

University of Groningen

Text selection proposals in dialogic reading in primary school

Pulles, Maaïke; Berenst, Jan; de Glopper, Kees; Koole, Tom

Published in:
 Pragmatics and Society

DOI:
[10.1075/ps.17029.pul](https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.17029.pul)

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

Publication date:
 2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Pulles, M., Berenst, J., de Glopper, K., & Koole, T. (2020). Text selection proposals in dialogic reading in primary school. *Pragmatics and Society*, 11(4), 591-614. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.17029.pul>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Text selection proposals in dialogic reading in primary school

Maaïke Pulles^{1,2} Jan Berenst¹ Kees de Gloppe² &
Tom Koole^{2,3}

¹ NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences | ² University of Groningen | ³ University of the Witwatersrand

In dialogic reading during inquiry learning in primary school, pupils read, think and talk together about text fragments for answering their research questions. This paper demonstrates from a conversational analytic perspective, how the shared activity of text selection is constructed in a goal-oriented conversation and how text selection proposals are used. Two main practices are identified depending on the situation: (1) when all participants are reading the text for the first time, a text selection proposal is constructed with reading-out-loud fragments, and (2) when only one of the participants is reading the text, a text selection proposal is constructed with an indexical text reference and indicative summary of the topic. In both practices, a separate utterance that functions as a proposal is required to accomplish the complete text selection proposal turn.

Keywords: dialogic reading, peer interaction, text selection proposals, conversation analysis: inquiry learning, primary education, classroom interaction

1. Introduction

In modern educational contexts with collaborative learning settings and a knowledge-building environment (Bereiter 2009; Walsweer 2015), such as inquiry learning, *dialogic reading* is a common activity. We speak of dialogic reading when participants are involved in interactions in which they read, think and talk together (Maine 2015). Inquiry learning is an educational process that involves learners asking questions regarding the world, collecting data to answer those questions (Littleton & Kerawalla 2012), and build knowledge together interactively (Mercer 1995). Searching for relevant information in books and online is a

common manner of collecting data and therefore text (as an object) has an important role in this *problem solving context*. In inquiry learning, one of the shared goals of dialogic reading is to decide which portions of a text are usable (or not) to answer the inquiry question. In this context of collaborative learning, discussing a text and making joint decisions (Stevanovic 2012) about using or not using a text, requires readers to reason about texts and clarify to the other participants what portion of the text is being discussed and why it may be germane to the shared goal. When using text excerpts to answer inquiry questions, these text fragments must be selected before they can be used (or rejected as not being useful). *Text selection proposals* are used to co-construct this shared selection activity and may concern positive selection (text is usable) or negative selection (text is not usable). Doing a text selection proposal is an action in which a participant proposes which part of a text may be relevant or not to use for a shared goal, such as answering a research question. And since pupils are often using more than one text excerpt, a text selection activity comprises multiple text selection proposals that together construct the activity.

From an educational perspective, it is interesting to learn more about how children use text in dialogic reading. Research on collaborative reading indicates its benefits for reading comprehension (Murphy, Wilkinson, Soter, Hennessey & Alexander 2009; Nystrand 2006; Palincsar, Brown, & Martin 1987; Van den Branden 2000). However, data from collaborative working settings in the context of inquiry learning should provide more insight into how pupils actually utilize text to build shared knowledge and how text elements are introduced into the conversation. A text's relevance can only be discussed if it is shared among the participants, whether the talk is about how to handle the text fragments or the content of the text.

In this study, we explore the text selection activity in dialogic reading during inquiry-learning settings – informed by CA methodology – to learn more about how pupils use text together to find relevant information to answer their own research questions. We will focus on the practices of text selection proposals to demonstrate how text selection is accomplished in different contexts, and how the activity of text selection in the context of retrieving relevant information from text is co-constructed. In this paper we use the term *practice* to describe the different manners of how an activity, such as text selection, is realized.

2. Background

There is a growing interest in how (digital) objects are used to organize and shape interaction (Nevile, Haddington, Heinemann, & Rauniomaa 2014) and how for example paper documents are used to accomplish shifts of topic (Svennevig 2012) or activity (Mikkola & Lehtinen 2014). Weilenmann & Lymer (2014), in their study on paper documents in journalistic work, made a distinction between *object-implicating* and *object-focused* interaction – a distinction which is of interest for our study. In object-implicating interaction, the object is incidentally involved and the interactional activity could have been done without the object. In object-focused interaction on the contrary, the object is *essentially* involved in the interaction, for example because it carries information that is used by the participants, such as the texts in the interactions in this study. Dialogic reading, in the educational context of inquiry learning, could be classified as an object-focused interaction, because the reading activity and the text as object determine the (topical) orientation in the interaction; the participants are reading a text to find an answer to their research questions. Focusing on text selection activities, it could even be stated that the interaction would not exist without the text to be selected, and therefore the text is essential.

Selecting text fragments in dialogic reading is a type of action in which one participant makes a *proposal* regarding a text excerpt that may be used (or not used) to answer the inquiry question. The other participants may accept the suggestion, reject it or discuss it. In any case, the discussion is a social activity, and the participants must make a joint decision (Stevanovic 2012) to use or not to use the text fragment. *Proposals* are a class of verbal actions in which a speaker proposes some form of action to be performed by the speaker and/or the recipient, immediately or in the near or remote future (Houtkoop-Steenstra 1987). In text selection, the proposed action is to use (or not) the selected fragment to answer shared inquiry questions.

Proposals in general have been the object of conversational analytic (CA) research (Houtkoop-Steenstra 1987). Some studies have demonstrated that while proposals may be constructed in different manners (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen 2014), crucially they are recognized and treated as proposals by the other participants (Heritage 2012; Levinson 2013), meaning that the action that is specified has to be accomplished by both speaker and hearer. Text selection proposals are a specific type of proposal that must include a reference to the selected text, which supports the argument of potential relevance of the information in the text. Moreover, text selection proposals normally occur in a sequence of such proposals in a collaboratively constructed text-selecting activity. From a CA perspective, it is interesting

to discern how these text selection proposals are constructed with (verbal or non-verbal) reference to the text and how they are treated to construct a shared activity. Whereas just like proposals in general, a *proposal for text selection* can be packaged in different manners, the sequential context of an utterance and its uptake by the recipient can make such a proposal into a proposal for text selection. We describe in this paper how those proposals are constructed in the process of action formation (Levinson 2013) during dialogic reading sessions and how a sequence of proposals forms the selection activity.

The literature on *proposals* also shows that, while verbal actions can be accomplished in various manners (Braam 2015; Couper-Kuhlen 2014; Houtkoop-Steenstra 1987; Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2012; Stivers & Sidnell 2016), these different practices have consequences for the uptake in the second pair-part. In *text selection proposals*, in which a participant is proposing a text fragment for use, the other participants must decide whether the fragment is indeed useful or not, and may agree or disagree with the proposal. The preferred uptake in the second pair-part of the proposal sequence is *acceptance* or *agreement* (Schegloff 2007). In cases of *text selection proposals*, the proposal may be positive (“use it”) or negative (“can’t use it”), and acceptance is based on agreement with this positive or negative evaluation of the selected text fragment. Notable in this light is the study of Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) in which they considered *proposals* as one of the two types of first pair-parts to make a suggestion for a future action or event. The first type of suggestion is an *assertion*, which is a call for commitment to a future action and may be responded to with simply an *information receipt* (‘mm’, ‘yeah’) or a *compliance* (‘okay’, ‘all right’). A *proposal*, by contrast, implies that a decision (agreement or rejection) must be made in the second pair-part and may even be elaborated upon in a post-expansion. Both participants must consider the possibility of the declarative utterance being a proposal. Stevanovic and Peräkylä demonstrated that the packaging of a suggestion for future action invokes an expectation as to how the suggestion should be interpreted by the other participants. In text selection activities during dialogic reading, we may expect the pupils to use proposals in order to suggest text fragments, since the selection is supposed to be a joint-decision-making process (Stevanovic 2012).

The present study also contributes to research on collaborative reading and dialogic education (Wegerif 2013), and may provide insight in how pupils reason together in the shared process of finding relevant information. It is known that reading together benefits reading comprehension (Nystrand 2006; Rojas-Drummond, Mazón, Littleton, & Vélez 2012; Van den Branden 2000), literacy development (Rojas-Drummond et al. 2017) and the content learning of the participants (Maine 2013, 2015; Melander & Sahlström 2009). Maine (2013) demonstrated how together,

dyads make meaning of a narrative text in a reading dialogue by embedding that text in a larger context related to their own experiences. While together exploring different interpretations of the text meaning, the pupils refer to text elements and use these to construct shared ideas in dialogue regarding the text meaning. A recent study (Rojas-Drummond et al. 2017) on dialogic literacy (both reading and writing) in the context of a structured task in which pupils had to write an integrative summary of three texts on a common theme, demonstrated that pupils who are trained in a dialogic manner of learning are able to collectively write a better integrative summary based on their joint understanding of the texts. (How the children managed to recognize and discuss the important text sections for the summary was not a focus of that study).

How children advance from reading a text to interaction in which learning occurs in a more 'open context' was studied by Melander and Sahlström (2009); in their case, a context that may have been more comparable to inquiry learning because the use of the text was based on the pupils' own interests. In these authors' study, children were reading a picture book on animals (with written text) during a "free activity"; they were not focused on a specific topic or on learning. The learning occurred spontaneously when the children came across something that caught their attention (i.e., the size of the blue whale), triggered by a picture with different animals on it; this triggered an interesting discussion among the children, and an exploration of the size of the blue whale compared with other animals or a ship. Melander and Sahlström also demonstrated, using CA, how learning occurred in this dialogic reading and how the pupils explored the size of the blue whale using information from the text. During the discussion, the pupils referred with indexical references (West 2102) to several elements of the book; in these selection practices, they used both nonverbal (pointing) and verbal references to the pictures they discussed (for example "Look, it is bigger than the elephant.").

So, while previous research established how children talk in contexts in which they make meaning of a given (narrative) text and how they learn 'spontaneously' from a text they find interesting, the context of the peer interaction in this study differed from that of earlier studies because in inquiry learning, children are reading with a certain goal: to construct new knowledge together to solve their research problem. Thus, the reading of the text and the sharing of information occur in pursuit of this goal, and the children themselves are making choices regarding which text parts to use or not to use. The children construct these choices together by doing text selection proposals and responding to these proposals – something which may give insight in the pupils' reasoning, as they have to relate their research question to the information that becomes available to them via the text. In this paper, we use CA to analyze (a) how children collaboratively

construct a text selection activity during dialogic reading in shared inquiry learning, and (b) how contextual differences in the activity affect how *text selection proposals* are accomplished.

3. Data and method of analysis

To answer the question regarding practices of *text selection proposals*, reading dialogues were analyzed in detail. For this, we used a selection from a large corpus of small group discussions regarding informative texts among children in grades 2–6 (age 7–12) in inquiry-learning settings. The data were collected in a larger research project on *Cooperation and Language Proficiency* conducted in six primary schools in the Netherlands, which sought to develop more insight into how inquiry learning and the collaborative work of students might contribute to both language skills and knowledge-building (Berenst 2011). Twice a year, the six schools were involved in an inquiry-learning project lasting several weeks, during which pupils worked together in small groups on their own research questions within a given theme (such as regional history, sports, the earth). A total of five projects were monitored by the researchers between 2012 and 2014. Additionally, data were collected in a smaller research project – conducted in 3 primary schools, in which pupils worked together in short-term inquiry-learning projects, with reading materials supplied by the public library (Braam, Pulles & Berenst 2015). Thus, in both projects pupils worked within a problem solving context on their own research questions, used texts to solve their knowledge problems, and talked about relevance of text fragments.

Most small groups comprised two to four children and were heterogeneous in age, grade and ability level, since the majority of the participating schools had children from different grades in a single classroom. Group work was videotaped by the researchers or their assistants, using cameras with external microphones, during sessions that normally lasted between one and two hours. During these group work sessions, the pupils were talking, planning, reading, writing, drawing, etc. together in the different stages of the inquiry-learning projects, in order to find good research questions, search for information, answer the research questions and present the results. The database comprises in total approximately 450 hours of videotaped material.

From this large database, we first selected all the video excerpts in which the group work concerned dialogic reading, which resulted in a collection of 38 video fragments (each lasting from 5–30 minutes). In most discussions, no teachers were involved. The relevant portions of the videotaped discussions were transcribed to

allow analysis of the discursive details (Ten Have 2007), with a focus on the interactional practices in the children's talk about text selection. The first analysis of this dialogic reading database provided 58 excerpts with *text selection proposals*; these are the basis of the qualitative analyses in this study, informed by applied CA (Antaki 2011; Mazeland 2008). We considered utterances as text selection proposals when the uptake by the recipients reflected that they were treated as such (Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2012). Our analysis of how text selection proposals were accomplished resulted in two main practices (respectively based on reading-out-loud and on reference to the text); these were further analyzed for sequential details in order to obtain insight in how the proposals were treated.

4. Findings: Talk about selection of text

In pupils' talk about text selection in the context of inquiry learning, text selection proposals are used to co-construct the shared activity of selecting relevant information. This text-selecting activity is considered as an *activity type* (Levinson 1992), because it is a goal-defined and structured activity in which text selection proposals are functionally adapted to the activity, whose goal it is to gather relevant information from texts so as to answer shared inquiry questions. The activity is constructed and structured by a series of text selection proposals. Each proposal may be followed by an acceptance or rejection or by a new text selection proposal that implicitly functions as a response, as in list constructions (Lerner 1994). Sometimes, a list is temporarily interrupted by elaborations on how to handle the text selection proposals, such as writing down, cutting and pasting, or paraphrasing the information – all actions that contribute to the activity's goal. The pattern of text selection proposals and their elaboration is repeated until the pupils, for whatever reason, finish the activity. One reason may be that they gathered sufficient information; however, the activity can also end because time is up or the pupils are distracted.

Excerpt 1 demonstrates how the participants are oriented to the goal of selecting and using relevant information from a text. Two boys are searching for online information regarding traffic rules, and they have just located potential relevant information on Wikipedia. They discuss which portions of the text could be used (lines 14–21 and 53–57) and what to do with the selected text (line 22–27 and line 45–50). Note that the *reading-out-loud* is marked by bold print. We use this excerpt to demonstrate some main characteristics of the text selection activity and text selection proposals before entering further into the different practices (in the next sections).

(1) *'I have a piece', grade 6–7*

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
14 Niek →	hey Jelmer, (.) # I have	hee Jelmer, (.) #ik heb
15	he:re a piece	hie:r een stuk
16	# ((selects	#((selecteert
17	text on screen))	tekst op scherm))
18 Jelmer	°yes eh (.) okay what?	°ja eh (.) okee wat?
19	#(2)	#(2)
20 Jelmer	#((looks at screen)) okay,	#((kijkt op scherm)) okee,
21 Niek	°this (.) tra:ffic law	°dit (.) verkee:rswet
22 Jelmer →	or we just paste it	of we plakken het gewoon
23 Niek	no eh:	nee eh:
24 Jelmer	but that's smart isn't it,	maar dat is wel slim toch,
25	#(3)	#(3)
26 Niek	#((cuts selected text))	#((knipt geselecteerde tekst))
27 Niek	and now to the powerpoint?	en nu naar de powerpoint?
	((lines 28–44 are skipped. Jelmer and Niek continue discussing how to copy and paste the selected text))	
45 Niek	hey and now in our own words?	hee en nu in eigen woorden?
46 Jelmer	ee:hin okay right	ee:hm oké best
47	(3)	(3)
48 Niek	no never mind that is too	nee laat maar dat is te
49	difficult [()	moeilijk [()
50 Jelmer	[we do that later	[doen we straks wel
51	#(2)	#(2)
52 Niek	#((returns to Wikipedia))	#((gaat terug naar Wikipedia))
53 Niek →	and this,	en dees,
54	#(16)	#(16)
55 Niek	#((selects text with cursor,	#((selecteert tekst met
56	cuts and goes to Word))	cursor, knipt gaat naar Word))
57 Jelmer	okay.	oké.

Niek reads on the screen and first tries to attract Jelmer's attention (Jelmer appears distracted at that moment) and then proposes a text fragment by pointing at the text on screen (selecting it with the cursor) while declaring that he has "a piece" (lines 14–17). Jelmer returns to his work and asks for clarification (line 18), followed by reading on the screen in silence. Then, Niek answers by reading aloud the title of the webpage, preceded by "this" (line 21). The text selection is treated as a proposal by Jelmer because he implicitly accepts it by making a next proposal regarding how to handle this selected text (line 22).

A procedural proposal such as this as a practice for accepting a proposal is among the more frequently ones observed in the data; others are minimal responses ("okay", "yes"), acceptance by doing (writing down, marking text, closing the webpage), or acceptance by making a new text selection proposal. Moreover, these types of acceptance demonstrate that the pupils are oriented to the shared goal: selecting all relevant information from the text and using the selected text.

Interestingly, in most cases a rejection of a text selection proposal in these data is not discussed, but immediately accepted. After a not-preferred second part, a post-expansion with a defense of the proposal would be expected (Schegloff 2007); however, in the case of text selection proposals, we rarely observed this.,

which indicates that there seems to be no preferred uptake, as there was no difference between acceptance and rejection. This confirms Lerner's (1994) observation that in a *list construction*, a new item on a list may replace a rejected list item. A sequence of text selection proposals can be perceived as a list construction, and a rejection may be replaced by a new text selection proposal, making it a new item on the list. Only when proposals concern procedures to address the text (line 22), a rejection (line 23) is sometimes discussed (line 24).

In the case of positive text selection proposals, often some type of *elaboration* follows. This elaboration may be (1) a *procedural proposal* regarding what to do with the text fragment (for example, 'or we just paste it,' line 22 in Excerpt 1), and/or (2) the *actual execution* of the selecting action (such as cutting and pasting selected text, line 26). Sometimes there is negotiation regarding the procedure, as in Excerpt 1, where Niek and Jelmer discuss how to handle the selected text; however, in the end (line 52), they return to the Wikipedia page to search for more relevant text fragments, after Jelmer has ended the negotiation by making a proposal to postpone a difficult component of the activity (putting the information in their own words) (line 50). This fragment demonstrates that the pupils are focused on the primary goal of the text selection activity: to identify relevant text fragments for use.

A text selection proposal is generally constructed in a *multi-unit turn*, not only comprising different turn-constructive units (TCUs) (Ford, Fox, & Thompson 1996), but also different actions – all these being necessary to complete the selection proposal. There are *two main practices* for text selection, connected to the context. First, one of the pupils reads a portion of the text aloud to the other participant(s) and completes the reading with a proposal. This reading-out-loud occurs in situations in which the pupils are sitting together, reading the same text for the first time, or when they share their previous selections from the (different) texts they have read individually, before the discussion. Second, in situations in which pupils are reading a text individually during the discussion, text selection proposals are accomplished by making an indexical or indicative reference to the text. This practice is also used in situations in which pupils search online for information; here, sometimes the students read aloud, and sometimes they read in silence (Excerpt 1).

In the next sections, we further characterize the two main practices of text selection proposals in dialogic reading (Sections 4.1 and 4.2). These practices not only differ according to the reading context in which they occur, but also as to the turn design (Drew 2013) of the text selection proposal and to the projective power of the first pair part.

4.1 Selection with reading-out-loud

The first – and in the data, the most common – practice of constructing a *text selection proposal* is by reading-out-loud (ROL) a portion of the text as a component of the text selection proposal turn. Excerpt 2 demonstrates the normal pattern of such a turn: the *ROL* component is always supplemented by an utterance that functions as a *selection proposal* (an implicit suggestion or an explicit proposal) that forms the complete *text selection proposal*. Here, three girls are in a reading dialogue during their shared inquiry regarding the history of street dancing: the girls read a text together on the spot and select potential useful text fragments to answer the question. We see how Kim constructs a selection proposal by (a) reading the text fragment aloud (lines 11–15), and (b) doing an explicit proposal that can be perceived as a question (line 16).

(2) ‘*shall we do this also*’, grade 3–4

	Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
8	Sylvia	there are often	er zijn vaak
9	Kim	wait a sec=	wacht even=
10	Sylvia	= quite loose and=	=vrij losjes en=
11	Kim	→ =nowadays it can be seen as a	=tegenwoordig kan het gezien
12		part of the hiphop and funk	worden als een onderdeel van
13		dance styles which had their	de hiphop en funkdance stijlen
14		origin already in the	die hun oorsprong al in de
15		seventy ties (.)	zeventig jaar hadden (.)
16		→ shall we do this also,	zullen we dit ook doen,
17	Sylvia	ok.	ok.

Sylvia accepts the explicit proposal with the minimal response “ok” (line 17). After this (preferred) response, the girls continue with the next fragment.

Excerpt 2 is an instance of a *positive text selection proposal turn*, in which the participant proposes to use a particular text fragment. Sometimes, however, while reading aloud, the text is considered not to be useful by the first speaker. These *negative text selection proposal turns* have the same design as the positive text selection proposals: ROL plus proposal. That occurred, for example, in Excerpt 3,¹ drawn from the same video as Excerpt 2, in which four selection proposals were made in a list construction, two of which were negative (lines 160–161, 162–169).

1. In all transcripts, reading and pronunciation errors in Dutch are kept in the English translations.

(3) *'Justin Timberlake', grade 3-4*

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
160 Kim →	for example to Pe Diddy, (.)	bijvoorbeeld aan Pe Diddy, (.)
161	no. (.) Emenem fifty cent, (.)	nee. (.) Emenem vijftig cent,
162	or we do this oht (.) <i>who</i>	(.) of we doen dit oht (.) <i>wie</i>
163	is thi:s? Justin <Tim ber lak	is di:t? Justin <Tim ber lak
164	ke> and so go on for a while	ke> en ga zo nog maar even
165	(3.0) Justin Timberlak	door (3.0) Justin Timberlak
166	(0.7) lake,	(0.7) lake,
167 Irene	Timberlak,	Timberlak,
168 Kim →	eh no we don't do this.	eh nee die doen we niet.
169 Irene	°no°	°nee°
170 Kim	this clip has been danced to	deze clip wordt er naar
171	one's heart's content this	hartenlust op los gedanst deze
172	style has been defenied as	stijl defenineert zich als
173	streetdance. streetdance.	
174	(2.0)	(2.0)
175 Irene	ehm:	ehm:
176	(1.5)	(1.5)
177 Irene	yes!	ja!
178 Kim	oktay,	okté,

The first negative proposal, comprised of a ROL and a “no” (line 161), can be minimal because of the working-together situation in which both participants have the same goal. In a working-together situation, it appears to be unnecessary to always be explicit regarding the relevance of the successive actions; therefore, no accounting is required. In addition to an announcement from Kim in a presequence of this excerpt, in which she declared, “First I’m gonna see what else we can do” – referring to their task of searching for relevant information –, this minimal selection proposal will do. The second negative text selection proposal turn is more extended because it comprises an explicit negative selection proposal, packaged as a declarative utterance (line 168) and immediately accepted by Irene (line 169). This working-together situation may also explain why the pupils often do not use any arguments to support their proposals: they all know what the question is; therefore, a minimal proposal with a ROL is sufficient.

In other cases, the proposal is implicit as, for example, in Excerpt 4. Here the ROL (lines 82–83) is combined with an argument (lines 83–84) referring to the relevance of the text although the argument functions as an implicit proposal, as shown in the verbal and nonverbal (written) acceptance by Marieke.

(4) *'cowling down', grade 4-5*

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
82 Anne	why is a cowling <i>down</i>	waarom is een kooling <i>down</i>
83	important. thats also quite	<i>belangrijk</i> . das ook wel even
84	interes[ting ((leafing))	intere[ssant ((bladert))
85 Marieke	#[cow ling (0,5) down	#[koo ling (0.5) down
86	#((writes))	#((schrijft))

We argued that a text selection proposal turn is constructed with both a ROL and a more or less explicit proposal. Two deviant cases confirm this. The first one, Excerpt 5, demonstrates that the ROL is an essential component of the selection proposal but on its own is not sufficient to be recognized as a text selection proposal. Excerpt 5 is again drawn from the video of Excerpts 2 and 3:

(5) *'streetdancing', grade 3-4*

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
58 Kim	ok.	ok.
59	(0.6)	(0.6)
60 Sylvia →	streetdancing has its	streetdance vindt zijn
61	origin (.) in the djetto's	oorsprong (.) in de djetto's
62	of America there (0.8)	van Amerika daar (0.8)
63 Kim	((turns page))	((slaat blaadje om))
64 Sylvia	htey:	htee:
65 Kim	what,	wat,
66 Sylvia →	this part we could do as	dit deel kunnen we ook nog
67	well=	even=
68 Kim	=(turns page back))	=(slaat blaadje terug))
69 Kim	you are doing like hey::,	jij doet echt zo van hee::,
70	(0.8)	(0.8)
71 Kim →	streetdancing has its	streetdance vindt zijn
72	[origin in the djetto's of	[oorsprong in de djetto's van
73 Sylvia	[origin in the djetto's of	[oorsprong in de djetto's van
74 Irene	[origin in the djetto's of	[oorsprong in de djetto's van
75 Kim	America]	Amerika]
76 Sylvia	America]	Amerika]
77 Irene	America]	Amerika]
78 Irene →	((marks text))	((markeert tekst))

Sylvia reads a text fragment aloud (lines 60–62), followed by a short pause and a page turn by Kim. By doing this, Kim demonstrates that she did not treat Sylvia's ROL as a proposal. This informs Sylvia that her selection proposal was not yet sufficiently complete to be interpreted as such, and a repair initiation follows (64). After this repair initiation, the text selection proposal is repaired by completing it with an explicit claim regarding the usability of the text fragment (lines 66–67). Kim responds to the text proposal by rereading the same sentence aloud in a joint turn construction with her partners. Finally, it is Irene who explicitly and definitely accepts the proposal by marking it in the text (line 78). Thus, the ROL in the selection proposal turn has an essential function; however, it was not sufficient because it still had to be made recognizable as a positive or a negative selection proposal.

For the second deviant case, we return to the previous selection proposal from Excerpt 3 (lines 170–178):

170 Kim	this clip has been danced to
171	one's heart's content this
172	style has been defenined as
173	streetdance.
174	(2.0)

175 Irene ehm:
 176 (1.5)
 177 Irene yes!
 178 Kim okTay,

This is an interesting case, in which Kim does not pragmatically complete the proposal turn. In a sequence containing both positive and negative text selection proposals (lines 160–169), Kim reads this text fragment aloud (lines 170–173) without making a proposal action. The long pause and the “ehm:” following (line 174–176) indicate that Irene waits for a clue about what to do with the text. The preceding selection proposals did contain proposal actions: the negative proposals were packaged as assertions (“no” and “no, we don’t do this”), and the positive proposal was packaged as a question (“or we do this?”). Although in this sequence of selection proposals, the proposal act itself may be minimal, there must be at least a clue to indicate whether the text selection is positive or negative. Although this clue is not presented, Kim accepts the proposal after a while (“yes”, line 177), and therefore treats the ROL as a minimal and positive selection proposal. These deviant cases indicate that normally, a simple ROL is not sufficient to count as a complete selection proposal, not even in a text selection activity; an additional clue is necessary to determine whether the fragment should be treated as relevant.

Another variation in constructing the text selection proposal turn concerns the presence or absence of some type of orientation to the activity’s goal before the ROL. There is an explicit announcement sometimes, such as “I will read this part” or “But yes, we continue” that orients the other to the ongoing shared activity. Another type of orientation is the attention-getter introducing the reading-out-loud either verbally (e.g. “wait a second” in Excerpt 2, or “hey”) or non-verbally (by pointing). Although we observe these kinds of orientations quite often, they are not a necessary component of the selection proposal activity, as seen in Example 5, where after a short pause (line 59), Sylvia immediately begins the ROL (lines 60–62). Because of the successive text selection activities, an announcement is not necessary in all text selection turns. Interestingly, we only observed these attention-getters before positive text selection proposals. This reflects the activity’s goal of finding relevant information: finding positive, or useful, information is marked.

All of the examples to this point were dialogic reading situations in which the pupils were selecting text ‘on the spot’ while reading the text for the first time. Another practice was observed when individual pupils read different texts before, made selections of relevant fragments and then came together to exchange their selected fragments and propose these fragments to one another. This different context influenced the construction of the text selection proposal, in particular the order of the various elements, as it is demonstrated in Excerpt 6, where three pupils research the history of the Dutch Closure Dike.

(6) 'closure dyke', grade 6

	Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
8	Sander →	i have the Afsluitdijk	ik heb de Afsluitdijk is een
9		[closure dyke] is a part of	onderdeel van
10		the sou thern sea works in	de zui der zeewerken in
11		nineteen twenty-seven was was	negentienzeventwintig werd
12		started with the construct ion	werd begonnen met de aan leg
13		in nineteen thirty-two the	in negentientweeëndertig werd
14		last lock hole de Vlieter was	het laatste sluitgat de
15		closed. one year later the	Vlieter gesloten. een jaar
16		dyke was opened for the (.)	later werd de dijk opengesteld
17		work traffic	voor het (.) werkverkeer
18	Leonie	yes: see: :	ja: zie: :
19	Roos	a year l later we don't need	een jaar l later dat hoeft niet
20		that (.)	(.)
21	Leonie	it doesn't make se:::ne	dat heeft geen nu:::t
22		((marks the text))	((markeert de tekst))
23	Sander	so only that	alleen dat dus
24	Leonie	yes this	ja dees
25	Roos	#that part	#dat stukje
26		#((points with pen in text))	#((wijst met pen in de tekst))
27		##(4)	##(4)
28	Sander	##((writes or draws in text))	##((schrijft/tekt in tekst))
29	Leonie	that [can *skip this	dat [kan wel *dit weg
30	Sander	[okay skip this okay	[okee dit weg okee ik zal
31		shall i first all?	ik eerst helemaal?
32	Sander	((takes the text))	((pakt de tekst))
33	Leonie →	nah see i in June nineteen	nah zie i in juni
34		twenty the first part of the	negentientwintig werd het
35		works was put out to contract	eerste deel van het werk
36		the construction of two point	aanbesteed de aanleg van twee
37		five kilometer long	komma vijf kilometer lange
38		Amsteldiepdiijk	Amsteldiepdiijk
39		(1)	(1)
40	Sander	ah this this.	ah dat dat.

In this context, the turn design is different from the situations in which pupils are reading a text for the first time on the spot. In the former cases, the ROL was followed by a text selection proposal action; here, the text selection turn begins with the proposal action, followed by the ROL. Excerpt 6 demonstrates two selection proposals (lines 8–17, 33–37), presented by different pupils. Both children begin with an explicit proposal before they start reading: “I have” (line 8) and “Nah see” (line 33). Both utterances were interpreted as proposals in this context, as can be seen from the participants’ acceptance of the proposal (lines 18, 40). Thus, the selection proposal turns are considered to be complete, including both the ROL and the proposal utterance.

It is interesting that in this excerpt, we observed one of the rare rejections. After the first selection proposal, Leonie accepts the proposal; then, however, Roos explicitly rejects a portion of the selected text with an argument referring to its relevance (line 19). Leonie then agrees with Roos, which leads to a short discussion among the three of them regarding which portions are relevant and which

are not. Interestingly, this rejection of a portion of the selection also implies that Roos accepts the rest. Normally, a rejection is not questioned again. The discussion in this case may occur because the reference to the content of the text fragment (“a year later”) and the consequence (“we don’t need that”), provide an opening to a discussion of which sub-fragments of the text may be useful.

In summary, these results indicate that a text selection proposal turn that includes reading-out-loud always contains at least two different actions, the ROL of the proposed text and a proposal act (Table 1). The order of these two components may differ; however, both are required for the turn to function as a text selection proposal. If one of these elements is not there, the turn is not treated as such in the process of action formation. An announcement or attention-getter may be a component of the text selection turn, but is not required.

Table 1. Multi-unit text selection turn with ROL

Text selection proposal turn with ROL	→ (Announcement/ Attention-getter)
	→ Reading-Out-Loud
	→ Selection Proposal

The proposal act can be formulated in a more or less explicit manner, from an explicit proposal (“we can do this”) to simply mentioning the relevance of the fragment (“this is interesting”); however, the manner does not influence the way in which the other participants respond to the proposal.

4.2 Selection by indexical and indicative reference

The second main practice of a text selection activity occurs when the pupils are reading silently for a short moment and want to propose text fragment as relevant to their partners who have not read this text yet. In this case, *access* to the content of the proposal (Stevanovic 2012) must be established differently, and its relevance is motivated by an indexical reference to the text (West 2012) and an indicative reference to the topic of the text and the inquiry question. For example, in Excerpt 7, as the students are looking for information on farm animals, Bart shows Alex an interesting part of the book by referring to what the text is about (lines 7–9) and by an indexical reference (“look here’s...”). The text reference refers to the relevance of this fragment, and functions as a provisional text selection proposal that is explicitly confirmed by Bart in lines 11–12, followed, after a short repair sequence, by a proposal for next action (lines 10–11).

(7) 'here's information', grade 2–3

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
1 Bart	hey Alex come here! ((to Alex, off camera)) (1) Alex you	hee Alex even komen! ((tegen Alex buiten beeld)) (1) Alex
3	should come here ((moves hand))	je moet even komen ((gebaart))
4		
5 Bart	#(2)	#(2)
6 Alex	#((arrives))	#((komt aanlopen))
7 Bart	→ ##look here's a lot of	##kijk hier staat heel veel
8	##((points in the book))	##((wijst in boek))
9	information about the <u>cow</u>	informatie over de <u>ko</u>
10 Alex	pig.	varken.
11 Bart	→ yes pigs. so you should	ja varkens. dus dit moet je
12	read this yes?	even doorlezen ja?
13 Ilse	no: eh not [yet	nee: eh nu nog [niet
14 Alexy	→ [I can do that	[kan ik straks
15	later okay?	wel doen ja?
16 Bart	yes.	ja.
17		

The proposal in lines 11–12 is formulated as a conclusion (“so”), which makes the reference to the fragment topic an *argument* for selecting this particular section of the book. Alex accepts this latter *proposal* by *suggesting* that the follow-up action (lines 12–13) could be postponed. The uptake does not discuss the relevance of the text; that appears taken for granted by Alex, who is simply talking about how (or better, when) to handle the text.

In Excerpt 8, drawn from the ‘library project’, we observe a similar construction of the selection proposal turn, with the same actions: proposal (lines 3–5) and argumentation (lines 6–7); only their order is different. Jacob and Maartje are doing research on the Earth and are reading different texts on this subject.

(8) 'because this is about seas', grade 3

Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
1 Maartje	we have a	we hebben een
2 Jacob	okay,	okee,
3	#this is all quite important,	#dis helemaal wel belangrijk,
4	#((points with pencil to text))	#((wijst met potlood op tekst))
5		
6	because this is about seas.	wahnt dit gaat over zeeën.
7	see,	zie,
8 Maartje	you didn't even <u>read</u> it yet	je hebt hem nog niet eens
9		<u>gelezen</u>
10 Jacob	oh <u>yes man!</u>	<u>jawel jonge!</u>

Jacob has just read the text in silence while Maartje was studying another text. Then, Jacob makes a text selection proposal (lines 2–5). The *text selection proposal* is packaged in a combined indexical reference (pointing and “this”) and an assessment of the importance of the text fragment, followed by an argument that indicatively refers to the topic of the text fragment being relevant. Here, the uptake is

neither an acceptance nor a rejection, but an objection by noting that one presupposition of making a text selection proposal (that is, reading the text fragment) was not accomplished. Or in Stevanovic's terms (2012), the *access* to the information by the proposer is questioned by the one who is in the accepting position. Again, not the relevance of the text, but a procedural aspect of the selection procedure is being discussed here.

As will be clear from these examples, the different types of text selection proposals refer to the global content of the text. The indicative mentioning of the primary subject of the text fragment is combined with an ensuing proposal regarding how to handle this particular text fragment. The non-verbal indexical references, such as pointing and selecting online with the cursor, help to specify which portion of the text is being discussed. The use of indicative references in these contexts is consistent with the notion of *dialogic space* in socio-cultural theory of learning activity in peer interaction (Howe 2010; Maine 2015; Wegerif 2013): there is no need to always make the topic of the talk explicit when participants are working together on a task that they all have agreed on.

As in the case of text selection proposals with ROL, *negative* text selection proposals also occur in text selection proposals with indicative and indexical references to the text; see for example, Excerpt 9. Three pupils are working together on the history of the Dutch Closure Dyke (compare Excerpt 6).

(9) '*nothing important*', grade 5–6

	Speaker	Transcript	Dutch original
66	Leonie	#and this	#en deze
67		#((points with pen to text))	#((wijst met pen op tekst))
68		in here is nothing important,	hier staat niks belangrijks
69			in,
70	Roos	#also in here there's is	#hier staat voor de rest ook
71		#((points to her text))	#((wijst op haar tekst))
72		nothing (.) anything important	niets (.)iets belangrijks in
73	Sander	do you have anything	heb jij nog belangrijks
74		important?	in?
75	Leonie	no only #that little piece	nee alleen #dat kleine stukje
76		here.	hier.
78		#((leaves in text and	#((bladert en laat
79		shows marked portion))	gemarkeerd stukje zien))
80	Sander	I also have nothing here.	ik heb hier ook niets.
81	Leonie	yes.	ja.

The pupils are making negative text selection proposals in a (responsive) list construction (Lerner 1994): a sequential list of text selection proposals in which a new item in the list (a new proposal) also functions as an acceptance. It begins with Leonie announcing her proposal, both verbally (“and this”) and non-verbally (pointing) in line 66–67 before she makes the actual negative proposal, which is based on the implicit reference to the topic by mentioning its non-relevance

(‘nothing important’, lines 68–69) as an argument. The preferred uptake is implicitly accomplished by Roos by a new selection proposal in the list, adding ‘also’ (70), which indicates that she is accepting Leonie’s first proposal. The pupils continue this practice of making negative proposals without mentioning the topic of the text fragment or of the inquiry question, followed by implicit acceptances. The difference with positive text selection proposals, as previously discussed, however, is that there is no further accounting for the negative proposal. We only observe a mention that the fragment is not important, not why it is not important. Thus, negative text selection proposals with a text reference component appear to be extremely implicit, compared with positive text selection proposals (having a text reference component).

Moreover, in all of these *text selection proposals*, *attention-getters* are used to draw a person’s attention to a particular portion of the text, even prior to the actual positive or negative text selection action. Some of these attention-getters orient the other participant to the ongoing activity, such as “hey Alex come here!” (Excerpt 7); they project positive text selection proposals. Others are used to orient the other’s attention to a particular portion of the text, but do not project a positive or a negative selection. Combinations of both verbal and non-verbal attention-getters point to the text, along with verbal utterances with indexical elements such as “look here” (Excerpt 7, lines 5–6) and “and this” (Excerpt 9, line 66). This pointing appears necessary to refer to the selected text, whether it is positive or negative.

Summarizing, a text selection proposal turn with a reference to the text always contains at least three different actions: (a) the selection proposal itself, (b) a component that functions as the referent of the text fragment, and (c) an account for the text selection proposal. The *proposal* act itself may be more or less explicit and may be packaged as an *instruction* or a *command* with the use of auxiliary verbs such as *should* (Excerpt 7), or may be more implicit as in Excerpt 8, in which the account (i.e., an assessment of the importance of the fragment) functions as the proposal itself. The account always contains a reference to the importance of the fragment and for positive text selection proposals also a reference to the text content. The order of these components may vary and it may be preceded by an announcement (see Table 2).

Table 2. Multi-unit text selection turn with reference to text

Text selection proposal turn with reference to text	→ (Announcement/ Attention-getter)
	→ Selection Proposal
	→ Reference to the text fragment
	→ Accounting

The account component appears to be important when there is no reading out loud. The ROL component may also function as an implicit account, since both participants know the content of the text that has been read aloud. If only one of the participants has read the text fragment and wants to propose it, the reference to the text fragment by itself is not sufficient to accomplish the text selection proposal; an explanation regarding its relevance and a more explicit account are required in order for the reference to be recognized as a text-selecting action.

5. Conclusion and discussion

In the present study, we traced, from a conversational analytic perspective, how dialogic reading participants select relevant text to answer their questions in the context of shared inquiry learning, and how the participants are collaboratively orienting to the specific goal of the text-selecting activity. Within this object-focused interaction, text selection proposals are used in talk regarding a text and its potential relevant information. Two types of proposals are involved here: positive proposals to select, and negative proposals to not select a fragment. The shared goal orientation is reflected in how the text selection activity is constructed in a list-construction of several text selection proposals, in which an acceptance of a text selection proposal may be accomplished by a new text selection proposal. Moreover, elaborations on procedures how to use a selected text are always followed by a new text selection proposal, unless the selection activity has come to an end. The multi-unit turn of a text selection proposal is complex, always comprising at least two actions that together accomplish the text selection proposal: a reference to the text and a selection proposal (also indicates whether the proposal is positive or negative). These components can be more or less explicit; however, in the process of action formation (Heritage 2012; Levinson 2013), they are necessary to design the turn as a text selection proposal. Hence it is not only the interaction as a whole, which is object-focused (Weilenmann & Lymer 2014); also on the level of interactional action, the text is essential to accomplish the action.

Two main practices of accomplishing a reference to the text were found. The first one is by reading aloud; the second, by making an indicative or indexical reference to the text. In the second practice, an account must be added to confirm the relevance of the text fragment to the recipient. If ROL is a component of the text selection proposal, the actual reading seems to be the account, as the recipient of a text should be convinced by its content. The reading of the text demonstrates its relevance, and since all participants are aware of their shared goal, i.e., what information they are looking for, this might explain why in this case, the text's relevance does not have to be argued explicitly, as it is part of the "dialogic space" (Wegerif 2013). When there is only an indicative mention of the content

and/or an indexical reference, more accounting work needs to be done, and the relevance of the text selection must be confirmed by an explicit reference to its relevance in relation to the text as a whole and to the research question. The need to refer to the text in a text selection proposal is also interesting in light of the components of joint-decision-making which were identified by Stevanovic (2012), namely *access*, *agreement*, and *commitment*. The text reference, whether with a ROL or an indicative or indexical reference, may function as a manner to fulfill the *access* component, as it provides the recipient with the content of the proposal.

Working together and solving problems together in a knowledge-building environment (Bereiter 2009; Walsweer 2015) is increasingly considered to be an important component of 21st century education. Dialogic reading is relevant in this framework, since text is an important information source in the knowledge-building discussion of the students. Studying this type of talk in detail contributes to our insights in how young readers collaboratively construct an activity which may contribute to shared knowledge building, namely finding and using relevant information in and from texts. The present study demonstrates that dialogic reading in a knowledge-building environment, such as inquiry learning, not only provides a natural context in which children talk and learn together about text content related to their research question; it also provides a natural context for developing reasoning skills when making joint decisions about using or not using a particular text content.

Funding

The research project on inquiry learning and language proficiency (project number PRO-3-29, 2012), was financed by the National Board of Practice-Oriented Research, SIA, which is part of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, NWO.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers for the insightful and constructive comments on our paper.

References

- Antaki, Charles. C. 2011. *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230316874>
- Bereiter, Carl. 2009. *Education and mind in the knowledge age*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Berenst, Jan. 2011. *Samenwerken en taalvaardigheid. Samenwerkend leren als werkvorm voor de stimulering van de mondelinge en schriftelijke taalvaardigheid van basisschoolkinderen. Raak-PRO projectvoorstel*. [Cooperation and Language Proficiency. Collaborative learning as a practice for promoting children's oral and written language proficiency in primary school. Raak-Pro Research Proposal. Leeuwarden: NHL University of Applied Sciences.
- Braam, Hilde M. 2015. Voorstellen en reacties tijdens peer-interactie in de midden- en bovenbouw van het primair onderwijs. [Proposals and responses during peer interaction in primary education] (Unpublished Master 's thesis). University of Groningen.
- Braam, Hilde M., Maaïke Pulles, & Jan Berenst. 2015. *Bibliotheek in de les. Werken aan leesmotivatie en informatievaardigheden bij wereldoriëntatie. Onderzoeksverslag*. [Library in the lesson. Working on reading motivation and information literacy in cultural-historical subjects. Research report] Leeuwarden: NHL University of Applied Sciences.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics* 24(3): 623–647. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.24.3.08cou>
- Drew, Paul. 2013. Turn design. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 131–149). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Practices in the construction of turns: The “TCU” revisited. *Pragmatics* 6(3), 427–454. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.6.3.07for>
- Heritage, John. 2012. Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45(1): 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684>
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke. 1987. Establishing agreement. An analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences. Ph.D diss., University of Amsterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110849172>
- Howe, Christine. 2010. Peer dialogue and cognitive development. A two-way relationship? In Karen Littleton & Christine Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues. Understanding and promoting productive interaction*. (pp. 32–47). London and New York: Routledge.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. Transcript Notation. In John M. Atkinson and John Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. ix–xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1994. Responsive list construction: A conversational resource for accomplishing multifaceted social action. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13(1): 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X94131002>
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1992. Activity types and language. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1979).
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2013. Action formation and ascription. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 101–130). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch6>
- Littleton, Karen, & Lucinda Kerawalla. 2012. Trajectories of inquiry learning. In Karen Littleton, Eileen Scanlon & Mike Sharples (Eds.), *Orchestrating inquiry learning* (pp. 31–47). London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136195>
- Maine, Fiona. 2013. How children talk together to make meaning from texts: A dialogic perspective on reading comprehension strategies. *Literacy*, 47(3), 150–156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12010>

- Maine, Fiona. 2015. *Dialogic readers. Children talking and thinking together about visual texts.* London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718217>
- Mazeland, Harry. 2008. *Inleiding in de conversatieanalyse.* [Introduction to Conversation Analysis] Bussum, The Netherlands: Coutinho.
- Melander, Helen & Fritjof Sahlström. 2009. In tow of the blue whale. Learning as interactional changes in topical orientation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1519–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.013>
- Mercer, Neil. 1995. *Guided construction of knowledge. Talk amongst teachers and learner.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mikkola, Piia & Esa Lehtinen. 2014. Initiating activity shifts through use of appraisal forms as material objects during performance appraisal interviews. In Maurice Neville, Pentti Haddington, Trine Heinemann & Mirka Rauniomaa (Eds.), *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity* (pp. 57–77). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Murphy, P. Karen, Ian A. G. Wilkinson, Anna O. Soter, Maeghan N. Hennessey & John F. Alexander. 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>
- Neville, Maurice, Pentti Haddington, Trine Heinemann & Mirka Rauniomaa. 2014. *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.186>
- Nystrand, Martin. 2006. Research on the role of classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(4): 392–412.
- Palincsar, Annemarie S., Ann L. Brown & Suzanne M. Martin. 1987. Peer interaction in reading comprehension instruction. *Educational Psychologist* 22(3): 231–253. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985sep2203&4_3
- Rojas-Drummond, Sylvia, Nancy Mazón, Karen Littleton & Maricela Vélez. 2012. Developing reading comprehension through collaborative learning. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 37(2): 138–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2011.01526.x>
- Rojas-Drummond, Sylvia, Fiona Maine, Mariana Alarcón, Ana L. Trigo, Maria J. Barrea, Nancy Mazón, Maricela Vélez & Riikka Hoffman. 2017. Dialogic literacy: Talking, reading and writing among primary school children. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 12:45–62, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.09.005>
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis.* Volume 1. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208>
- Stevanovic, Melisa. 2012. Establishing joint decisions in a dyad. *Discourse Studies* 14(6): 779–803. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612456654>
- Stevanovic, Melisa & Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(3): 297–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.699260>
- Stivers, Tanya & Jack Sidnell. 2016. Proposals for activity collaboration. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49(2): 148–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1164409>
- Svennevig, Jan. 2012. The agenda as resource for topic introduction in workplace meetings. *Discourse Studies* 14(1): 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445611427204>
- Ten Have, Paul. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208895>

- Van den Branden, Kris. 2000. Does negotiation of meaning promote reading comprehension? A study of multilingual primary school classes. *Reading Research Quarterly* 35(3): 426–443. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.35.3.6>
- Walsweer, Albert P. 2015. Ruimte voor leren. [Space for Learning] Groningen/Leeuwarden: Ph.D diss. University of Groningen/NHL University of Applied Sciences.
- Wegerif, Rupert. 2013. *Dialogic: Education for the internet age*. London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203111222>
- Weilenmann, Alexandra & Gustav Lymer. 2014. Incidental and essential objects in interaction. paper documents in journalistic work. In Maurice Nevile, Pentti Haddington, Trine Heinemann & Mirka Rauniomaa (Eds.), *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity* (pp. 319–335). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- West, Donna. 2012. Indexical reference to absent objects. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 6(1): 280–294. <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2012-0119>

Appendix. Transcription key (based on Jefferson 1984)

- bold** printed text that is read aloud
- [text overlapping speech
- # / ## overlapping embodied action with an ongoing silence or utterance
- = break and subsequent continuation of contiguous utterances
- (0.4) pause (seconds)
- (.) micro pause (< 0.2 seconds)
- . stopping, drop in tone
- , continuing intonation
- ? rising intonation
- ! animated tone
- ↑ marked rising shift in intonation
- talk that is softer than surrounding talk
- text emphasis
- : extension of the sound (0.2 seconds for every colon)
- <text> talk that is slowed down compared to surrounding talk
- () transcriber could not hear for the stretch of talk
- ((text)) description of details of the conversational scene

Address for correspondence

Maaïke Pulles
NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences
Centre for Multilingualism and Literacy
P.O. Box 1080
8900 CB Leeuwarden
The Netherlands
maaïke.pulles@nhlstenden.com

Biographical notes

Maaïke Pulles is a researcher at the NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences in Leeuwarden and at the University of Groningen. Her PhD-research is concerned with dialogic reading and knowledge building in inquiry-learning settings in primary education. Earlier, she has worked at the University of Groningen as researcher and advisor on language education.

Jan Berenst is professor (retired) of Discourse & Learning at the NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands. Previously, he worked as a senior lecturer and researcher at the Center for Language and Cognition of the University of Groningen. He has published on (among other subjects) intercultural communication, medical interaction, teacher meetings, classroom interaction, children's conversations, literacy development and language pedagogy. His recent research concerns the role of classroom interaction in the process of children's knowledge construction, especially the characteristics of peer interaction in inquiry learning in the schools.

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*.

Tom Koole is professor of language and social interaction at the University of Groningen. He has used conversation analysis to investigate classroom interaction, emergency calls and health communication. He is also a visiting professor in the Health Communication Research Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. His present research is concerned with the use in interaction of linguistic and embodied tokens of understanding. He has published in international journals such as *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Discourse Studies*, *Linguistics and Education* and *Journal of Pragmatics*.