective in eliciting a longer student turn.

Although most of the invitations soliciting accounts appear to be prompted by the 'bareness' of the students' assertions, this category also contains a number of instances in which the students' contributions are not 'bare', for example because the student has just given an account. A case in point is Extract 3, occurring between Extract 1 and 2 in the same lesson. At the beginning of this fragment, the teacher draws the attention back to the impact of the German occupation on the Dutch people's lives. When Mark responds to the teacher's questions by solely expressing his assumption (line 11), the teacher produces an IfE similar to the one in Extract 1. Following Mark's account, however, the teacher produces a second (line 17) and subsequently even a third IfE (line 21) to solicit accounting.

Extract 3: Soliciting another account – 'why'
(29/30.2016S1L8.0.15.30)

```
1   Tch:    even even even weer terug naar eh (0.6) je bent een kind
            just just just back again to uh (0.6) you are a child
2           of een volwassen iemand in die tijd,
            or a grown-up in that time,
3           e:h (0.5) [hoe ziet  ]↑hoe ziet je leven d'r uit.=kun je
            u:h (0.5) [how does  ]↑how does your life look.=can you
4   Pim:             [((coughs))]
5   Tch:    ga je gewoon naar je werk,
            do you just go to your work,
6           ga je gewoon naar school,
            do you just go to school,
```

```
7              doe je gewone dingen,=sport je nog,
               do you do normal things,=do you still play sports,
8   Kar:       ik de[nk
               I thi[nk
9   Tch:           [of zit je alleen maar binnen.
                   [or do you only sit inside.
10             *(0.3)
    Tch:       *gazes around
11  Mar:       +niet $zo:maar denk ik.
               +not $just like tha:t I think.
    Tch:       +shrugs shoulders
                  $directs gaze to Mark
12             (0.2) *(0.2)*
    Tch:             *gestures to Mark*
13  Tch:       waarom niet,
               why not,
14             (0.3)
15  Mar:       nou: e:h ↓want tis natuurlijk wel enorm gevaarlijk om zo
               we:ll uh ↓because it's of course PRT terribly dangerous
16             maar eventjes +↑jip↑pie ↑weer+ naar school te gaan,
               to just like that +↑yoo↑hoo ↑go+ to school again,
    Mar:                       +cheering gesture+
17  Mar:       en=
               and=
18  Tch:    =wa- wa- waarom.=wat kan er gebeuren °dan°?=
         →  =wh- wh- why.=what can happen °then°?=
19  Mar:    =nou: er zijn natuurlijk duitsers ook in het land,
            =we:ll there are of course also germans in the country,
20             (0.4)
21  Tch:       maar waarom zijn die: gevaarlijk dan?
         →     but why are the:y dangerous then?
22             (0.5)
23  Mar:       [de eh
               [the uh
24  Kar:       [°(nou) d'r is een oorlog.°
               [°(well) there's a war°.
```

When the teacher has solicited a first account from Mark in lines 11–13, Mark designs his response as an account ('because', line 15) and mentions danger as a reason for his assumption. Following this account, the teacher again asks 'why' and adds a question of what can happen (that makes it so dangerous) in line 18. The teacher thus invites Mark to elaborate and produce another account, thereby digging deeper into the previous account. When Mark indeed gives a second account ('there are Germans in the country', line 19), the teacher produces yet another account solicitation by asking why those Germans are dangerous (line 21). This invitation urges

Mark to dig even deeper and to provide an account for the account of the account. When Mark does not immediately succeed to produce one, Kars begins to give an account of his own (lines 23–24). Contrary to the IfE in line 13, the IfEs in lines 18 and 21 do not appear to be prompted by the 'bareness' of the preceding student turn that inherently invites elaboration in the shape of an account for the assessment. Instead, they display the teacher's attempt to let students dig deeper and unpack and verbalize their reasoning (cf. 'Socratic questioning'; Chin, 2007). However, by inviting Mark to produce more and longer turns, the teacher simultaneously takes every other turn and thereby maintains the turn-taking pattern that characterizes a more teacher-fronted kind of participation framework.

By means of Extracts 1–3, we have shown that the production of an account is one of the directions in which teachers steer their students while inviting them to elaborate their previous turns. These invitations are produced through 'why'-questions as well as more off-record variants such as formulations constituting 'known-answer requests for confirmation' (Raymond & Stivers, 2016). The invitations that solicit accounting typically follow students' assessments and expressions of assumptions, either spontaneous or elicited. While most invitations in this category appear to be prompted by the 'bareness' of these assertions, some do not follow a 'bare' assessment and seem to be produced in order to realize deepening of the students' contributions. In both cases, the teacher treats the previous student contribution as not enough or in any case as an opportunity to provide (more) accounting. Virtually all invitations within this category result in the production of an account, or at least a contribution that is designed as an account.

Soliciting explanations

Another category of teachers' IfEs in our data comprises solicitations of explanations. These invitations follow students' spontaneous as well as elicited contributions that are factual in nature, such as descriptions of certain notions or events. With this type of IfEs, the teachers demonstrate an 'asymmetry of knowledge or understanding' (Morek, 2015, p. 241) between them and the student and provide this student with the opportunity to explain their previous contribution and/or deepen that turn. The invitations are often shaped as interrogatives explicitly projecting an explanation, as 'what kind'-questions, or as wh-questions such as 'how did that go' or 'why did they do that?'. As will be shown, some invitations

seem to target an explanation *of* the previous turn, while others seem to target an explanation *on the basis of* the previous turn.

Extract 4 constitutes an example of an IfE that quite explicitly solicits the production of an explanation of the previous turn. At this point in the lesson, the class is discussing different options for offering resistance to the German occupation. Right before the excerpt, the teacher has announced to allocate some turns to the more silent students and has asked Lieneke to come up with another act of resistance. Upon her response, the teacher invites her to elaborate and explain what she means.

Extract 4: Soliciting an explanation – 'could you explain what you mean?'
(48.2016S1L10.0.11.34)

```
1   Tch:   wat zou je nog meer kunnen doen om
             what else could you do to
2            (0.4)
3   Lie:   [mm
4   Tch:   [het is niet erg als je dingen niet weet hoor.=maar
             [it doesn't matter if you don't know things PRT.=but
5            probeer- pro↑beer klein beetje mee te
             try- ↑try a little bit to
6            (2.2)
7   Tch:   wat zou je nog meer kunnen doen om het eh de duitsers
             what else could you do to eh make it difficult for the
8            moeilijk te maken.
             germans.
9            (0.5)
10  Tch:   of om: de nederlanders te helpen.
             or to: help the dutch.
11           (1.2)
12  Lie:   misschie:n ehm (1.1) allemaal dinge:n (1.0) instoppen
             maybe: uhm (1.1) put all kinds of thi:ngs (1.0) in their
13           in hun tanken bij[voorbeeld,
             tanks for ex[ample,
14  Jam?:                     [°(ja dat-)°
                              [°(yes that-)°
15  Jam:   °ce*[ment.°]=
             °ce*[ment.°]=
    Tch:      *shifts gaze to Jamiro
16  Pim:      [jha  ]=
             [yeah ]=
17  Tch:   =we- w >wil je< uit[leggen wat je bedoelt?
       →   =cu- c >could you< ex[plain what you mean?
18  Jam:                       [cement in de kogel: eh: waar die
                                [cement in the bullet: eh: where
```

```
19            kogel[s    uit]+komen.=
              those bullet[s      co]me +out.=
     Tch:  →                          +gazes back at Lieneke
20 Sve:         [(die eh)]
                          [(they uh)]
21            =(kogel [tegen)
              =(against [bullet)
22 May:             [ja
                      [yes
23 Kar:            [(en daa[r) proppen in te stoppen.
                      [(and) to [stuff (it) with clods.
24 Tch:                  [wat be- wacht lieneke wat bedoel je
        →                    [what do- wait lieneke what do you
25            precies?
        →     mean exactly?
26            (0.3)
27 Lie:    kijk dat ze bijvoorbeeld ehm hele (0.7) ehm ik weet
           look that they for example uhm very (0.7) uhm I don't
28         niet hoe je dat noemt maar gewoon
           know how you call that but just
29         (0.6)
30 May:    [cement (erop)
           [cement (on it)
31 Lie:    [ehm bijvoorbeeld (.) iets instopt dat niet goed is voor
           [uhm for example (.) put in something that is not good
32         •h de tanken en dat ze dan: •h dat daar instoppen.
           for •h the tanks and that they then: •h put that there.
```

When Lieneke suggests putting 'all kinds of things' in the German tanks (lines 12–13), Jamiro softly mentions cement (line 15). The teacher then solicits an explanation (line 17), while gazing at Jamiro. However, when Jamiro starts speaking again, the teacher quite quickly shifts his gaze back to Lieneke (line 19) and repairs his IfE as being addressed to Lieneke (line 24). In both IfEs, adopting a lower epistemic stance, the teacher explicitly asks her what she means (exactly) and thereby creates an explanation slot (cf. Antaki, 1996; Morek, 2015). Following the repaired invitation, Lieneke indeed produces an explanation prefaced by 'look' (lines 27–28, 31–32). In this explanation, she transforms 'all kinds of things' into the more precise 'something that is not good for the tanks', thereby clarifying that she is talking about sabotaging the tanks. Interestingly, the teacher produces his first IfE while other students have started to participate in the discussion as well. By requesting an explanation from Lieneke specifically, he prompts her to produce more and longer turns, while simultaneously preventing the discussion framework from taking shape.

In the next extract, the teacher solicits an explanation *on the basis of* the previous turn by asking a 'what kind'-question. The lesson is about the Second World War and right before this extract, the class discusses when a person is deemed Jewish. When Laurens then spontaneously remarks that Jewish people had to go to specific shops, the teacher produces the invitation for elaboration.

Extract 5: Soliciting an explanation – 'and what kind of special shops then?' (65.2016S2L9.0.24.37)[1]

```
1   Tch:     dan ben je niet joods:.
             then you are not jewish:.
2   Lau:     het was wel zo, (0.5) dat ehm: (0.4) dat ze:- e:h
             it was PRT such, (0.5) that uhm: (0.4) that they:- uh
3            (0.4) speciale winkels voor joden had*den.
             (0.4) had special shops for *jews._
    Tch:                                   *looks at his watch
4            (0.2)
5   Man:     +[maa:[r
             +[bu:[t
6   Gee      +[ja  [(        speciale)
             +[yes[(         special)
    Tch:  →  +gazes back at Laurens
7   Tch:         [en ↑wat voor speciale winkels dan?
          →      [and what ↑kind of special shops then?
8            (0.3)
9   Lau:     nou: (0.2) gewoon echt speciale winkels speciaal voor
             we:ll (0.2) just actual special shops especially for
10           joden.
             jews.
```

After Laurens's spontaneous remark regarding a historical event (lines 2–3), two students almost immediately start to produce a response (lines 5–6). The teacher, however, gazes at Laurens and – in turn-initial overlap with the aforementioned students – invites him to elaborate. He does this by asking what kind of shops he is talking about (line 7). Here again, the teacher assumes a lower epistemic stance and grants the student the opportunity to provide an explanation. Whereas the invitation in Extract 4 solicits an explanation of what was meant in the initial turn, this invitation projects an explanation that expands on and specifies the previous turn: it elicits the discussion of a 'kind of' shops, the discourse marker 'and' and the particle 'then' evidencing the follow-up character of the invitation. Prefacing his turn with 'well', Laurens responds and transforms 'special shops for Jewish people' to the more specific 'shops especially for Jewish

people'. With regard to the participation framework this extract appears to be similar to Extract 1. Again here, the teacher ratifies a spontaneously produced contribution and encourages elaboration, thereby promoting a discussion framework.

With Excerpt 4 and 5, we have demonstrated that IfEs can also be produced to solicit explanations and express the teacher's lower epistemic stance regarding the understanding of the student's turn. The teachers in our data do so by means of interrogatives that explicitly state the expectation of an explanation, by 'what kind'-questions, or by wh-questions such as 'how did that go' or 'why did they do that?'. The invitations in this category follow students' spontaneous as well as elicited contributions that are factual in nature and lend themselves well for the solicitation of explanations. Some of the invitations seem to target an explanation *of* the previous turn (e.g. Extract 4), while others seem to target an explanation *on the basis of* the previous turn (e.g. Extract 5). Virtually all of the student contributions in response to these invitations indeed consist of an explanation or specification of the preceding turn or are in some cases at least designed as such.

Soliciting continuations

Finally, our data also include two instances in which the teacher solicits a continuation. Both these IfEs follow self-selection by a student and do not project an account or explanation, but rather encourage the student to continue speaking and expand on the particular knowledge or thoughts that this student has brought up. Extract 6 below presents one of the two invitations that solicit continuation. In this extract, the teacher has just asked whether the students know – or think they know – more about the resistance, thereby encouraging them to extend the current discussion of their prior knowledge. In response to this question, Pim mentions a big protest in line 1, followed by a spontaneous contribution by Dinand which prompts the teacher's IfE.

Extract 6: Soliciting a continuation – 'do you know more about it?'
(43.2016S1L10.0.04.23)

```
1   Pim:    (mm weer was) (.) nou: ze gi↑ngen •h in de tweede wereld
            (mm again was) (.) we:ll they once: also ↑went •h in the
2           og- (.) oorlog °toch° ook een kee:r met heel veel
            second world wa- (.) war out on the streets with a lot of
```

```
3              mensen een (0.3) ja:: demonstreren of verzet doen?
               people to a (0.3) ye::s protest or do resistance °right°?
4              al[leen
               bu[t
5    Jul:        [s:taking.
                 [s:trike.
6    May:      [mja
               [myeah
7    ???:      [(staking)
               [(strike)
8    Pim:      [ja: ja: dat is toch beide- dat is toch een ↓beetje
               [ye:s ye:s that is PRT both- that is ↓kind of the °same°
9              het°zelf[de°?
               thing [right?
10   Jul:             [de winterstaking °of° zo?
                      [the winter strike °or° someting?
11   Din:      nee [de februa*ri↓sta[king.
               no [the februa*ry ↓stri[ke.
     Tch:  →                   *directs gaze to Dinand
12   May:        [nee.
                 [no.
13   Clss:                        [ja
                                   [yes
14   Jul:                         [ja ja oh sorry.
                                  [yes yes oh sorry.
15             (0.4)+(0.9)+(0.5)$(0.5)
     Tch:  →       +slowly nods once+
           →                       $lowers chin, open-palm gesture to Din
16   Tch:      *weet je d'r meer +van?
           →   *do you know more +about it?
     Tch:  →   *retracts hand    +lifts chin
17             (0.3)
18   Din:      eh: ik- het is: in februari maar ik weet niet meer (of:)
               uh: I- it is: in february but I do not now anymore (if:)
19             was het nou op zevenentwintig februari?
               was it PRT on twenty-seven february?
```

Pim's contribution is followed by a number of turns in which the students debate the right term (lines 5–9) and the right title (lines 10–14) for the event. When Dinand self-selects and produces his overt correction in line 11, the teacher gazes at him (line 11), and nods and gestures to him in the gap that follows (line 15). He then produces his invitation: 'do you know more about it?' (line 16). This invitation for elaboration formatted as a yes/no interrogative addresses Dinand's epistemic status and is presumably prompted by his strong 'no'-prefaced demonstration of knowing (Koole, 2010) in line 11. Contrary to the invitations in the

previous categories, this invitation does not project an account or explanation. Rather, it invites Dinand to continue speaking and expand on his previous turn by demonstrating more knowledge on the February Strike. Dinand indeed shows to understand the invitation as such and expands his demonstration of knowing in lines 18 and 19. Again, the IfE ratifies a spontaneous contribution and elicits elaboration, stressing the discussion character of the interaction. The 2.3-second gap in line 15 presumably also plays a part in the teacher's elicitation of an elaborating turn, as other students' contributions are no longer forthcoming and the IfE may be used as a means to reinitiate the discussion framework (Willemsen et al., 2019).

The extract shows that the teachers incidentally produce IfEs that simply project sharing of more knowledge or thoughts on the same topic. The invitation in Extract 6 was formatted as 'do you know more about it', the other as 'go on with what you said'. Both these formats clearly invite continuation of the previous turn, but do not project more specific types of responses, such as accounts or explanations. In both cases, the IfE follows self-selection by the students and, hence, mainly seems to provide that student with the opportunity to unpack the (sub)topic that s/he has brought up. The invitations indeed turn out to function in that way, as both student responses constitute the unpacking of the preceding turn. As these invitations mainly encourage the students to continue speaking and expanding their previous turn, one could say that these invitations constitute extensive continuers by means of which a discussion framework is fostered.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to describe teachers' invitations for elaboration (IfEs) during whole-class discussions around text in fourth grade history and geography lessons. With these invitations, the teachers encourage their students to elaborate and build upon their previously produced turns. In our data, we identified three types of IfEs, differing in the kinds of elaboration they solicit from the student. Ordered from frequent to incidental, these three types are: (1) IfEs soliciting an account of the previous utterance, (2) IfEs soliciting an explanation, and (3) IfEs that simply solicit a continuation.

Types of IfEs and their contexts

The IfEs that solicit accounting often follow more subjective – and hence accountable – student contributions. Both on-record and off-record variants of these invitations occur in the data. Often, these invitations seem prompted by the 'bareness' of the preceding assertion, whereas in other cases, the teacher encourages the student to dig deeper still. The IfEs that solicit explaining follow less subjective contributions by the students. Some of the invitations project an explanation of the previous turn, whereas other invitations rather project an explanation *on the basis of* that turn (e.g. by soliciting specification). The IfEs that solicit continuation follow spontaneous student contributions. This is also the case for some of the IfEs of the other two types, although most of these invitations follow teacher-initiated student responses. The IfEs that solicit continuation do so by conveying that the student is encouraged to expand the turn and share more knowledge or thoughts than in the preceding turn.

From these results, we can conclude that there are different contexts that prompt the invitations for elaboration. In some cases, the invitation seems to be prompted by and inherent to the bareness of the student's assertion. In other cases, the students' contributions prompt the teachers to encourage the students to dig deeper and/or verbalize their thinking. In both types of instances, the teachers steer toward a specific type of response: an account or an explanation. The invitations that solicit continuation and follow spontaneous student contributions are different, as they do not steer into a certain direction regarding the solicited response. Rather, they show that the teachers sometimes give their students the space to just continue speaking after a spontaneously produced contribution and to expand on it by sharing their knowledge and thoughts. As this concerns only two instances in a collection of 70 items, the question is how much space the teachers actually give their students in elaborating their contribution. The IfEs that solicit continuation show that the teachers are open to their students' own input, but most IfEs following spontaneous student contributions in our collection nonetheless steer the students in the direction of an account or an explanation. These invitations give students less freedom to elaborate their contribution in whichever way they want, but incite them to verbalize their underlying thoughts and come to the core more quickly.

Participation frameworks

Our observations regarding the participation framework in each extract seems to further reflect the teachers' balancing act between handing over control to the students on the one hand and ensuring the quality and length of the contributions on the other (Hargreaves et al., 2003; Schuitema et al., 2018). The teachers ratify spontaneous turns, elicit elaborations and invite other students' responses, but they also frequently reclaim control of the turn-allocation in order to elicit longer and elaborated turns from specific students. In this way, one characteristic of the discussion framework, namely students having a discussion among themselves, is hindered by the teachers' promotion of another characteristic: students producing more and longer turns.

One specific practice that appears to underline the teachers' attempt to enable a discussion framework is the off-record account solicitation. Its set of characteristics – the shallow epistemic gradient it conveys as well as the optional provision of an account in response (Raymond & Stivers, 2016) – may be the exact reason why the teachers in our data make use of the off-record account solicitation: it enables a deviation from the asymmetrical teacher-fronted type of classroom interaction towards a more discussion-like framework as it exercises less control over the interaction. A future study of these IfEs shaped as off-record account solicitations could provide us with more detailed information on how these IfEs function in the interaction and how they differ from the overt account solicitations (e.g. why) with regard to the participation frameworks.

Student responses to the IfEs

Our somewhat coarse analysis of the student responses to the IfEs demonstrates that all three types of IfEs virtually always result in responses that correspond to the solicitation. Although most student responses in our IfE collection do consist of actual accounts and explanations, some responses are *formatted* as an account or explanation, but rather constitute a repetition of the standpoint. This observation is in line with Ross (1995, 2008), who showed that students' explanations can be of low quality and consist of justifications rather than actual explanations. As in this paper, our focus was on the teachers' ways to invite students to produce elaborations of previous turns, we did not take a closer look at the exact function, the construction and the quality of the student responses. Of

course, such an analysis would also be interesting (e.g. Quasthoff et al., 2017) and would serve as a next step in the scrutiny of teachers' turns in whole-class discussions and the effects these turns have on the ensuing interaction as well as the students' overt reasoning.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that the teachers use various invitations for elaboration to solicit different types of responses from the students. For all three types of IfEs, the students answer with the conditionally relevant response or in some cases at least format their response as such. By means of the IfEs, the teachers convey to the students that their contributions are interesting and worthy of elaboration. The off-record account solicitations provide further evidence of the teachers' attempts to establish a more or less symmetrical participation framework. Moreover, the fact that the IfEs also follow a substantial number of spontaneously produced student contributions shows that the teachers really create space for students' own input and longer stretches of student talk. Nonetheless, most of the teachers' invitations do steer the students into a specific direction as regards the type of response solicited. Hence, without aiming at a specific answer (known-information question; Mehan, 1979), the teacher still establishes certain directions for the response to be produced and thereby exercises control over the interaction. This mainly holds for the IfEs that solicit accounts and explanations; the IfEs that solicit continuation come closest to providing the students with ownership over their contributions and the discussion as a whole.

About the authors

Annerose Willemsen is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Learning at Linköping University. Using multimodal conversation analysis and discursive psychology, she focuses on interaction in educational settings. During her PhD at the University of Groningen, she analysed teacher conduct facilitating whole-class discussions around texts in primary school. Currently, she studies children's traffic and mealtime socialization in Swedish preschools. She has published in international journals such as *Classroom Discourse*, *Linguistics and Education* and *Social Interaction*.

Myrte Gosen is an assistant professor at the Center for Language and Cognition Groningen. She has a particular research interest in classroom interactions in

relation to knowledge and she uses conversation analysis to identify the fundamental structures and practices in interaction that are related to knowledge construction. She has published in international journals such as *Pragmatics and Society*, *Classroom Discourse*, *International Journal of Educational Research* and *Linguistics and Education*.

Tom Koole is professor of language and social interaction at the Center for Language and Cognition Groningen and visiting professor at the Health Communication Research Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. He uses conversation analysis to study interaction processes in particular in education and health care. He has published in international journals such as *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Discourse Studies*, *Pragmatics and Society*, *Health Psychology* and *Linguistics and Education*.

Kees de Glopper is professor of speech communication and discourse analysis at the University of Groningen, where he teaches courses in literacy, language education and research methodology. His research interests include literacy, interaction and learning, reading and writing education, vocabulary learning and educational technology. He has published in international journals such as *Classroom Discourse*, *Learning and Instruction*, *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *Pragmatics and Society* and *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*.

Acknowledgements

Appendix: supplementary transcription conventions

Tch:	teacher's bodily behaviour
`*talk(*)`	bodily behaviour during talk; start (and end) marked with *, +, etc.
`*`**`bodily behaviour`**`(*)`	

Adapted from Mondada (2016)

Note

1 We are aware that in English, 'Jewish person' is often preferred over 'Jew'. With our translations of the transcript, however, we wanted to stay as close to the utterances in the source language as possible.

References

Antaki, C. (1996). Explanation slots as resources in interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(3), 415–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1996.tb01105.x

Bargh, J. A. & Schul, Y. (1980). On the cognitive benefits of teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(5), 593–604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.72.5.593

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning* (1st edition). Portsmouth, N.H: Heinemann Educational Books.

Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms: Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(6), 815–843. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20171

Damhuis, R., De Blauw, A. & Brandenbarg, N. (2004). *CombiList, een instrument voor taalontwikkeling via interactie: Praktische vaardigheden voor leidsters en leerkrachten*. Nijmegen: Expertisecentrum Nederlands.

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.666022

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher.

Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. (2004). Participation. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 222–244). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gosen, M. N., Berenst, J. & De Glopper, K. (2015). Shared reading at kindergarten: Understanding book content through participation. *Pragmatics and Society*, 6(3), 367–397. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.6.3.03gos

Hargreaves, L., Moyles, J., Merry, R., Paterson, F., Pell, A. & Esarte-Sarries, V. (2003). How do primary school teachers define and implement 'interactive teaching' in the National Literacy Strategy in England? *Research Papers in Education*, 18(3), 217–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152032000107301

Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. In A. Freed & S. Ehrlich (eds), *Why Do You Ask? The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195306897.003.0003

Heritage, J. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 30–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646685

Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 370–394). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch18

Jefferson, G. (1986). Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies*, 9, 153–183. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00148125

Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 43(2), 183–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351811003737846

Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 180–206.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7(2), 183–213.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk amongst Teachers and Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

Morek, M. (2015). Show that you know – Explanations, interactional identities and epistemic stance-taking in family talk and peer talk. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 238–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.004

Murphy, P. K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soter, A. O., Hennessey, M. N. & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 740–764. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015576

Myhill, D. (2006). Talk, talk, talk: Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(1), 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520500445425

Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When recitation becomes conversation. In M. Nystrand, *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom* (pp. 1–29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S. & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 35(2), 135–198. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP3502_3

Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: 'Limited access' as a 'fishing' device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3–4), 186–198. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1980.tb00020.x

Quasthoff, U., Heller, V. & Morek, M. (2017). On the sequential organization and genre-orientation of discourse units in interaction: An analytic framework. *Discourse Studies*, 19(1), 84–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445616683596

Raymond, C. W. & Stivers, T. (2016). The omnirelevance of accountability: Off-record account solicitations. In J. D. Robinson (ed.), *Accountability in Social Interaction* (pp. 321–353). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reznitskaya, A., Kuo, L.-J., Clark, A.-M., Miller, B., Jadallah, M., Anderson, R. C. & Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2009). Collaborative reasoning: A dialogic approach to group discussions. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640802701952

Ross, J. A. (1995). Students explaining solutions in student-directed groups: Cooperative learning and reform in mathematics education. *School Science*

and Mathematics, 95(8), 411–416. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.1995. tb10194.x

Ross, J. A. (2008). Explanation giving and receiving in cooperative learning groups. In R. M. Gillies, A. F. Ashman & J. Terwel (eds), *The Teacher's Role in Implementing Cooperative Learning in the Classroom* (pp. 222–237). New York: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-70892-8_11

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289

Schuitema, J., Radstake, H., Van de Pol, J. & Veugelers, W. (2018). Guiding classroom discussions for democratic citizenship education. *Educational Studies*, 44(4), 377–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2017.1373629

Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (eds). (2013). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch4

Solem, M. S. (2016). Negotiating knowledge claims: Students' assertions in classroom interactions. *Discourse Studies*, 18(6), 737–757. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445616668072

Soter, A. O., Wilkinson, I. A., Murphy, P. K., Rudge, L., Reninger, K. & Edwards, M. N. (2008). What the discourse tells us: Talk and indicators of high-level comprehension. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47(6), 372–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2009.01.001

Van der Veen, C., Van Kruistum, C. & Michaels, S. (2015). Productive classroom dialogue as an activity of shared thinking and communicating: A commentary on Marsal. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 22(4), 320–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039.2015.1071398

Webb, N. M. (2009). The teacher's role in promoting collaborative dialogue in the classroom. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709908X380772

Willemsen, A., Gosen, M., Koole, T. & De Glopper, K. (2019). Gesture, gaze and laughter: Teacher conduct facilitating whole-class discussions among students. *Social Interaction: Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality*, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.7146/si.v2i2.118045

Willemsen, A., Gosen, M. N., Koole, T. & De Glopper, K. (2020). Teachers' pass-on practices in whole-class discussions: How teachers return the floor to their students. *Classroom Discourse*, 11(4), 297–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1585890

Willemsen, A., Gosen, M. N., Van Braak, M., Koole, T. & De Glopper, K. (2018). Teachers' open invitations in whole-class discussions. *Linguistics and Education*, 45, 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.03.001