

University of Groningen

“What do you think?”

van Balen, Joke; Gosen, Myrte; de Vries, Siebrich; Koole, Tom

Published in:
Linguistics and Education

DOI:
[10.1016/j.linged.2022.101037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101037)

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:
2022

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

Citation for published version (APA):

van Balen, J., Gosen, M., de Vries, S., & Koole, T. (2022). “What do you think?": How interaction unfolds following opinion-seeking questions and implications for encouraging subjectification in education. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, [101037]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101037>

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.



“What do you think?” How interaction unfolds following opinion-seeking questions and implications for encouraging subjectification in education

Johanna van Balen^{a,b,*}, Myrte N. Gosen^a, Siebrich de Vries^{a,b}, Tom Koole^{a,c}

^a University of Groningen, Center for Language and Cognition, Oude kijk in 't Jatstraat 26, Groningen 9712 EK, the Netherlands

^b NHL Stenden Hogeschool, University of Applied Sciences, Rengerslaan 10, Leeuwarden 8917 DD, the Netherlands

^c Health Communication Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 May 2020

Revised 28 February 2022

Accepted 2 March 2022

Keywords:

Classroom interaction

Subjectification

Opinions

Follow-up

Conversation analysis

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how classroom interaction unfolds following an opinion-seeking question asked by teachers or students. By using conversation analysis as a research method, the authors found that to an opinion-seeking question the preferred response of a student is to express an opinion as if it originated from their own thoughts. These responses are often followed by a non-minimal follow-up by both teachers and peers. We illustrate that the non-minimal follow-ups are formulated in two different ways: generic or specific, whereby a specific non-minimal follow-up appears to offer the best opportunity for subjectification. Subjectification is about the existence of the student as subject of his own life. If a student provides a specific non-minimal follow-up, the student expresses himself as a subject, with his own thoughts and a unique voice, which appears to prompt a dialogue in which fellow participants are also invited to express themselves.

© 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

The domain of subjectification, according to Biesta (2009, 2012, 2015a, 2015b, 2016, 2018a, 2020), is part of a multi-dimensional view on the purposes of education that also comprises qualification and socialisation. Qualification, one of the main functions of education, entails the making available of knowledge and skills (Biesta, 2020, p.92). The second domain of education is socialisation, which refers to ‘the (re)presentation of cultures, traditions, and practices, either explicitly but often also implicitly’ (Biesta, 2020, p. 92). Subjectification on the other hand is about the student’s existence as a subject of his or her own life and not as ‘object of educational interventions’ (Biesta, 2020, p.89) and refers to the freedom that every human being has, again and again, to say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or to do ‘this’ or ‘that’. In order to encourage subjectification in the classroom, teachers should therefore introduce students to this freedom and teach them to relate to this freedom in a ‘mature’ way, which implies that students learn to ask them-

selves whether what they say or do contributes to living well and living well together (e.g., Biesta, 2018b; Biesta 2020).

To gather data for this study, we asked teachers to attend to subjectification during lessons on reading and literature. On their own initiative, these teachers chose to ask students for their opinions, or they let students ask their peers for their opinions to prompt them to express themselves as subjects. Whether subjectification actually occurs is not measurable or observable to a teacher. However, by looking at the interaction it is observable what the response to such an opinion-seeking question looks like, whether and how a follow-up subsequently emerges and what this implies for encouraging subjectification in the classroom. Although a great amount of research has been done on giving opinions (e.g., Degoumois et al., 2017; Mulan, 2010; Myers, 2004; Maynard, 1989) and assessments (e.g., Sidnell, 2012; Mondada, 2009; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Pomerantz, 1984), we have found no research evidence pertaining to the interactional consequences of asking opinion-seeking questions in relation to creating room for subjectification in education. Nor do we know of any research on subjectification by studying interaction in the classroom.

In this study, by using conversation analysis as a research method (Maynard, 2013; Ten Have, 2007), we therefore seek to answer which interactional consequences asking an opinion-seeking question has and secondly how its use makes room for subjectifi-

* Corresponding author at: NHL Stenden Hogeschool, University of Applied Sciences, Rengerslaan 10, Leeuwarden 8917 DD, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: joke.van.balen@nhlstenden.com (J. van Balen).

cation in education. We consider such research of great interest as the findings can help teachers understand their own actions and impact on student interactions better, which could contribute to further encouraging subjectification in education.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Expressing opinions through talk-in-interaction

Expressing an opinion is a way of expressing one's personal view on a certain situation, topic or person. Whilst a fact can be checked on correctness, an opinion cannot (Sacks 1992). further describes having an 'opinion' as 'something which lay persons are entitled to have when they're not entitled to have knowledge – in the sense that they can offer it without ever proposing to have to then defend it' (p.33). An opinion therefore refers more to a moral order rather than an epistemic order.

As far as we know, there has been little conversation analytical research done in regards to asking for or giving opinions within classroom interaction, apart from Degoumois and colleagues (2017) and Willemsen and colleagues (2018). There is however other research available on opinions, such as Myers' (1998, 2004) studies within focus groups, designed to represent and clarify the general public opinion on a particular product. Moreover, Mullan (2010) has done a study on opinions and the use of discourse markers and Maynard (1989) has conducted a study on strategy for opinion-giving through a three-part 'perspective-display sequence' within mundane interaction.

However, most conversation analytical research has been done on assessments (e.g., Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Mondada, 2009; Pomerantz, 1984; Sidnell, 2012; Clayman & Riesner, 1998). Assessments are in a way related to opinions, seeing as an assessment is commonly understood as the expression of one's 'positively or negatively valenced stance toward some person or object talked about' (Sidnell, 2012, p.304). Apart from the fact that these studies were not conducted within an educational context, there is according to Degoumois and colleagues (2017) a difference between assessments and opinions. They argue that the expression of an opinion is most often not confined to a single turn, instead it is dynamically co-produced by participants through extended sequences, while assessments according to Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) are typically organized 'within the turn at talk' (p.49). Moreover, Degoumois et al. (2017) further consider assessment as:

one of many potential components involved in the activity of expressing personal opinion and document the expression of opinions in talk-in-interaction as a local accomplishment that is continuously adapted online to the local circumstantial details of the ongoing interaction, including co-participants' conduct. (p 33)

Based on these definitions, we make use of the notion 'opinion' in this study. Since asking for 'opinions' in classrooms represent a unique setting we need to consider studies that focus on this specific context.

2.2. Asking for opinions in classroom interactions

Asking for an opinion is a type of information-seeking question (ISQ) (Mehan, 1979), of which the questioner does not know in advance which answer will be given but assumes the respondent will be able to give it. In contrast, posing known information questions (KIQ) implies that the questioner (e.g., teacher) knows in advance what the answer should be (Mehan, 1979). Classroom interactions that involve KIQ have an initiation–response–evaluation (I–R–E) pattern (Mehan, 1979). It starts with the teacher's initiation, which evokes a response from the student in the second

position, which then prompts the teacher to respond to the answer in the third position with an evaluation of its correctness (Mehan, 1979). Following ISQ, the I–R–E pattern might emerge partly, in that the teacher initiates and the student responds, but evaluation does not necessarily take place. Furthermore, in interactions involving ISQs, students speak more than they would in response to KIQ and the teacher is not a conductor but instead plays along (Cazden, 2001). Moreover, the teacher exhibits interest in students' ideas (Nystrand, 1997) and encourages them to express their own thoughts, personal experiences and opinions (Myhill, 2006; Nystrand, 1997; Soter et al., 2008). Although existing research highlights the importance of questions that can elicit opinions in classrooms, it does not elaborate on opinion-seeking questions uniquely or in a detailed, sequential way.

Furthermore, studies of opinions shared in classroom interactions rarely feature conversation analyses (cf Degoumois et al., 2017.; Willemsen et al., 2018). In notable exceptions, Degoumois et al. (2017) investigate opinions provided by students in secondary school classrooms to understand 'how young people deal with the challenges of expressing personal opinions within a primary site of their socialisation – the classroom – as part of their interactional competence' (p. 30). They acknowledge that expressing opinions is a delicate issue in classrooms. In order to deal with that students make use of systematic procedures, such as seeking affiliation with co-participants or augmenting public acceptance of their opinions, often through humour or displays of uncertainty (Degoumois et al., 2017) Willemsen et al. (2018), also found that teachers use a broad range of open invitations in classroom interactions to elicit aligning responses, including opinion-seeking questions and they qualify opinion-seeking questions as invitations for students to offer specific types of responses. The teacher does so by indicating a topic and requesting a specific response, typically formatted as 'What do you think of?' 'What would you do if?' or 'How did you experience?' (Willemsen et al., 2018, p. 43). Their study includes some sequential details, but they do not explicitly detail how or among whom the provided opinion subsequently prompts reactions.

2.3. Following up on opinions

Considering the lack of research on responses to opinions expressed in classroom interactions, we turn to more general interaction classroom studies that reveal how a teacher reacts in the third position. First of all, there is the influential research of the Initiation-Reply-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (e.g. Mehan, 1979.) which is later followed-up by studies focused on the third position (Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Cullen, 2002; Lee, 2007; Koole, 2012; Solem & Skovholt, 2019) Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)., though they use the term 'feedback' or 'follow-up' to represent the third position (instead of evaluation), propose that the third move can consist of three categories of 'act': accept (including reject), evaluate, and comment (which encompasses sub-categories such as exemplify, expand, and justify). With the recognition that teachers might perform various evaluations or assessments in response to students' answers, Koole (2012) argues that assessments consist of three evaluation dimensions: the positive- and negative dimension, the object dimension related to what is being assessed, and the dimension of the value, according to which the object is being assessed Koole (2012). further argues that doing an assessment necessarily involves all three dimensions and responses can refer to each of these dimensions.

Furthermore, previous research on the third position highlights its importance for how the interaction unfolds (e.g., Cullen, 2002; Nassaji & Wells, 2000) Cullen (2002). identifies two broad pedagogical roles of the follow-up: evaluative or discursive. An evaluative follow-up exists to provide feedback on an individual student's

response. A discursive follow-up instead seeks to gather students' contributions and 'incorporate them into the flow of (classroom) discourse' (Mercer, 1995, p. 26), to sustain and develop a dialogue between the teacher and the class. In this way the emphasis is on content rather than form. A discursive follow-up frequently occurs after questions with a referential rather than display function, so that there is no right or wrong answer predetermined by the teacher (Cullen, 2002). By reviewing the sequences that unfold in response to a follow-up, Schegloff (2007) found that an evaluative follow-up tends to feature minimal post-expansions which do not project any additional within-sequence talk beyond itself. They are designed to propose closure of the sequence (Schegloff, 2007), a 'sequence-closing third'. It might take various forms, such as expressions of 'okay', assertions, or (partial) repetitions. However, if the third position takes a discursive role (Cullen, 2002), a non-minimal post-expansion arises, which differs 'in that the turn following that second pair part is itself a first pair part, and thereby projects at least one further turn – its responsive second pair part – and thereby its non-minimality' (Schegloff, 2007, p. 149). A common form of non-minimal post-expansion is by making other-initiated repair. If an other-initiated repair begins after a first pair part, it represents the start of an insertion expansion, and if a repair initiative arises after a second pair part, it represents the start of a non-minimal post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007).

Whereas Cullen (2002) take a pedagogical, interactional perspective on the third position, Lee (2007) and Solem and Skovholt (2019) adopt a conversation analytical perspective. In addition to noting that classroom interactions consist of a vast array of recognisable actions (e.g. Mehan, 1979.), Lee (2007) identifies them as parts of lively discourses-in-interaction that call for immediate, contingent, and communicative acts from the teacher. Thus, the third position is 'an extraordinary place that brings into view a vast array of interpretive works and contingent methods of actions by the teacher as he or she acts on the students' second turns' (Lee, 2007, p. 1226) Solem and Skovholt (2019). also underline the complexity and importance of the third position and assert that it constitutes a slot where teachers can perform various actions and practices. In turn, they identify three teacher formulations for the third position, reflecting different tasks for the class interaction: transforming, challenging, and summarising formulations.

These important insights suggest ways that teachers can invite students to express opinions, how students answer opinion-seeking questions, and what function the third position takes during class interactions. But they provide little evidence about precisely which kinds of responses an opinion-seeking question is likely to elicit and how teachers respond in the third position. Nor do we know how students respond to fellow students and the extent to which giving an opinion might contribute to increasing subjectification within education.

2.4. Subjectification and expressing an opinion

According to Biesta (2020), 'what is at stake in the idea of subjectification is our freedom as human beings and more specifically, our freedom to act or to refrain from action' (p. 93). This view of freedom is not linked to a theoretical or complicated philosophical concept; it pertains to the 'mundane experience that in many – perhaps even all – situations' (p.93) people encounter in their lives. That is, freedom is a 'first-person matter' (p.93), reflecting how to exist as the subject of one's own life, not as an object of what other people want from you (Biesta, 2020).

Research on subjectification features two main streams. First, argumentative papers assert the purpose and direction of educational processes and practices in light of subjectification (e.g., Biesta 2009, 2010, 2015b, 2017, 2020; Davies, 2006). Second, ethnographic papers study these directions in practice in varied

educational settings (Hasslöf & Malmberg, 2015; Lanas & Kelchtermans, 2015; Parker, 2002), using ethnographic data, such as transcripts of teacher discussions, to gain insights into educational processes, practices, and teachers' views on education. These studies adopt discourse theory, 'purposefully constructed narrative data' and thematic analysis (Lanas & Kelchtermans, 2015), and they often rely on information gathered from children's writing, observations of classroom activities, or other material beyond the classroom (Parker, 2002). However, they do not gather information from interactions that take place within educational settings where room for subjectification has been made.

Still, they provide some relevant insights for our research. With regard to asking for an opinion and conducting a dialogue, Hasslöf and Malmberg (2015) demonstrate that critical thinking offers room for subjectification Hasslöf and Malmberg (2015). define critical thinking as having 'various qualitative meanings related to different epistemological views' (p. 252) and argue that creating space for it in relation to taken-for-granted norms enables an educational process in which students can discuss and explore options. Subjectification also requires going beyond expressing personal opinions or inner feelings and instead to address *how* such opinions and feelings encounter the world (Biesta, 2020) by bringing initiatives into dialogue with other initiatives and with the world, prompting some degree of self-limitation (Biesta, 2018b) or 'qualified freedom' (Biesta, 2020). People live not only with and for themselves but also always in the world, with others, which imposes limits on their actions. In turn, an 'important aspect of trying to exist as subject is to figure out what these limits are, which limits should be taken into consideration, which limits are real, and which limits are the effect of arbitrary (ab)use of power' (Biesta, 2020, p. 96).

However, within the I-R-F structure, there appears to be not much room for students to bring initiatives into dialogue, since teachers generally use formal classroom turn-taking rules which restricts student participation and autonomous interaction (e.g., Cazden, 2001; Lemke, 1990). However, when teacher-initiated classroom discussions appear to be conducted through a 'multilogue', students are given more interactional space to contribute to the interaction (Schwab, 2011) and thus to act as subjects Schwab (2011). defines a multilogue as "an interaction format in whole-class settings where more than two participants are involved, either directly or as bystanders and listeners who follow the ongoing interaction and who may take part in it" (p. 15). Additionally, Phillipson and Wegerif (2017) suggest that dialogic education could be a suitable way for teachers to create room for subjectification. This approach to teaching and learning aims to engage students in classroom dialogues based on equality, collectivity, reciprocity, and accountability (Mercer et al., 2020). Therefore, through dialogic education students learn to ask questions, listen, take others' views seriously, accept that others have different perspectives, and seek to understand them (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2017). Through this form of education, students can discover what they have to say, by giving an opinion for example, and also discover the extent to which such opinions can affect others Wells and Arauz (2006). indicate that:

the single most important action a teacher can take to shift the interaction from monologic to dialogic is to ask questions to which there are multiple possible answers and then to encourage the students who wish to answer to respond to, and build upon, each other's contributions. (p. 414)

Asking for an opinion can therefore be a way to achieve a more dialogical form of education and thus make room for subjectification. However, we know of no research that details exactly what occurs after asking an opinion-seeking question within the inter-

action or to what extent it leads to a dialogue that eventually contributes to subjectification.

3. Data and method

The data for this research were gathered through a project set up by the first author who also works as a teacher educator and supervised 11 student teachers who conducted didactic research (Collins et al., 2004; Plomp & Nieveen, 2013) on subjectification in the classroom. The stated purpose was for student teachers to strengthen the quality of education by investigating the learning processes of their students and creating moments of guidance (NHL Stenden Hogeschool, 2020). The 11 student teachers worked at eight different secondary schools and taught independently for an entire school year. They all teach Dutch language and literature, the native language of the students. The class sizes average 25 students. Hereafter, we use 'teacher' to refer to these student teachers.

The teachers have made a didactic design that consists of a number of lessons focused on reading and literature, in which explicit attention is paid to subjectification. They formulated points of attention for their didactic design, such as asking ISQ (Mehan, 1979) about topics that students can relate to and identify with, so that they exhibit interest in students (Nystrand, 1997); breaking with the I-R-E structure by trying to avoid evaluations (Cullen, 2002; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975); and using more dialogical forms of interaction that might encourage students to respond to one another (Cazden, 2001; Gosen et al., 2009; Phillipson & Wegerif, 2017; Walsweer, 2015). The teachers shaped their didactic designs independently, in multiple lessons. In addition to learning objectives that involved making room for subjectification, the lessons pursued learning goals such as stimulating active speaking and listening. The students were made aware of these objectives in advance and discussed with the teacher what they understood by active speaking and listening.

The lessons always contain a relatable, appealing trigger, such as a video, text, poem, or statement. The teacher educator did not explicitly encourage the teachers to ask opinion-seeking questions, yet all the teachers independently and regularly asked for opinions, encouraging students to express themselves. The lessons took two forms: those involving the whole class and those in which students work in small groups (2–5 students). The teachers decided whether they wanted students to work in groups. Their lessons were video-recorded, mostly by the teachers themselves or in some cases by a fellow teacher, supervisor, or researcher, using one or two cameras on tripods in the front and back of the class. This video material provides the data for this study; the 46 video-recorded Dutch lessons last for a total duration of 29 h.

From these data, we collected 31 opinion-seeking questions from 16 different lessons and transcribed the relevant fragments, in accordance with Jeffersonian conventions (e.g. Jefferson, 1986., see Appendix A). In the transcripts the names of the students and teachers are anonymized. The data collection includes opinion-seeking questions asked by both teachers and fellow students in either traditional classroom settings where students sit in rows of two (10 instances) but also in less traditional settings where students work in small groups (8 instances), students and teacher sit in a circle (6 instances), or where they stand up in the classroom (7 instances). When students ask one another for opinions, they might use assignment cards, or they have been instructed beforehand to ask for others' opinions, such as by formulating a proposition. The assignment cards, provided by the teacher, contain pre-formulated opinion-seeking questions. Thus, if a student asks another student for an opinion using an assignment card, it represents an initiation of questions prepared by the teacher, but no script exists for how they should respond. In each excerpt, the

teacher makes clear that the goal is for students to give their opinion, listen to someone else's opinion, and think about what their opinion means for someone else.

To collect the opinion-seeking questions, we relied on our knowledge of what constitutes an opinion-seeking question, as summarised in several characteristics:

- (1) It is addressed to a specific person, such as by mentioning a student's name or using the personal pronoun *jij* ('you') while looking at the student.
- (2) The asking for an opinion is done by an information-seeking question (ISQ) (Mehan, 1979).
- (3) The opinion request includes verbs such as *vinden*, *denken*, or *lijken*, which translate into 'thinking' (Mullan, 2010), or else the noun *mening* ('opinion').
- (4) There is a clear person, object or situation on which an opinion should be expressed, whether explicitly mentioned in the question or made clear in advance.

In the data we noted a distinction between questions directed toward prompting an opinion or an explanation for an opinion. A general preference for type-conformity (Raymond, 2003; Schegloff, 2007) leads students to answer what-questions more often with opinions and why-questions with explanations. We include both types in the data collection.

Furthermore, an opinion usually contains an evaluative predicate, such as *beter* ('better') or *goed* ('good'), or adverbs such as *niet* ('not') and the Dutch particle *wel* in the sense of *ik ben het er wel mee eens* ('I agree') or *ik ben het er niet mee eens* ('I disagree'). The use of personal pronouns *ik* ('I') and *mij* ('my') signal that the response is personal and relates to the person expressing the opinion.

To analyse these interactive data, we applied conversation analysis (Maynard, 2013; Ten Have, 2007). This scientific framework, derived from the field of interaction analysis, reflects the organizational principles of a conversation, by which participants give meaning to what they say and do (Maynard, 2013; Sidnell, 2012; Ten Have, 2007). With this method we can specify how opinion-seeking questions are asked, what type of responses they generate, how these responses evoke follow-ups, and what function the follow-up has in classroom interactions from a subjectification perspective.

4. Findings

In this section we will first discuss the responses to an opinion-seeking question to illustrate that opinions are formulated in two ways; opinions are formulated by a student either on her or his own or else in reference to a previously mentioned opinion. We also discuss in 4.1 that giving an opinion is the preferred action when a sequence starts with an opinion-seeking question. In 4.2, we then present excerpts of the follow-up to an opinion-seeking question to demonstrate that the follow-up leads in most cases to non-minimal post-expansion and in some cases to minimal post-expansion.

4.1. Response to opinion-seeking questions

We provide three excerpts in this section. In [excerpt 1](#) the student gives an opinion without reference to any previously expressed opinions, whereas in [excerpt 2](#) a student refers to a previously given opinion. Lastly, in [excerpt 3](#) there is a deviant case which reveals that a student orients to an opinion-seeking question by projecting an opinion as a response. In the first two excerpts, the teacher asks the opinion-seeking question, whereas in the last one, a student asks the question. Furthermore, in [excerpt 1](#), students engage in a whole-class discussion, whilst in excerpts 2

Excerpt 1

Response without reference to a previously expressed opinion.

23	teacher	waarom lijkt het jou een g:ood idee of geen goed why do you think it's a good idea or not a good
24		idee aram, idea aram,
25→	Aram	nouhet lijkt me(.) wel een goed idee,(.) well it seems to me (.) (PRT) a good idea, (.)
26		want je hebt dan meer vrije tijd en (.) als je het because then you'll have more free time and (.) if you
27		snapt hoeft je ook niet naar de les te gaan (.) understand it you don't have to go to class either (.)
28		en kan je met een ander vak bezig die je niet goed and you can work on another course that you find
29		snapt(.) en (.) dat ja. difficult (.) and (.) that yes.
30		(2.0)

Excerpt 2

Response with reference to a previously expressed opinion.

1	Jens	>nah ik gebruik ze wel eens maar dat maakt me niet >nah I use them sometimes but I don't really
2		zoveel uit, dat is niet<(.) care that much, that is not <(.)
3		echt racistisch of zo (.) vind ik. really racist or anything (.) I think.
4	Mieke	°ja°- °yes°-
5		(2.0)
6	teacher	mieke wat vind jij. mieke what do you think.
7→	Mieke	dat vind ik ook. that is what I think too.
8	teacher	ja:, yes:, (1.0)
9		
10	teacher	vind je het onzin [wat uh die uh dierenorganisatie wil, do you think it is nonsense [what uh this uh animal organisation wants,
11		
12		

Excerpt 3

Deviant case: giving an opinion is the preferred action.

1	Sjoerd	>toe maar.< ((kijkt naar Lien)) >go ahead.< ((looks at Lien))
2→	Lien	↑nou nou wat ik van het onderwerp vind? ↑well well what I think of the subject?
3	Sjoerd	ja en waarom. yes and why.
4→	Lien	ja dat is een hele goede vraag. yes that's a very good question,
5		nou:. well:
6		(0.5)
7		hh
8		(2.0)
9→	Lien	(h)
10	Janneke	moet ik eerst, shall I go first,
11→	Lien	ja ga jij anders eerst maar yes you go first
12		dan bedenk ik nog even. then I'll think about it for a moment.

and 3 they are having conversations in pairs. In the discussion of these excerpts we consider both the turns and the sequence.

In response to an opinion-seeking question, the student in [excerpt 1](#), Aram, formulates an opinion without reference to any previously expressed opinions. The whole-class discussion deals with the concept of flipping the classroom, a teaching method where the teacher records instructions and explanations on video, which students watch at home first, then work on assignments

or ask questions during class. The teacher asks an opinion-seeking question to start the conversation.

By asking Aram the opinion-seeking question, the teacher assigns a turn ([Sacks et al., 1974](#)). The design of this question requires a response that contains a choice between two alternatives ([Englert, 2010](#)), ‘een g:ood idee of geen goed idee aram,’ (‘it’s a good idea or not a good idea aram,’), as well as an account for this choice, ‘waarom lijkt het jou’ (‘why do you think’) (line 23). The

question thus is an open invitation, projecting specific types of responses (Willemssen et al., 2018).

In line 25, Aram starts the second turn with the initial 'nou' ('well') (Drew, 2013) and continues with 'het lijkt me (.) wel een goed idee,' ('it seems to me (.) (PRT) a good idea,'). This is an utterance that indicates his position and expresses his opinion, before initiating the explanatory statement (lines 26–29), 'because then you'll have more free time'. The inclusions of 'dan' ('then') and 'als' ('if'; line 26) suggest Aram is imagining how he would act if the teacher were to flip the classroom. After further explanations (lines 26–29), he confirms his own opinion, 'en dat ja.' ('and that yes. '; line 29), which serves as a turn-exit device (Sacks et al., 1974). Aram is not referring to a previously given response, but he formulates his response as a thought of his own, as is the case in most of the situations we reviewed (27 instances). In almost all sequences studied, an opinion appears in the second turn. In one situation however, four turns precede the response of the addressee because other students react instead, and in another situation the student begins with an insertion-expansion, asking 'wat is ↑er' ('what's ↑up') before giving a personal opinion in response to an opinion-seeking question.

In three sequences, students refer to a previous opinion in response to an opinion-seeking question, as can be seen in excerpt 2. The students, working in pairs, take turns answering questions on cards, which pertain to a proposal by an animal rights organization to introduce a ban on proverbs that refer to animals because it can encourage animal abuse. The teacher walks around the classroom answering or asking questions. Jens answers the question on a card, 'What does the subject of the text have to do with your life?'

Jens first refers (line 1) to his own experiences with the expression 'nah ik gebruik ze wel eens' ('nah I use them [proverbs] sometimes'). Then with a conjunction he indicates an opposing relationship, 'maar' ('but'), and expresses his point of view 'dat maakt me niet zo veel uit,' ('I don't really care that much,') (lines 1–2). His opinion follows: 'dat is niet echt racistisch of zo (.) vind ik.' ('that is not really racist or anything (.) I think.') (lines 2–3). The opinion features the negative adverb 'not' and the modal adjective 'racist'; the phrase 'I think' formulates the comment as his personal opinion. Mieke gives a listener response in the follow-up, answering 'yes-' (line 7). Then the teacher joins in to ask Mieke an opinion-seeking question: 'Mieke what do you think.' (line 6). Mieke responds with, 'that is what I think too.' (line 7), referring with both 'dat' and 'wat' ('that') ('what') to Jens's statement and making her utterance personal by using the words 'vind ik' ('I think'). By using the word 'ook' (too), Mieke indicates that she shares the same opinion. Mieke thus displays agreement, without adding anything or referring to her own experiences or opinion. In the three similar instances in which students refer to a previously given opinion, a follow-up question by the teacher follows, as can be seen here in excerpt 2 in line 10–12, where the teacher asks a new opinion-seeking question. The responses that refer to a previously given opinion are not considered to be preferred responses and provide for sequence expansion (Schegloff, 2007). This excerpt thereby also illustrates that the expression of an opinion in talk-in-interaction is 'a local accomplishment that is continuously adapted online to the local circumstantial details of the ongoing interaction including co-participants' conduct' (Degoumois, et al., 2017, p. 33).

In the data we observed a deviant case which shows one sequence with a non-preferred expansion and no opinion in response to an opinion-seeking question. The student in this excerpt explicitly identified her response as lacking, confirming the sense that when a sequence starts with an opinion-seeking question, giving an opinion is the preferred action. We present this specific case in excerpt 3, involving students' responses to an article about a father who required his 10-year-old daughter to walk for 8 kilo-

metres behind a school bus because she bullied other children. In groups of three students they discussed the case, using question cards to ask one another questions. Sjoerd reads a card with the opinion-seeking question, 'What do you think of the subject and why?' and prompts Lien to answer (line 1).

Lien starts, in response to 'go ahead' (line 1), by repeating aloud part of the question from the card, '↑nou nou wat ik van het onderwerp vind?' ('↑well well what I think of the subject?') (line 2) to which Sjoerd gives a listener response 'yes' and refers to the 'why' part of the opinion-seeking question on the card (line 3). In the next turn however, the requested opinion with explanation does not follow. Instead, Lien says, 'ja dat is een hele goede vraag,' ('yes that's a very good question,') and offers a clear hesitation with 'well,' (line 5), silence (line 6), and laughter (line 7). The utterance design reveals a problem in achieving the preferred type of the second pair part (Pomerantz, 1984). Although Janneke is not the selected speaker, she offers to give the preferred response, asking 'shall I go first,' (line 10), to which Lien consents, 'yes, you go first' (line 11). Lien demonstrates that she is aware that she has not been able to formulate a relevant response (line 12), remarking 'dan beden ik nog even.' ('then I'll think about it for a moment.'). The words 'then' and 'for a moment' show that Lien has not yet finished answering the question, so even if her fellow student is going to answer the question first, she plans to think about a fitting response to the opinion-seeking question. In this excerpt, providing the conditionally relevant next action (i.e., response to the opinion-seeking question) has greater force for participants than maintaining the right or obligation of a selected speaker to take the next turn (Stivers & Robinson, 2006). As this fragment shows, students orient themselves to an opinion-seeking question by projecting an opinion as a response; if it does not succeed, the speaker acknowledges the response as inadequate.

With regard to subjectification, these excerpts show that asking an opinion-seeking question encourages students to express their opinions whilst simultaneously leaving students free in *how* they formulate responses. A student might formulate her or his own opinion, like Aram does (excerpt 1), or refer to an earlier given opinion, like Mieke does (excerpt 2). It is up to these students to decide what to say, how to express it, and to what extent they self-identify as subjects.

4.2. Follow-ups to opinion-seeking questions

All the responses to opinion-seeking questions are followed up in our data, mostly by the teacher, but also occasionally by other students when they are not in a 'traditional' classroom setting (i.e., seated in regular rows). That is, students only provide a follow-up (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) while working in small groups, standing around the classroom, or sitting in a circle. The question-answer sequences mostly involve non-minimal post-expansions (Schegloff, 2007), though in a few of them we find a minimal post-expansion that does not project any further within-sequence talk beyond itself (Schegloff, 2007). The non-minimal follow-ups are formulated in two different ways: generic or specific. The generic follow-up is an utterance that could follow any opinion; a specific follow-up instead contains some specific reference to the given opinion. We observe that the teacher usually provides a generic follow-up, whereas in most studied exchanges students do a specific follow-up. This will be shown in five different excerpts: a minimal follow-up given by the teacher (excerpt 4), a minimal follow-up given by a student (excerpt 5), non-minimal follow-ups given by the teacher (excerpt 6) and students (excerpts 7 and 8), for which we distinguish generic (excerpt 6) and specific (excerpts 7 and 8) forms.

Excerpt 4

Minimal follow-up by a teacher.

11	teacher	en wat was jouw of wat is jouw mening pen even and what was your or what is your opinion hold your pen
12		vast ((kijkt naar leerling x)) wat is jouw mening over je
13		((looking at student x)) what is your opinion of your het gedicht, the poem,
14	Roos	uh dat ik het vaag vond maar we::l herkenbaar. uh I thought it was vague but ra::ther relatable.
15→	teacher	wel herkenbaar, rather relatable,
16		en jan waar gaat het gedicht over and jan what is the poem about
17		volgens jou. according to you.
18	Jan	afscheid. farewell.

Excerpt 5

Minimal follow-up by a student.

21	Jelle	<u>nou</u> zeg het maar. well just say it.
22	René	nou ik vind het <u>fijn</u> als ik eerst het slechte well I think it would be nice if I heard the bad
23		nieuws hoor (.) want als ik dan een beetje boos ben news first (.) because if I'm a little bit angry
24		of zo dat dan ik dan beetje niet leuk vind dus, or so that I don't like it a lot so,
25		dan daarna het goede nieuws hoor then I hear the good news afterwards
26		dan weer een beetje blij ben. then I am a little bit happy again.
27→	Jelle	precies dat. precisely that.
28		(2.0)
29	René	nou ik zet een vraagteken. well I'm placing a question mark.
30	Jelle	ik ook. me too.

Excerpt 6

Generic non-minimal follow-up by a teacher.

1	teacher	ik wil dat Maria begint (.) wat vind jij van het gedicht. I want maria to start (.) what do you think of the poem.
2	Maria	uhm:
3		(1.0)
4	Maria	leuk, nice,
5→	teacher	waaro[m]. wh [y.
6	Maria	[eigenlijk niet. [not really.
7	Studentx	oké, okay,
8	Maria	uhm:
9		(1.0)
10	Maria	omdat het uhm (.) over liefde gaat, because it is uhm (.) about love,
11		(1.0)
12	Maria	en liefde is leuk. and love is nice.
13	teacher	(1.5)
14		wil iemand daarop reageren. would anyone like to respond to that.

4.2.1. Minimal post-expansion

In 8 of the 30 sequences studied, we find that minimal post-expansion is occurring. The third turn in these excerpts completes rather than expands the sequence (Schegloff, 2007). The minimal follow-up usually is an acknowledgement of receipt, such as 'okay' or 'yes', or else an assertion or repetition of part of the first response. The teacher provides such a minimal follow-up in 7 out of the 8 sequences. For example, in **excerpt 4**, students are working

in small groups of 3 to 4 people where each group receives a different poem about a relatable subject such as falling in love. They first must read the poem themselves and consider their opinion, after which they will exchange their opinions in their group. Afterwards the teacher ran a class discussion.

The teacher gives a minimal follow-up (line 15) by repeating the last two words of the response 'wel herkenbaar,' ('rather relatable,') without acknowledging the labelling of the poem as vague.

Excerpt 7

Specific non-minimal follow-up by a teacher.

25	Aram	nou het lijkt me (.) wel een goed ↑idee (.) well it seems to me (.) (PRT) a good ↑idea (.)
26		want je hebt dan meer vrije tijd en (.) als je het because then you'll have more free time and (.) if you
27		snapt hoeft je ook niet naar de les te gaan (.) understand it you don't have to go to class either (.)
28		en kan je met een ander vak bezig die je niet goed and you can work on another course that you find
29		snapt(.) en (.) dat ja. difficult (.) and (.) that yes.
30		(2.0)
31→	teacher	oké- okay-
32		(2.0)
33→	teacher	uhm (.) zou je dat ook zo gaan <u>doen</u> ? uhm (.) would you actually do so?
34		(3.0)
35	Aram	uh: h uh: h
36		(2.0)
37		((leerlingen lachen)) ((students laugh))
38	Aram	dat weet ik nog niet, that I do not yet know,
39		(2.0)
40	Aram	ik denk het wel. I think so (PRT).
41		(1.0)
42	teacher	oké- okay-
43		(1.0)
44	teacher	waarom lijkt het jou <u>wel</u> of geen goed idee uh liza. why do you think it is a good or bad idea uh liza.

The follow-up serves as a sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007). The teacher also directly asks another student a question in the same turn: 'en jan waar gaat het gedicht over volgens jou.' ('and jan what is the poem about according to you.') (line 16) in which she moves on to another topic, initiating a new I-R-F sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Roos does not have an opportunity to explain her opinion.

In only one situation we find a minimal follow-up from a student, in *excerpt 5* (line 27), where students are reading dilemmas aloud from cards whilst working in pairs. They take turns expressing their opinions on the dilemma and explaining them. Then they write down a cross (indicating a different opinion) or question mark (signalling that the student would like to know more about the choice made). In this excerpt, the dilemma is: 'Would you rather hear the good news first or the bad news?' René's phrasing is not fluent, which indicates that he is thinking aloud.

When René has given his opinion in response to the dilemma (lines 22-26), Jelle responds with a minimal follow-up, 'precies dat.' ('precisely that.'), with which he shows his agreement and which serves as a sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007). In the next turn, René looks at the answer sheet and indicates the insertion of a question mark, which signals moving on to the next topic. Although Jelle does not further address the response and also moves on, he indicates by writing down a question mark as well, that in theory he would like to know more in response to this opinion. René also indicates that he would like to further discuss his own opinion. This excerpt illustrates that students are willing to give an opinion and to elaborate on it when requested.

4.2.2. Non-minimal post-expansion

The majority of sequences with a follow-up after an opinion feature non-minimal post-expansion (22 of 30). The teacher provides this follow-up 15 times; students do so 7 times. When teachers do a non-minimal follow-up, they mainly provide invitations for elaboration (Willemsen et al., 2020) with prompts such as 'tell',

'why', or repeating part or all of the response, inducing sequence expansion (Schegloff, 2007) *Excerpt 6* offers an example. The students have read a poem together and the teacher starts the class discussion by asking Maria for her opinion (line 1).

The non-minimal follow-up 'why' (line 5) pertains to an evidently not preferred response, which evokes post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007). The non-minimal follow-up also launches another I-R-F sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Maria first responds with 'leuk,' ('nice,') (line 4) to describe her opinion of the poem, and though she also says 'eigenlijk niet.' ('not really,') (line 6), Maria considers 'nice' her preferred answer because she subsequently offers an explanation in line with this initial first response, 'omdat het uhm (.) over liefde gaat,' ('because it is um (.) about love,') and 'en liefde is leuk.' ('and love is nice,') (lines 10-12). Instead of responding to the content of this explanation, the teacher involves the class in the discussion and asks 'wil iemand daarop reageren.' ('would anyone like to respond to that.'). The sequence is thus extended, creating room for other students to express themselves.

In our data, in the vast majority of cases (11 of 15) a teacher provides such a generic follow-up that could refer to any given opinion. The interaction gets stimulated by this follow-up, which remains under the teacher's control and maintains the teacher-student-teacher structure. The follow-up 'why.' (line 5) thus has a discursive role (Cullen, 2002), as in that it uses students' contributions and incorporates them into the flow of the discourse (Mercer, 1995, p. 26) involving dialogue between teacher and students. Characteristic of discursive follow-ups is the referential function of the responses, rather than a display function, which means there is no right or wrong answer predetermined by the teacher (Cullen, 2002). As *excerpt 6* shows, the teacher takes a supporting role and does not explicitly respond to the content of the response, such as by revealing her own thoughts on the poem or the response. We found no examples of students providing such a generic non-minimal follow-up on their own initiative though,

Excerpt 8

Specific non-minimal follow-up by a student.

1	Anne	en jij jasper? and what about you jasper?
2	Jasper	ik denk eerlijk geze:gd(.) I honestly think that(.)
3		het is inderdaad kort, it's indeed a short time,
4		(1.0)
5	Jasper	ja:: yes::
6		(1.0)
7	Jasper	maar ja, but yes,
8		(1.0)
9	Jasper	uh: d'r kwamen ook andere dingen sneller uit (.) <u>in</u> uh: other things also happened quickly (.) in
10		een hele korte periode, a very short time,
11		(1.5)
12	Jasper	en misschien kan het ook wel eens- and maybe it could also be-
13		↓ja bijvoorbeeld de telefoon kwam er <u>ook</u> in ↓well for example the telephone also came
14		een paar jaar: weet je (.) within a few years you know (.)
15		maar (.) ja misschien (.) is het but (.) yeah maybe (.) when it
16		langzamerhand wordt opgebouwd, is being built up gradually,
17		(1.0)
18	Jasper	zou eerst beginnen would start first
19		zo dat iets wat ↑wel normaal lijkt: in a way that ↑does look normal
20		een snack bijvoorbeeld, a snack for example,
21→	Anne	mmm:: ja dat zou kunnen insectensnacks
22		mmm:: yes that could be insect snacks
23		worden dan (.)ja door bijna de helft van then become (.) yes by nearly half of
24		(3.5)
25→	Anne	jij vindt meer dat uh 't ['t you think it's more like uh it [it
26	Jasper	[kan wel van de [may well be in the
27		toekomst zijn maar niet zo snel. future but not so fast.
28	Anne	oké (.) meer in stapjes. okay (.) like step-by-step.
29	Jasper	ja. yes.
30		(3.0)
31	Linda	ja- yes-
32		(2.0)
33	Anne	ja, yes,
34	Jasper	nice::- nice::-
35		(1.0)
36	Jasper	en wat denk je er zelf van(.) [waarom, and what do you think of it yourself (.) [why,
37	Anne	[>HE nou ja< ik wist [>HE well yes< I couldn't
38		niets te bedenken. think of anything.
39		maar ik zou het zelf niet eten hoor, but I would not eat it myself PRT,
40		zeker niet volgend jaar a:l. certainly not next year a:l:ready.
41		(1.0)
42→	Linda	ik denk dat als je ermee opgroeit als ki:nd=, I think when you grow up with it as a chi:ld=,
43	Anne	=°dan is het weer anders.° =°then it is different.°
44	Linda	kijk dan is het allemaal (.) wat makkelijker. look then it all (.) becomes a bit easier.

so it appears more common for a teacher to provide this type of follow-up.

In four sequences, the teacher gives a more specific non-minimal follow-up, which does not apply to every opinion as it contains specific references to the response. For example, in [excerpt 7](#)—a continuation of [excerpt 1](#), in which students are discussing flipping the classroom—the initial question was: ‘why do you think it’s a good idea or bad idea ↑aram’. In lines 25–29, Aram gave his opinion and explanation; the follow-up starts in line 31.

The teacher starts his non-minimal follow-up with an acknowledgement of receipt ‘okay-’ (line 31). Then there is a 2-s pause (line 32) after which the teacher starts a new turn with a critical question (Solem & Skovholt, 2019), ‘uhm zou je dat ook zo gaan doen?’ (‘uhm would you actually do so?). The question does not just ask for more information but is a substantive response to the answer given. A recipient who responds with such a critical question expresses some personal analysis of the comment Solem and Skovholt (2019) consider a critical question a type of challenging teacher formulation, which aims to offer students an opportunity to reconsider their opinions. In [excerpt 7](#), line 38, Aram responds to the critical question by expressing doubt: ‘that I do ↑not yet know.’ In the other sequences in which a critical question represents the follow-up, the student’s reaction is similarly an explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty. Thus, a specific follow-up in the form of a challenging teacher formulation is giving students an opportunity to explore and/or reconsider their opinion and can encourage further reflection on what they have said.

We found seven examples of a non-minimal follow-up by a student, all of which contain specific references to the given opinion. In addition, the I-R-F structure disappears and a dialogue emerges in which both the questioner and the respondent show a form of thinking together (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2017), as shown in [excerpt 8](#). These students are discussing, in groups of three, self-formulated propositions based on an article and video about eating insects. The thesis underlying this excerpt is as follows: ‘In a year’s time half of the Dutch population will eat insects’. The teacher has indicated in advance that he wants the students to give an opinion and an explanation when they discuss the propositions. Anne asks Jasper for his opinion; Jasper’s phrasing is not fluent, which indicates that he is thinking aloud.

The specific non-minimal follow-up by Anne in lines 21–23 includes a receipt token (Gardner, 1998), ‘mmm::’, and displays agreement with the utterance, ‘yes that could be’, followed by an utterance that states the feasibility of the example provided by Jasper, ‘insect snacks then become’. She continues with ‘yes by nearly half of’ (line 23), referring to half of the Dutch population (i.e., the thesis) and reacting again in the affirmative with ‘yes’. That is, she incorporates the previously given opinion in her follow-up. However, Anne does not finish her utterances (lines 22 and 25), produces a gap (line 24), and ends her turn with ‘uh it it’ (line 25). Therefore, this turn will not be continued and the action is complete. Jasper takes over and finishes the reasoning, ‘may well be in the future but not so fast.’ (lines 26–27).

Another specific non-minimal follow-up occurs in line 42, when Linda expresses her own opinion by self-selecting, ‘ik denk dat als je ermee opgroeit als ki:nd=’ (‘I think when you grow up with it as a chi:ld=’). With this comment, she is referring to Anne’s given response but also elaborating on it from her own perspective. Notably, Anne then continues (line 43) and finishes the utterance Linda started, ‘=then %it’s all different.’. The students finish one another’s utterances and create connections by self-selecting, which shows that all three students express themselves as subjects. The turn-taking system becomes more fluent, the I-R-F structure disappears, and a more conversation-like genre emerges (Nassaji & Wells, 2000). In all of the other studied sequences in-

volving a non-minimal follow-up by a student, we find chains of shared thinking (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2017). Thus, specific non-minimal follow-up by students provide relevant opportunities for subjectification, as students learn to express their opinions but also to ask questions, listen to one another, and take others’ views seriously. As a result, students should be able to develop initiatives and discover to what extent these initiatives affect others, which is central to subjectification.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In the present study, we provide insights into how interaction unfolds following opinion-seeking questions, and we indicate what these sequences imply for encouraging subjectification during lessons. We have showed that students almost always accept the call to respond to an opinion-seeking question. Students know that their opinion is required and are willing and able to give an appropriate response to an opinion-seeking question about a relatable topic. The vast majority formulate a response as if it originated from their own thoughts and present it as their own. Referring to a previously given opinion, in response to an opinion-seeking question, is considered a ‘dispreferred’ response, therefore it evokes sequence expansion (Schegloff, 2007). Asking opinion-seeking questions offers students the possibility to say ‘this’ or ‘that’, which encourages them to express themselves as subjects and discover what they and others have to say.

Responses to opinion-seeking questions are always followed-up with either a minimal or a non-minimal post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007). The minimal post-expansion follow-up serves as a sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007), usually given by the teacher. This finding is somewhat surprising, because the teacher asks for opinions but then does not elaborate on them. In sequences with minimal post-expansion there is also less room for subjectification, because students do not have a chance to further explore their own opinions or discover how those opinions affect others. However, this situation is also relatively rare, as most of the situations we studied feature non-minimal post-expansion after an opinion.

When the teacher provides a non-minimal follow-up, it tends to be generic, aimed at asking for clarification or elaboration, which has a discursive role (Cullen, 2002). Through this non-minimal generic follow-up, the teacher offers students a chance to elaborate on their opinions and further explore them. In addition, listeners can gain insights into their peers’ thinking. In some sequences, the teacher instead provides a specific follow-up; a challenging teacher formulation (Solem & Skovholt, 2019) that encourages students to ‘own’ their opinions but at the same time take a critical view on their statements. Despite these differences in the formulation of the follow-up, we find no difference in the structure of the sequence; it remains an I-R-F structure for both generic and specific follow-ups. With non-minimal follow-ups, generic or specific, students can elaborate or take a critical look at their opinions, whereby the teacher creates room for subjectification. However, the conversations remain in the form teacher–student–teacher; teachers do not reveal what they think of the response or the effects of the students’ opinion on them. Therefore, students cannot use this scenario to discover to what extent their opinions conflict or correspond to the opinion of someone else.

By avoiding the expression of their own thoughts in the follow-up, teachers might be attempting to signal supportiveness, or they might be attempting to retain control of the conversation, as it appears that breaking the I-R-F structure can lead to commotion, unexpected reactions, and possible conflicts (Christoph & Nystrand, 2001). Breaking the I-R-F structure can therefore be somewhat risky for teachers, which might discourage them from responding substantively to offered opinions or allowing other stu-

dents to respond spontaneously. However, it is precisely these possibilities of unexpected initiatives and the experience of resistance that are essential to subjectification (Biesta, 2018b). Trying to exist as a subject requires becoming aware of not only living with and for oneself but also in a world with others, which imposes real limits on actions (Biesta, 2020). In other words, subjectification is not about expressing one's personal opinion without limits but rather about how such opinions encounter the world (Biesta, 2020). Without substantive responses to their given opinions, students have a harder time learning the effects of their words and what limits might exist; reflection is thus less likely to arise.

Previous research has described how teachers respond to student responses (e.g., Cullen, 2002; Lee, 2007; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji & Wells, 2000) but not how students respond to fellow students. As our study reveals, students give non-minimal follow-ups only if they are not in a regular classroom set-up, for example when they are working in groups or engaged in class discussions while sitting in a circle. They make specific non-minimal follow-ups in almost all the studied sequences; students never provide a generic follow-up on their own initiative. Their specific non-minimal follow-ups pass the turn to the recipient, to give him or her an opportunity to continue expressing thoughts, but they also serve to express the students' own thoughts. By offering a specific non-minimal follow-up, the student reveals him- or herself as a subject with thoughts and a unique voice, which is essential for subjectification. Our results show that a specific non-minimal follow-up by a student usually prompts some form of dialogic interaction, in which both participants express themselves equally and the I-R-F structure disappears. A dialogue offers great opportunity for subjectification; students respond substantively to what has been said by asking questions and sharing feelings, experiences, or other opinions. Through dialogue they gain opportunities to discover and reflect on the extent to which their opinions affect others.

In addition, there are some comments and recommendations to be made which we think are of relevance for teachers who want to make room for subjectification in their lessons. First, the teachers we observed in this study explicitly told their students that, during the filmed lesson, the intention was for them to speak and listen actively. The students in most of the studied exchanges were given some time to form their opinions or talk with partners before the teacher posed the opinion-seeking question. We do not know what the impact has been on the students' willingness to answer an opinion-seeking question, but we assume that it has had a positive impact on creating an environment in which students are more willing to express an opinion, since in all the exchanges observed, students are prepared to answer opinion-seeking questions.

Secondly, the observed teachers always asked for an opinion in response to a relatable trigger such as a video or a poem. The extent to which this influenced the opinion forming is not known from this study and would be interesting to investigate further. Furthermore, given the outcome that students in our studied data only follow up if they are not sitting in a regular set-up, we recommend that teachers who want to make room for subjectification by conducting classroom discussions do so in smaller groups or in a circle, to ensure that students can respond directly to each other without the intervention of the teacher. After the discussions, a teacher could then remind students to do a so-called 'reality check' which means that students learn to ask themselves questions such as: Does what I say or do, or desire to say or do, help in living well and living well together? (Biesta, 2020; Biesta, 2018a; Biesta, 2018b) in order to encourage students to reflect on what they have said, not said and/or heard.

Finally, when teachers ask opinion-seeking questions in a regular whole classroom setting it would be advisable to explicitly encourage fellow students to provide the follow-up, so that a multi-

logue (Schwab, 2011) can arise in which there is room for several students to express themselves as subjects, or to give more specific non-minimal follow-ups themselves instead of generic non-minimal follow-ups, so that the student gets the chance to discover how his or her opinion is being perceived by someone else.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that a conversation analytical view of classroom interaction can lead to concrete recommendations for educational practice, since the results of this study not only provide insights into how interactions unfold following opinion-seeking questions, but they also indicate what these sequences imply for encouraging subjectification in the classroom.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of Competing Interest

No competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the 11 student-teachers and their students who provided the data for this study. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their thorough comments and suggestions.

Appendix A. Transcription conventions (based on Jefferson, 1986)

[word[word	overlapping talk
word==word	'latching': no gap between two turns
(1.0)	pause of one second
(.)	micro pause, shorter than 0.2 s
?	sharp rising phrase intonation, not necessarily a question
,	slight rising phrase intonation, suggesting continuation
.	falling phrase intonation
-	flat intonation
↑ ↓	marked rising or falling shift in syllable intonation
WORD	louder than surrounding talk
°word°	softer than surrounding talk
<u>word</u>	stressed syllable
wo:rd	lengthening of the preceding sound
>phrase<	faster than surrounding talk
<phrase>	slower than surrounding talk
hh	audible aspiration
.hh	audible inhalation
((points))	verbal description of (non-verbal) actions

References

- Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Journal Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33–46.
- Biesta, G. (2010). A new logic of emancipation: the methodology of Jaques Rancière. *Education Theory*, 60(1), 39–59.
- Biesta, G. (2012). *Goed onderwijs en de cultuur van het meten [Good education and the culture of measuring]*. Boom|Lemma.
- Biesta, G. (2015a). *Het prachtige risico van onderwijs [The Beautiful Risk of Education]*. Phronese.
- Biesta, G. (2015b). What is education for? On good education, teacher, judgement, and educational professionalism. *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 75–87.
- Biesta, G. (2016). *Het leren voorbij [Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future]*. Phronese.
- Biesta, G. (2017). Don't be fooled by ignorant schoolmasters: On the role of the teacher in emancipatory education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 15(1), 52–73.
- Biesta, G. (2018a). *De terugkeer van het lesgeven [The Rediscovery of Teaching]*. Phronese.

- Biesta, G. (2018b). *Tijd voor pedagogiek [Time for pedagogy]*. Universiteit voor Humanistiek, Net aan Zet.
- Biesta, G. (2020). Risking ourselves in education: Qualification, socialisation, and subjectification Revisited. *Educational Theory*, 70(1), 89–104.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Heinemann.
- Christoph, J. N., & Nystrand, M. (2001). Taking risks, negotiating relationships: One teacher's transition toward a dialogic classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36, 249–286.
- Clayman, S. E., & Reisner, A. (1998). Gatekeeping in action: Editorial conferences and assessments of newsworthiness. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 178–199.
- Collins, A. D., Joseph, D., & Bielaczyc, K. (2004). Design research: Theoretical and methodological issues. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 13(1), 15–42.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 117–127.
- Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), 425–438.
- Degoumois, V., Petitjean, C., & Doehler, S. P. (2017). Expressing personal opinions in Classroom Interaction: The role of humor and displays of uncertainty. In S. P. Doehler, G. De Weck, L. Filiuzzo, E. Conzales-Martinez, & C. Petitjean (Eds.), *Interactional competences in institutional settings from school to the workplace* (pp. 29–57). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Drew, P. (2013). Turn Design. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 131–149). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Englert, C. (2010). Questions and responses in Dutch conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2666–2684.
- Gardner, R. (1998). Between speaking and listening: The vocalisation of understandings. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 204–224.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1(1), 1–55.
- Gosen, M., Berenst, J., & de Glopper, K. (2009). Participeren tijdens het voorlezen van prentenboeken in de kleuterklas. Een pilot-study [Participating in shared book reading in kindergarten. A pilot-study]. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen*, 82(1), 53–63.
- Hasslöf, H., & Malmberg, C. (2015). Critical thinking as room for subjectification in education for sustainable development. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(2), 239–255.
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Jefferson, G. (1986). Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies*, 9, 153–183.
- Koole, T. (2012). Teacher evaluations: assessing 'knowing', 'understanding', and 'doing'. In G. Rasmussen, C. E. Brouwer, & D. Day (Eds.), *Evaluating cognitive competences in interaction* (pp. 43–66). Benjamins.
- Lanas, M., & Kelchtermans, G. (2015). 'This has more to do with who I am than with my skills' – student teacher subjectification in Finnish teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 47, 22–29.
- Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1204–1230.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning and value*. Ablex.
- Maynard, D. W. (1989). Perspective-display sequences in conversation. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 91–113.
- Maynard, D. W. (2013). Everyone and no one to turn to: Intellectual roots and contexts for conversation analysis. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 11–31). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mehan, H. (1979). What time is it, Denise?: Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory Into Practice*, 18(4), 285–294.
- Mercer, N. (1995). The guided construction of knowledge: Talk among teachers and learners. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Major, L. (2020). *The routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education*. Routledge.
- Mondada, L. (2009). The embodied and negotiated production of assessments in instructed actions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42(4), 329–361.
- Mullan, K. (2010). *Expressing opinions in French and Australian English discourse. A semantic and interactional analysis*. John Benjamins.
- Myers, G. (1998). Displaying opinions: Topics and disagreement in focus groups. *Language in Society*, 27(1), 85–111.
- Myers, G. (2004). *Matters of opinion, talking about public issues*. University Press.
- Myhill, D. (2006). Talk, talk, talk; Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(1), 19–41.
- Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'triadic dialogue'? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 376–406.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When recitation becomes conversation. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom* (pp. 1–29). Teachers College Press.
- NHL Stenden Hogeschool. (2020). *Handleiding Didactisch Ontwerp 2020-2021 [Manual Didactic Design 2020-2021]*. Academie vo&mbbo.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939–967.
- Parker, L. (2002). The subjectification of citizenship: student interpretations of school teachings in Bali. *Asian Studies Review*, 26(1), 3–37.
- Phillipson, N., & Wegerif, R. (2017). *Dialogic Education*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Plomp, T. J., & Nieveen, N. (2013). *Educational design research. Part A: An introduction*. SLO.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 53–95). University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organizing of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2012). "Who knows best?": Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. *Pragmatics and Society*, 3(2), 294–320.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The english used by teachers and students*. Oxford University Press.
- Solem, M. S., & Skovholt, K. (2019). Teacher formulations in classroom interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(1), 69–88.
- Soter, A. O., Wilkinson, I. A., Murphy, P. K., Rudge, L., Reninger, K., & Edwards, G. (2008). What the discourse tells us: Talk and indicators of high-level comprehension. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47(6), 372–391.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35(3), 367–392.
- Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. *Classroom discourse*, 2(1), 3–19.
- Walsweer, A. P. (2015). *Ruimte voor leren, Een etnografisch onderzoek naar het verloop van een interventie gericht op versterking van het taalgebruik in een knowledge building environment op kleine Friese basisscholen [Space for learning. An ethnographic study of the course of an intervention aimed at strengthening the use of language in a knowledge building environment at small Frisian primary schools]*. Dissertation University of Groningen.
- Wells, G., & Arauz, R. M. (2006). Dialogue in the classroom. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 15(3), 379–428.
- 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.
- Willemsen, A., Gosen, M., Koole, T., & de Glopper, K. (2020). Asking for more, teachers' invitations for elaboration in whole-class discussions. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 4(2), 192–216.