Journal of Pragmatics 176 (2021) 15–25

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Pragmatics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma

Teacher epistemic stance as a trouble in foreign language classroom interaction

Jaume Batlle [a, *], Mandy Deal [b]

[a] Departament d'Educació Lingüística i Literària i Didàctica de Les Ciències Experimentals i la Matemàtica, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
[b] Applied Linguistics Department, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 16 November 2019
Received in revised form 4 January 2021
Accepted 16 January 2021
Available online 11 February 2021

Keywords:
Classroom interaction
Meaning-and-fluency contexts
Epistemic incongruency
Epistemic stance
Territories of knowledge
Repair

ABSTRACT

In foreign language learning, students are commonly encouraged to share their experiences, opinions and beliefs. Such actions position the teacher as an interactant with no access to this knowledge unless the student makes it publicly available. At the same time, it is normatively expected that teachers have primary access to knowledge related to their responsibilities as language experts. Such contextual constraints shape classroom interaction within which moments of epistemic incongruence may arise as, for example, when an epistemic stance is not in line with the assumed epistemic status. Taking a conversation analytic approach, this study aims to investigate teacher epistemic stance as a source of trouble that emerges during episodes of meaning-and-fluency foreign language classroom interaction. The analysis reveals that incongruent teacher epistemic stance unfolds in two ways: 1) when students have initiated a word-search that must be repaired by the teacher, and 2) when the teacher inaccurately anticipates some information pertaining to the students' territory of knowledge. In both cases, the teacher displays an epistemic stance that is seen to be incongruent with the participants' epistemic statuses. Findings also indicate that these episodes require certain repair work to resolve the resulting dissonance to which the interactants orient.

1. Introduction

In foreign language learning, teacher-student interaction is considered a main locus for elucidating how teachers and students display their knowledge (e.g. Koole, 2010; Sert, 2013; Jakonen and Morton, 2015) as it is revealed throughout the turn-taking system. However, in this kind of interaction, speakers do not have a symmetrical epistemic access to certain knowledge (Enfield, 2011), and maintain an asymmetry associated with the context, their rights and obligations (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage and Clayman, 2010; Koole, 2012). The teacher is understood as having a greater epistemic access to the class content based on his or her knowledge about the language and related competence, all of which is understood as epistemic expertise (Stivers and Rossano, 2010; Koole, 2012). Thus, epistemic stance and status, as expressions of epistemic expertise, are considered important in the navigation of learning and teaching processes (Rusk et al., 2016). In this way, in meaning and fluency contexts (see Seedhouse, 2004, 2019), the teacher asks students about some specific information that

* Corresponding author. Facultat d'Educació, Universitat de Barcelona, Passeig de la Vall d'Hebron, 171, 08035, Barcelona, Spain.
E-mail address: jaumebatlle@ub.edu (J. Batlle).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.01.023

only they know. Students' talk about their experiences, opinions or feelings is a main focus of this kind of interaction. A specific epistemic domain comes into play, that is, a K− epistemic gradient corresponds, commonly, to the teacher and a K+ epistemic gradient, generally speaking, corresponds to the student who is answering the teacher's questions (Lee, Y., 2015). This asymmetry is based on epistemic divergences (Robinson, 2013) that can produce some incongruences regarding the epistemic stance of participants (Heller, 2017).

The aim of this study is to investigate two specific kinds of epistemic incongruences in meaning-and-fluency teacher–students interaction, that is, 1) when the teacher has to solve a student-initiated repair sequence and 2) when the teacher erroneously anticipates some information about the students' experience. In both cases, the teacher is showing an inappropriate stance that diverges from his/her expected territory of knowledge because the students have the epistemic primacy. It will be argued that, when the teacher shows an incongruent epistemic stance, a repair sequence may come into play to solve the epistemic incongruence. This study will contribute to a more in-depth understanding of how epistemic stance shapes the sequential organization of classroom interaction.

2. Epistemics in foreign language classroom interaction: status, stance and territories of knowledge

From a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, research about epistemics has focused on, among other issues, the relationship between epistemic status and epistemic stance (e.g. Heritage, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b). Epistemic status is conceived of as a relationship between an interactant and his or her domains of information. An epistemic status is dynamic and may change from turn to turn. In contrast, an epistemic stance may be understood as the orientation that speakers exhibit with regard to some knowledge, by claiming or not claiming it (Pomerantz, 1984). An epistemic stance helps to construct the identity categories involved in interaction (Ochs, 1993; Gordon and Ikizoglu, 2017). The concept of epistemic status encompasses the possession of information as well as the right to possess this information and to articulate it.

Ownership of information can be envisaged within the concept of what is known as territories of knowledge (Heritage, 2012a; Hayano, 2016). Epistemic rights are related to the orientations towards authority and the recognition of action. Participants attribute a deontic dimension to their own and to their interlocutors' entitlement and responsibility. In this way, speakers occupying a specific kind of identity can assume an epistemic primacy (Hayano, 2011) over other speakers by using specific epistemic devices such as the *yo* particle for Japanese (Hayano, 2011) or the use of negative interrogatives (Heritage, 2012a).

Although research in epistemics has been developed mainly in naturally-occurring interaction, in recent years, many studies have applied an epistemics framework to analyze interaction in foreign language classrooms. For example, Koole (2010), in a study about teacher-student interactions in high school classrooms, shows that students deploy two types of actions to indicate their access to the epistemic domain in question: statements of knowledge and displays of knowledge, both oriented to the teacher's questions. Koole found that the students articulate answers with "displays of understanding (…) in sequential positions where a *claim* is the preferred response, while displays of knowing occur in environments where a *demonstration* of knowing is preferred" (2010: 184; emphasis in the original). Consequently, the students' epistemic access is built in interaction and is indexed in the teacher's utterances and participation. Sert (2013, 2015) and Sert and Walsh (2013), on the other hand, analyze students' claims of insufficient knowledge and state that the students are marking a K− epistemic stance when they produce an 'I don't know' utterance accompanied by multimodal resources such as gaze or hand gestures. This stance is produced when the teacher checks the students' access to certain knowledge. Moreover, the lack of knowledge can trigger epistemic search sequences (Jakonen and Morton, 2015) initiated with wh-questions that serve "to resolve emergent knowledge gaps on the side of the asker" (Heller, 2017: 159). Kääntä (2014) focuses her attention on the verbal and multimodal resources that students use to exhibit a K+ epistemic status when the teacher performs classroom management-related actions and assumes a K− epistemic stance.

3. Epistemic divergences and epistemic incongruencies in teacher–students interaction

Research about epistemics in foreign language classroom interaction has also been focused on situations in which divergent knowledge between the teacher and students is made relevant in the classroom interaction. Heller (2017) investigates how students employ unexpected knowledge claims. In these types of sequences, teachers design their turns to project their recipient students to be in a specific epistemic position. Student displays of an unexpected K+ epistemic gradient represent an incongruence between the epistemic stance and status. In other words, a student may reveal a divergent knowledge when she "demonstrates knowledge that she is not expected to possess yet" (Heller, 2017: 159).

Repair, as a method to deal with problems in interaction, is a mechanism closely related with epistemic divergences (Robinson, 2013). Other-initiated repair seeking clarification, for example, is perceived as a way to equalize an epistemic gap (Atar, 2016), and information request sequences (Leyland, 2014) project a recipient K+ epistemic status to solve the problem. A clarification about what has just been said is an action that invites responses to resolve an epistemic imbalance by raising a K− status to that of a K+. The participant who initiates a repair sequence assumes a K− epistemic gradient and displays an orientation towards the recipient as possessing an epistemic position of K+. Epistemic status is made visible as epistemic stances emerge, then, in repair sequences (Jakonen and Morton 2015), which form the locus for construction of epistemic authority and primacy in foreign language classroom. Rusk, Sahlström and Pörn (2017) report on the epistemic value of known-answer questions in peer-to-peer interactions. These types of questions are deployed by interactants in learning

contexts even when they have access to the information being requested and, therefore, the relevant knowledge "is within the speaker's epistemic domain" (Rusk et al., 2017: 55). Such questions are commonly formulated by the teachers, for example, when initiating an interactional sequence and "usually employ the analytical apparatus of analyzing repair practices-although known-answer questions are not associated with doing repair in the classroom" (Rusk et al., 2017: 55).

Repair can also be a mechanism used to challenge the teacher's epistemic authority. As Jacknick (2013) shows for form-and-accuracy contexts, students' repair work can be used as a way to indicate a trouble related with epistemic access. Troubles derived from epistemic divergences can also be related with what participants may expect from each other (Sert and Jacknick, 2015). Epistemic status may not be recognized by interactants as corresponding to an action that is normatively expected. Such an epistemic clash' can emerge, for example, when a student's claim of epistemic access is accompanied by actions conveying an unwillingness to participate as reported in work by Sert and Jacknick (2015). These researchers argue that students can use smiles as a way to maintain affiliation when an epistemic clash emerges.

As has been highlighted above, research about epistemic divergences has been commonly grounded in a broad understanding of teacher-student interaction. However, no studies have explicitly analyzed epistemic divergences in meaning-and-fluency contexts (Seedhouse, 2004), a kind of interaction based on referential questions (Mehan, 1979; Long and Sato, 1983; Nunn, 1999), since, unlike display questions, the teachers do not know the answer when they ask students questions. In this kind of interaction, students display their epistemic primacy through supplying information elicited by the teacher. This information is not included in their shared epistemic store (Gardner, 2007), and the epistemic primacy associated with this knowledge is assumed only by the students. When students draw on their experiences, teachers must deal with an asymmetry of knowledge to manage the interaction (Lee, Y., 2015: 638). This asymmetry is momentary, because participants are "engaged in mutual action and interaction (…) to arrive at some kind of mutually acceptable 'epistemic equilibrium'" (Rusk et al., 2016: 4); that is, teacher epistemic stance moves from K− to K+. However, as we will show in this study, teachers can show a certain epistemic stance that indexes a misunderstanding and, therefore, the need for repair work.

4. Data and method

The data of this study were collected from a Spanish as a Foreign Language study abroad course in Barcelona during the fall semester 2012. The group was composed of an experienced Spanish as a Foreign Language teacher and twelve A1 students (CEFR, 2001) from the United States (9), Korea (1), Germany (1) and Sweden (1). A total of 40 h of classroom sessions were video-recorded. Data showing teacher-student meaning-and-fluency context interactions (Seedhouse, 2004, 2019) that arise during the course were selected for analysis. The participants were engaged in *Round Robin* classroom activity (Mortensen and Hazel, 2011), in which the teacher was asking, one by one, about the students' travels around Europe and, in general, what they were doing or going to do during the weekend.

The analysis is built on CA (Sidnell and Stivers, 2012) as a research methodology. Using the methods of CA, we examine episodes of classroom interaction when the teacher's epistemic stance is treated by the students as incongruent. A total number of 16 cases were observed in the data: 10 of them the cases corresponded to incongruent teacher epistemic stances addressed during repair work, and 6 of them were related to the teacher's inaccurate presuppositions regarding the students' territory of knowledge. We analyze two different extracts for each case (4 in total) with the aim to exemplify the different ways teacher epistemic stance becomes a trouble in meaning-and-fluency contexts. The extracts have been transcribed following the Jeffersonian system for CA (Jefferson, 2004; Hepburn and Bolden, 2017; see Appendix) with an idiomatic English translation. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, participants were coded as a T for teacher and S for students, each with a specific number to distinguish them from one another.

5. Analysis

As stated earlier, episodes of a teacher's epistemic divergence in two different interactional situations are analyzed. The first case arises in a sequence where the teacher carries out repair work without accurately identifying what the trouble source is. The second refers to an interactional context when the teacher is seen as inappropriately assuming epistemic primacy, thereby leading to an epistemic divergence as the teacher anticipates information from the student epistemic domain. The first set of examples shows troubles rooted in the teacher's displayed orientations towards his epistemic authority as he initiates repair work. The second set features teacher utterances displaying a K+ epistemic stance, thereby conveying an incongruent epistemic status since the information he is claiming about the student is inappropriate. In both cases, the teacher's epistemic stance is the source of the trouble.

5.1. Teacher's epistemic stance in repair work

In the interaction under consideration, the teacher and students were engaged in a Round Robin activity. As described previously, the teacher asked each student about his or her future travel plans or past experiences. For example, in the following extract, the teacher is asking Student 7 (S7) where she was over the previous weekend. It is worth noting that, due to the task features of the Round Robin activity, the same question is used for all the students, so the teacher does not need to repeat it. The teacher, therefore, merely says the name of the next participant that s/he has selected to speak. S7, in this case, explains that she went to Ireland with her classmates ('mis amigas y yo:: fuimos a *Ireland*', line 2). However, the student

is not saying the name of the country in Spanish, or the target language, so the teacher corrects her by supplying the name of this country in Spanish ('mhm (.) Irlanda', line 3).

Extract 1

```
JBR_1:7.2,14:06
01   T:    S7?
02   S7:   oh mis amigas y yo:: fuimos a Ireland
           oh my friends and I  we went to Ireland
03   T:    mhm (.) Irlanda
                   Ireland
04   S7:   s- sí (.) cómo se dice e[n español?
           yes. How do you say it in Spanish?
05   T:                             [<Irlanda>
                                      Ireland
```

Extract 1 exemplifies the common way that the round robin interaction is constructed. The teacher asks a student about future plans or past experiences without knowing what the student is going to say. The student formulates a response that includes information about her experience, that is, her territory of knowledge. In providing the information requested of her, the student does not use the target language when stating the name of the country she had visited. The teacher corrects the student's action by providing the name of the country in Spanish (line 3). The exposed correction reveals an orientation towards a normative pedagogical aim related to the institutional classroom setting. The student displays her understanding of this obligation by providing an answer. This sequence shows orientations towards the student's epistemic primacy related to the epistemic domain of her personal experience. The teacher corrects the student's inappropriate language use, and in so doing he indexes his epistemic primacy and responsibilities linked to his linguistic expertise.

The following extract (Extract 2) is a continuation of Extract 1. In this sequence, the student shows again a K− epistemic stance related to the target language. She initiates a word search sequence (Brouwer, 2003; Kotani, 2017) for the word 'cliffs' in Spanish ('cómo se dice *cliffs* en español?', line 11). She deploys a request for information from the teacher and thereby positions herself as an unknowing interactant (Stivers, 2010).

Extract 2

```
JBR_1:7.2,14:23
10   T:    =>dónde habéis estado< (.) en Dublín?
             where have you been, in Dublin?
11   S7:   eh sí y: Galway y: cómo se dice cliffs en español?
           eh yes and Galway and how do you say cliffs in Spanish?
12   T:    [igual]
            the same
13   S7:   [cliffs] (.) eh=
            cliffs      eh
14   T:    =creo que igual (.) sí
           I think that the same, yes
```

In word search sequences, students' actions display a K− epistemic stance, while teachers show a K+ epistemic stance as they attempt to solve the problem. In the extract above, when S7 asks the teacher about the meaning of the word, *cliffs* (line 11) she projects a recipient K+ epistemic position. The teacher aligns with this projected status and takes the floor to carry out repair work. In line 12, the teacher claims that the term in question is the same in Spanish. However, he displays uncertainty of his candidate answer in his next turn (line 13–14) when he downgrades his epistemic stance by designing his next turn to include an epistemic stance marker, *I think* ('=creo que igual'). The student's acceptance of this repair work, and of the teacher's epistemic primacy, is shown by her taking up his proposal: she repeats the word that is now deemed to be correct ('[cliffs] (.) eh=', line 13).

After the repair sequence (Extract 2), the participants resume the Round Robin task activity. During this time, S11 is looking for the translation of the word *cliff*, the trouble source that emerged in Extract 2, in his tablet (data not shown). After several turns, S11 raises his hand to ask permission to take the floor (Sahlström, 2002) (data not shown). As is seen in Extract 3 below, the teacher selects him as the next speaker (line 37), and S11 asks if the Spanish word for *cliff* is 'acantilado' ('la palabra para: (.) cliff es <acantilado>?', line 38).

Extract 3

```
JBR_1:7.2,10:01
37   T:     viendo >pero< (.) Roma pequeña pequeña:: no es (.) S11
            looking but       Rome small small it is not small. S11
38   S11:   la palabra para: (.)  cliff es <acantilado>?
            the word for cliff is 'acantilado'?
39   T:       ↑ah porque pensaba que era un- ↑lugar (1.0) los- (.) >o sea

            ah because I thought it was a  place the I mean
40          ((turns his gaze to S7))
41          (.) °has ido a ver< (.) los acantilados=
```

```
                you have gone to see the cliffs
42    S7:       sí=
                yes
```

In line 38 the S11 launches a confirmation request regarding the meaning of the word cliff. He achieves this by means of a rising intonation. It is worth noting that he is requesting confirmation from the teacher, even though he has found the translation in Internet. By showing a K− epistemic stance, he positions the teacher as having epistemic authority, and as being responsible for assessing his suggestion. In line 39, the teacher verbalizes a change of state token (Heritage, 1984) thereby acknowledging the inadequacy of his former repair work. He accounts for his previous epistemic trouble with an "I thought that" statement (Kärkkäinen, 2012) ('↑ah porque pensaba que era un ↑lugar', line 39), expressing a change of his epistemic status: from K− to K+. The teacher then returns his attention to S7 and initiates a confirmation request (line 40–41) about what S7 had wanted to articulate in her previous turn. S7 aligns with his action by confirming the teacher's new understanding of the information she had intended to share (line 42).

When a student expresses a lack of knowledge related to a learnable, as was seen S7's turns in Extracts 1 and 2, the teacher usually takes the floor and repairs the trouble of interest and, in so doing, displays an epistemic stance K+. However, we have seen that such an epistemic stance could be problematic. Even though the student's turn is designed to project the teacher K+ epistemic position, there exists a possibility that another student could intervene if inappropriateness of the repair work is perceived. S11 has effectively corrected the teacher, but he formulated his repair work by displaying an epistemic status K− and positioning the teacher as having the epistemic authority. The teacher aligns with the student's action by employing a change of state token to index his change of status from that of unknowing to knowing. He orients to the moral obligation that can accompany teacher epistemic expertise by formulating an account for his not having provided appropriate information.

In the classroom, repair work can also be done due to problems of hearing (Drew, 1997). This specific trouble can be identified by repeating the word or words that preceded the trouble source of the prior turn in order to indicate what was not understood or heard. These practices are seen to unfold in the following extract (Extract 4).

Extract 4

```
JBR_1:11.1,11:33
01    S7:     mis compañeras y yo fuimos a Switzerland
              my classmates and me went to Switzerland
02    T:      a?
              to?
03    S7:     Switzerland?
              Switzerland?
04    T:      a S- (.) a Sutton?
              to S-    to Sutton?
05    S7:     Sutton?
              Sutton?
06    T:      no (.) no s-=
              no     I don't kn-
07    S12:    =Switzerland
08    S7:     Switzerland?
09    T :     ah a Su- a Suiza: (.) >vale< es[taba pen-
              ah to Switzerland     ok I was thin-
10    S7:                                    [(    )
11    T1:     estaba pensando en Sutton la discoteca::
              I was thinking of Sutton, the club
```

In this sequence, S7 is saying that she travelled to Switzerland with her classmates ('mis compañeras y yo fuimos a *Switzerland*', line 1). However, possibly due to linguistic limitations, she code-switches and uses the non-target language word to refer to the central European country. Then the teacher initiates a repair sequence ('a?', line 2). He repeats the preposition used by the student directly before the trouble source. Subsequently, S7 repeats the word and indexes it as a trouble source ('*Switzerland*?', line 3) by means of a rising intonation, which is seen to initiate a repair sequence. She is inviting the teacher to address her lack of knowledge by providing the appropriate target language term. S7 is therefore displaying a K− epistemic stance and projecting an acceptance of a K+ epistemic stance. However, the hearing problem persists. The teacher starts a second repair sequence, by offering a candidate repair solution ('a S- (.) a Sutton?', line 4).

The teacher is still not able to identify the initial trouble source, but continues to occupy a position of epistemic primacy in an attempt to repair the trouble. He refers to Sutton, a famous disco club in Barcelona, displaying an assumption that the students went to this club, which can be confirmed in a later turn (line 11) when he explains this reasoning behind this proposed solution for the word under question. The repair is not successful, so S7 makes visible her uncertainty about the teacher's repair work ('Sutton?', line 5) by repeating his candidate term and employing a raised intonation. The teacher disaligns with the student's previous action (Keevallik, 2011) by using a disclaimer 'I don't know' ('no (.) no s-=', line 6) to indicate his lack of knowledge (Pekarek-Doehler, 2016) regarding the information she seeks. The teacher displays a negative epistemic stance (Lindström et al., 2016) with a dispreferred response, thereby displaying an understanding that his repair work was unsuccessful. In line 7, S12 repeats the trouble source ('=*Switzerland*'), and establishes an explicit multilogue

interaction (Schwab, 2011). S12 is seeking an adequate repair work from the teacher. S7, as the student who produced the lexical problem, intervenes in the interaction marking explicitly the trouble source ('*Switzerland*?', line 8) by using a raised intonation. Finally, after the student has again indexed the trouble source, the teacher supplies the translation and, in consequence, establishes a successful repair work. After a change of state token, he provides the Spanish word for Switzerland ('ah a Su- a Suiza: (.) >vale< es[taba pen-', line 9). The teacher also gives an account for not having given an appropriate solution to the students' request for information in his previous turns ('estaba pensando en Sutton la discoteca::', line 11) by employing an "I thought" (Kärkkäinen, 2012) utterance.

Extract 4 shows a trouble related to K− teacher epistemic stance. There is a divergence between the epistemic stance displayed by the students when they start a repair sequence and the epistemic stance shown by the teacher when he tries to resolve the problem. S7's question is oriented towards clarifying the word that is identified as the trouble source. When the teacher does not hear the word in question, he offers a candidate repair, making visible his uncertainty, and in turn, a K− epistemic stance. The students' epistemic stance towards the teacher as having a K+ status is divergent from the teacher's K− epistemic stance.

Unlike the sequences in the previous extracts, where the teacher had not shown an awareness of his lack of knowledge in the repair sequence, in Extract 4 the teacher makes his unknowing status visible as he co-manages the repair sequence with the students. In the previous extracts, the students participated to recruit the teacher's attention to the repairable after the teacher was shown to have closed the repair sequence. In Extract 4, however, the teacher shows his awareness of the trouble source as he responds to the word search request by offering a candidate repair, which also displays a K− epistemic stance—he therefore does not orient towards his having epistemic primacy.

The data analysis has revealed a problematic treatment of the teacher's epistemic stance. In the extracts shown above, the students project a taking up of the epistemic primacy, or K+ status, by the teacher as seen in their requests for him to repair the trouble sources that they identify. However, the teacher shows different epistemic stances while dealing with the repair work. The teacher's K− epistemic stance elicits the students' help in the attempt to resolve the repair and, consequently, in the recovery of the teacher's epistemic primacy.

Orientations towards the teacher's lack of epistemic primacy may stem from his lack of access to information. Meaning-and-fluency contexts imply that the epistemic primacy is assumed by the students. However, when a linguistically-related knowledge gap is detected, students design their turns to index dependence on the teacher's expertise in order to pursue access to this knowledge, and in so doing they show a K− epistemic stance as well as the teacher's epistemic authority. The participants orient towards the teacher's obligation to carry out the repair. Furthermore, the teacher may attempt to do this work in spite of a lack of access to the students' epistemic domains.

5.2. Teacher epistemic stance and lack of epistemic primacy

Another kind of problematic epistemic situation emerges when a teacher anticipates information related with the students' epistemic domain (Heller, 2017). In meaning-and-fluency contexts, such as those arising in Round Robin activity, students share information that is not theoretically known by the teacher. Therefore, the epistemic primacy is assumed by the students. However, in some cases, the teacher may anticipate information, which can lead to an epistemic incongruence. Such a phenomenon can be observed in Extract 5 (below). In this extract, the teacher has asked S3 where he is going to travel for the weekend (data not shown). The student replies that the following day he will go to Prague, the capital of the Czech Republic ('↑mañana (.) voy a Praga', line 1).

Extract 5

```
JBR_1:6.1,9:26
01   S3:   ↑mañana (.) voy a Praga
           tomorrow I go to Prague
02   T:    a Praga?
           to Prague?
03   S3:   sí
           yes
04   T:    hasta el domingo
           until Sunday
05   S3:   sí (.) o:h (.) ah hasta:: lunes pero lunes eh: [( )
           yes, oh... Ah, until Monday, but Monday uh:   [( )
06   T:                                                  [que es más
                                                         [coz it's
07         barato mhm?  [hhh
           cheaper mhm? [hhh
08   S3:               [sí sí (.) y eh:: (.) yo quiero:: gastar? (0.5)
                        yes yes, and eh I want to... spend?
```

Extract 5 presents an interaction where S3 is talking about his trip to Prague on the following weekend (line 1). In the next turn, the teacher expresses surprise in response to this information by repeating the name of the city to where the student is planning to travel ('a Praga?', line 2) and using a rising intonation. This form of a polar question is answered by the student affirmatively ('sí', line 3). The teacher displays an understanding of the student's activity as limited to a weekend trip by

claiming that the student will return on Sunday ('hasta el domingo', line 4). By packaging his response with an assertion structure, he adopts a K+ epistemic stance, although he does not, in fact, have access to the student's epistemic domain. This lack of epistemic access poses a risk for his action's being recognized as a repairable. This is seen by the student's responding repair work ('sí (.) o:h (.) ah hasta:: lunes', line 5). The teacher shows a K+ epistemic stance without actually knowing if the information expressed is true or false, as can be observed by the student's reply to his claim. In this case, the student is not coming back to Barcelona on Sunday, as the teacher has suggested, but on Monday. However, S3 aligns with the teacher's assertion by displaying agreement through the use of a yes particle (line 5). After a brief pause, however, his change of state token conveys a change in his understanding of the teacher's information. He seems to notice that the teacher's affirmation is not accurate. In consequence, the student repairs the previous utterance, a K+ action indicating that the teacher's affirmation is not understood to be within his epistemic domain. Interestingly, the teacher completes the student's utterance ('[que es más // barato mhm? [hhh', lines 6–7). The teacher overlaps the student's speech and adopts again a K+ epistemic stance, despite not having heard the reasons why the student is coming back to Barcelona on Monday. The teacher then adds a question tag at the end of his turn, thereby requesting confirmation from the student and downgrading his epistemic stance.

Extract 5 is an example of how the teacher may adopt a K+ epistemic stance even when he seemingly does not have epistemic expertise. This situation may make relevant a repair sequence by the student, who perceives the teacher's utterance as problematic, or as an epistemic incongruence (Heinemann et al., 2011) because the teacher's K+ epistemic stance is not seen to be consistent with his K− epistemic status. The epistemic authority is ascribed to the student, whose experience is under discussion. The teacher is anticipating information that belongs to the epistemic domain of the student—she is the owner of this knowledge. Because the teacher's contribution indicates an unknowing status in regards to this topic, his turn constitutes a trouble. The information provided in his turn is not appropriate, so the student repairs it. However, unlike the previous extracts presenting repair work done by the teacher, in Extract 5 the student repairs the teacher's utterance, in spite of initially aligning with the teacher's action. This student's other-repair follows a divergence between the teacher's epistemic stance and his epistemic domain.

The previous extract (Extract 5) has shown a student other-repair in response to a divergence between the teacher epistemic stance and the teacher epistemic domain. However, not all the students accomplish repair work as seen in the extract below (Extract 6). In the following sequence the teacher is asking S1 what she did over the previous weekend. The student, who stayed in Barcelona, is trying to say that she went to the Picasso Museum and to a Christmas market.

Extract 6

```
JBR_1:11.1,11:26
01   T:    de vacaciones? °muy bien° (.) S1 y tú?
           on holidays very well S1 and you?
02         qué has hecho este fin de semana?
           what have you done this weekend?
03   S1:   e:m en ↑Barcelona: (.) fui:: a: (al museo)
           eh in Barcelona I went to (to the museum)
04         al museo al museo Picasso
           to the museum to the Picasso museum
05   T:    mhm
06   S1:   y:: (0.5) la festival por o para °Navidad° (°Christmas°)
           and the festival for or for Christmas
07   T:    el jueves por la noche?
             Thursday night?
08   S1:   (°sí°)
           yes
09   T:    cuando:: el: shopping night out
           when the shopping night out
10   S1:   oh [no:]
11   T:       [este] o::=
              this or
12   S1:   =em: (0.5) do[mingo
           eh          Sunday
13   T:                  [no (.) el domingo?=
                         no     the Sunday?
14   S1:   [sí
            yes
```

After the teacher explicitly gives the floor to S1 ('S1 y tú? // qué has hecho este fin de semana?', lines 1–2) by asking her what she did during the weekend, the student starts explaining that she stayed in Barcelona and, after some hesitations, she specifies that she went to the Picasso Museum ('fui:: a: (al museo) // al museo al museo Picasso', lines 3–4). The teacher's response token (line 5) invites the student to continue providing information about her weekend. Upon resuming her explanation the student talks about a Christmas market that she attended ('y:: (0.5) la festival por o para °Navidad° (°*Christmas*°)', line 6). This utterance is not fully understood by the teacher, who then seeks information about when the market that the student visited took place. Specifically, he proposes a day and time and uses a rising intonation,

which constitutes a confirmation request: whether the student went to the event on Thursday night ('el jueves por la noche?', line 7). This information is confirmed by the student (line 8). However, the teacher extends his turn by elaborating on a reference to the Shopping Night Out, a special night in Barcelona: the first day of the Christmas sales when all the shops are open ('cuando:: el: *shopping night out*', line 9).

In line 10, the student utters a change of state token, displaying an awareness that her former affirmation ((ºsíº), line 8) was an inappropriate response to the teacher's previous confirmation request (line 7) because the content of his next turn is incorrect. She indicates that the information provided by the teacher was not accurate and that she did not go to the Shopping Night Out ('oh [no:]'). The student takes the floor to clarify that she is referring to an activity that she did on Sunday ('=em: (0.5) do[mingo', line 12). The teacher displays his alignment with her turn by acknowledging his mistaken information with 'no' and repeats the information supplied by the student, seeking confirmation ('[no (.) el domingo?=', line 13). Finally, the student confirms that she was trying to talk about an activity that, in fact, she did on Sunday (line 14).

In Extract 6, we can observe once again the teacher's anticipating information related to the student's epistemic domain. In line 7, the teacher formulates a question in which he refers to information about the day when the student went to the Christmas market -Thursday night-although his utterance is with rising intonation, indexing a downgraded epistemic stance. He requests confirmation about the night when the student went to the market and links the topic, Thursday night, with the *Shopping Night Out*. The student, at first, displays agreement with the teacher, thereby establishing epistemic congruence. The teacher's next contribution, looking for specific information, reveals to the student a trouble that she had not perceived earlier, indexed by a change of state token (line 10) and the student's other-repair (line 12). The student treats the teacher's anticipated information as problematic, in spite of her earlier response to his utterance as epistemically adequate. She self-repairs her former epistemic stance and also other-repairs the teacher's proposal seemingly constructed from the perspective of his own epistemic domain related to Barcelona traditions.

The teacher has assumed epistemic primacy while the student orients towards the information about her weekend activity as being associated with her epistemic domain. In line 13, the teacher positions himself as having a K− epistemic status when he deploys a clarification check. In this turn, the teacher establishes that information that he initially proposed is not accurate and accepts the student other-repair. This acceptance is convergent with the student's position. S1 confirms that she went to the market on Sunday (line 14), with a positive token, aligning with the teacher's previous polar question, and does not offer further information.

As shown in Extract 6, the teacher-anticipated information becomes a trouble source when his displays of K+ epistemic stances diverge from his perceived epistemic status. The teacher inaccurately anticipates information about what S1 did, which leads to repair work by the student. However, compared to the repair work observed in Extract 5, the type of activity unfolding in Extract 6 is more complex. S1 is not merely launching a next-turn other-repair; she needs more turns to resolve the problem. The teacher projects a yes/no student response, and the student complies, possibly indicating an orientation towards the moral order of the interaction (Mortensen and Hazel, 2017) related to the progressivity of the task accomplishment.

The data analyzed above demonstrate that epistemic divergences may emerge when the students take the floor and claim epistemic primacy. When the teacher publicly anticipates information, the student has the opportunity to indicate whether the teacher's proposed information is accurate or not. Therefore, the epistemic divergence perceived between a teachers' K+ epistemic stance and a lack of access to the student epistemic domain may be addressed in students' turns.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The study presented in this article has focused on teacher epistemic stance as a trouble in language classroom interaction. In meaning-and-fluency interaction, students express their own ideas much more freely (Seedhouse, 2004). Epistemic primacy pertains to the students, so, commonly, they bear the responsibility to answer questions about their experiences. The territory of knowledge, then, is owned by the students. However, the analysis has shown that the teacher can display a problematic epistemic stance regarding specific information. The data analysis of the present study indicates the epistemic stance is understood as a trouble source when it is incongruent with what is expected for the teacher's epistemic status or when the teacher enters into the student's territory of knowledge. In these cases, the teacher's epistemic status does not correspond with what is expected by the students and, consequently, they initiate a repair trajectory. They orient towards a responsibility to carry out the repair work and make visible the teacher's epistemic stance as a trouble source.

When the teacher's epistemic stance is recognized as a trouble source, specific repair work is launched to deal with the epistemic incongruence. In the first case, repair is achieved in response to the teacher's inability to repair the word-search problem appropriately; in the second case, student other-repair work unfolds to address a perceived epistemic incongruence of the teacher. Repair is developed in a larger sequence if the students are unable to do a repair work based on their epistemic expertise. As it has been shown, despite the students' K+ epistemic status, their level of competence hinders the establishment of a repair work.

The problems observed in relation with the teacher epistemic stance have some similarities with findings in other institutional domains. For example, in agents and customers interactions (Lee, S.H., 2016), which hold an accountable epistemic asymmetry, it is shown that when incongruity occurs, agents orient their performance towards resolving it through asserting their knowledge. In our data, the students also assert their knowledge if they consider the teacher's epistemic stance as being incongruent, repeating the trouble source if the incongruence is after a word-search sequence or other-repairing the

teacher's utterance in the case of an erroneous presupposition about the student's information. This assertion leads to a recalibration of the participants' relative epistemic statuses (Raymond, 2018: 75), as can be observed by the change of state token uttered by the teacher and his accounts of his previous understandings. These patterns of changing epistemic ecologies may point to a general preference for epistemic equilibrium (Rusk, et al., 2016) among the participants.

When teacher's epistemic stance is considered a trouble in interaction, students have the opportunity to repair it. In such cases, like in other types of repair sequences, the epistemic status is seen as a key aspect permeating the repair work (Leyland, 2014; Jakonen and Morton, 2015; Atar, 2016). In the present study, the ones who deal with the repair work are the participants who are normatively understood to possess the territory of knowledge. Because the students have to talk about their own experiences in meaning-and-fluency contexts, are positioned as having epistemic primacy; they manage the territory of knowledge and, in so doing, they assume the higher epistemic status to deal with the repair work. By repairing the teacher's utterances, the students are projecting a recipient change of epistemic access, from K− to K+. However, this activity does not constitute a challenge to the teacher's epistemic authority, unlike that seen in form-and-accuracy contexts (Jacknick, 2013), where students' repair of teacher's work is understood as a face-threatening act to the teacher's primary epistemic status. In these situations, the teacher assumed a K+ epistemic position, and the epistemic stance is seen as incongruent (Lee, S.H., 2016) by the students, who repair the teacher's utterance.

Likewise, we have seen that in cases when the student projects a teacher K+ epistemic status through the initiation of a word search sequence, the teacher can also show a K− epistemic stance by deploying claims of not knowing, as seen in Extract 4. In accordance to what Heller (2017) has reported, the teacher may elicit specific students' knowledge and orient towards the students' having a K+ epistemic status. However, in meaning-and-fluency contexts, the incongruence is about what the students project and what the teacher actually does. In cases in which a word search sequence unfolds, the students project a teacher K+ epistemic stance. However, the teacher may or may not display this expected stance because the territory of knowledge of interest is not associated with him.

By examining teacher–students interaction, this article contributes to a better understanding of the management of knowledge in foreign language classroom interaction. Considered as a classroom context mode of interaction (Walsh, 2011), the understanding of its characteristics and its sequential development is one of the keys for teachers to be able to gain a better awareness of their own teaching practices. The knowledge of the diverse ways that teacher–students interaction may be accomplished affords the teachers opportunities to deepen their understanding of how 'doing teaching and doing learning' is co-constructed over the different contexts of classroom interaction. The teacher is normatively expected to take responsibility for the progressivity of classroom interaction. Therefore, his/her participation in repair sequences is seen as tied to the achievement of repair work and resolution of the associated problems. The data analyzed in this study have shown that teachers can employ suggestions or establish a kind of collaborative telling when attempting to carry out repair work to address troubles arising in teacher–students interaction. In this way, the present study has shown a specific problem regarding teachers' participation. Our findings suggest that in some classroom contexts, when teachers make public presumptions about students' information, to which they have no epistemic access, a trouble could arise that is difficult for students to repair if they do not have the ability to address it. Therefore, teachers may consider how they deal with some shared territories of knowledge that are not related to their epistemic primacy. Findings from this analysis may facilitate teachers' development and vigilance when handling students' shared information in meaning-and-fluency contexts; some practices, such as making assertions that may lie outside of their own epistemic domains, can lead to more complex interaction, and the students may not always be prepared to repair the epistemic trouble. At the same time, this complexity could be navigated to foster learning processes and create learning opportunities as activity that emerges in such contexts provides a fertile interactional space for students' extended participation towards achieving mutual comprehension. Ultimately, this study shows how epistemic stances are displayed and managed in meaning-and-fluency context interactions and provides important insights for understanding classroom interaction and the development of the students' participation.

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

None.

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our thanks to Professor Paul Seedhouse for his very insightful comments and their willingness to revisit the manuscript. We would also like to thank Spencer Hazel, Adam Brandt and the Micro-Analysis Research Group (MARG) researchers for their comments regarding the data analysis.

Appendix. Transcription conventions

↑	Shift to high pitch on next syllable
?	Rising intonation on previous syllable
.	Falling intonation on previous syllable
=	Latching
.hh	In breath
hh	Hearable aspiration (e.g., exhale, laughter token). The more 'h's the longer the aspiration.
[	Top begin overlap
]	Top end overlap (when relevant)
[	Bottom begin overlap
]	Bottom end overlap (when relevant)
<word>	Slower than surrounding talk
°word°	Softer than surrounding talk
word	Emphasized talk
£word£	Smiley voice
wo-	Cut-off
:(:::)	Stretching of previous sound (the more colons, the longer the stretching)
(0.2)	Length of pauses in seconds
(.)	Micropause (less than 0.2 s)
(word)	Uncertain transcription
*	Time when the nonverbal action happens

References

Atar, Cihat, 2016. The Sequential Organization and Management of Teachers' Other-Initiation of Clarification in Second Language Classroom Contexts. PhD Dissertation. University of Newcastle.

Brouwer, Catherine E., 2003. Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: opportunities for language learning? Mod. Lang. J. 87 (4), 534–545.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona, 2016. More than an epistemic hedge: French *je sais pas* 'I don't know' as a resource for the sequential organization of turns and actions. J. Pragmat. 106, 148–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.014.

Drew, Paul, 1997. "Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. J. Pragmat. 28 (1), 69–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)89759-7.

Drew, Paul, Heritage, John (Eds.), 1992. Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Enfield, Nick, 2011. Sources of asymmetry in human interaction: enchrony, status, knowledge and agency. In: Stivers, T., Mondada, L., Steensig, J. (Eds.), The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.013.

Gardner, Rod, 2007. The right connections: acknowledging epistemic progression in talk. Lang. Soc. 36, 319–341. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507070169.

Gordon, Cynthia, Ikizoglu, Didem, 2017. 'Asking for another' online: membership categorization and identity construction on a food and nutrition discussion board. Discourse Stud. 19 (3), 253–271. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445617701810.

Hayano, Kaoru, 2011. Claiming epistemic primacy: *yo*-marked assessments in Japanese. In: Stivers, T., Mondada, L., Steensig, J. (Eds.), The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 58–81. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.004.

Hayano, Kaoru, 2016. Subjective assessments. Managing territories of experience in conversation. In: Robinson, J. (Ed.), Accountability in Social Interaction. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 207–238. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.003.0007.

Heinemann, Trine, Lindström, Anna, Steensig, Jakob, 2011. Addressing epistemic incongruence in question-answer sequences through the use of epistemic adverbs. In: Stivers, T., Mondada, L., Steensig, J. (Eds.), The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 107–130. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.006.

Heller, Vivien, 2017. Managing knowledge claims in classroom discourse: the public construction of a homogeneous epistemic status. Classr. Discourse 8 (2), 156–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1328699.

Hepburn, Alexa, Bolden, Galina, 2017. Transcribing for Social Research. SAGE, London. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473920460.

Heritage, John, 1984. Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Heritage, John, 2012a. Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge. Res. Lang. Soc. Interact. 45 (1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684.

Heritage, John, 2012b. Epistemics engine: sequence organization and territories of knowledge. Res. Lang. Soc. Interact. 45 (1), 30–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646685.

Heritage, John, 2013a. Epistemics in conversation. In: Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (Eds.), The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Blackwell, London, pp. 370–394. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch18.

Heritage, John, 2013b. Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. Discourse Stud. 15 (5), 551–578. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445613501449.

Heritage, John, Clayman, Steven, 2010. Talk in Action: Interaction, Identities and Institutions. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.

Jacknick, Christine, 2013. "Cause the textbook says...": laughter and student challenges in the ESL classroom. In: Glenn, P., Holt, E. (Eds.), Studies of Laughter in Interaction. Bloomsbury, London, pp. 185–200.

Jakonen, Teppo, Morton, Tom, 2015. Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. Appl. Linguist. 36 (1), 73–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt031.

Jefferson, Gail, 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G. (Ed.), Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation. John Benjamins, Philadelphia, pp. 13–31. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef.

Kääntä, Leila, 2014. From noticing to initiating correction: students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. J. Pragmat. 66, 86–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.010.

Kärkkäinen, Elise, 2012. I thought it was very interesting. Conversational formats for taking a stance. J. Pragmat. 44 (15), 2194–2210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.09.005.

Keevallik, Leelo, 2011. The terms of not knowing. In: Stivers, T., Mondada, L., Steensig, J. (Eds.), The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 184–206. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.009.

Koole, Tom, 2010. Displays of epistemic access: student responses to teacher explanations. Res. Lang. Soc. Interact. 43 (2), 183–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351811003737846.

Koole, Tom, 2012. The epistemics of student problems: explaining mathematics to a multilingual class. J. Pragmat. 44 (13), 1902–1966. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.08.006.
Kotani, Mariko, 2017. Initiating side-sequenced vocabulary lessons: asymmetry of linguistic knowledge and opportunities for learning in conversation. Pragmat. Soc. 8 (2), 254–280. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.8.2.05kot.
Lee, Yo-An, 2015. Negotiating knowledge bases on pedagogical discourse: relevance of identities to language classroom interactions. Text Talk 35 (5), 621–642. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2015-0014.
Lee, Seung-Hee, 2016. Epistemic asymmetry and accountability in service interaction. In: Robinson, J. (Ed.), Accountability in Social Interaction. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 175–206. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.003.0006.
Leyland, Christopher, 2014. Epistemic maneuvering in extended information request sequences between EFL teachers. Novitas-ROYAL (Res. Youth Lang.) 8 (2), 136–152.
Lindström, Jan, Maschler, Yael, Doehler, Pekarek, Simona, 2016. A cross-linguistic perspective on grammar and negative epistemics in talk-in-interaction. J. Pragmat. 106, 72–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.09.003.
Long, Michael, Sato, Charlene, 1983. Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In: Seliger, H., Long, M. (Eds.), Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition. Newbury House, Rowley, MA, pp. 268–285.
Mehan, Hugh, 1979. Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
Mortensen, Kristian, Hazel, Spencer, 2011. Initiating round robins in the L2 classroom – preliminary observations. Novitas-ROYAL (Res. Youth Lang.) 5 (1), 55–70.
Mortensen, Kristian, Hazel, Spencer, 2017. Navigating the moral maze. Order and transgression in language classroom participation. In: Schwäb, G., Hoffmann, S., Schön, A. (Eds.), Interaktion im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Beiträge aus der empirischen Forschung. LIT Verlag, Berlin, pp. 113–133.
Nunn, Roger, 1999. The purpose of language teachers' questions. Int. Rev. Appl. Linguist. 37 (1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1999.37.1.23.
Ochs, Elinor, 1993. Constructing social identity: a language socialization perspective. Res. Lang. Soc. Interact. 26 (3), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2603_3.
Pomerantz, Anita, 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of referred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), Structures of Social Action. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 57–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.008.
Raymond, Geoffrey, 2018. Which epistemics? Whose conversation analysis? Discourse Stud. 20 (1), 57–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445617734343.
Robinson, Jeffrey, 2013. Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: the case of partial questioning repeats. In: Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J. (Eds.), Conversational Repair and Human Understanding. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 261–292. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757464.009.
Rusk, Fredrik, Pörn, Michaela, Sahlström, Fritjof, 2016. The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. Classr. Discourse 7 (2), 184–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1171160.
Rusk, Fredrik, Sahlström, Fritjof, Pörn, Michaela, 2017. Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: incongruent interrogative practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction. Ling. Educ. 38, 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.02.004.
Sahlström, Fredrik, 2002. The interactional organization of hand rising in Classroom Interaction. J. Classr. Interact. 37 (2), 47–57. Retrieved from. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23870411.
Schwab, Götz, 2011. From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. Classr. Discourse 2 (1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2011.562654.
Seedhouse, Paul, 2004. The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective. Blackwell, Malden.
Seedhouse, Paul, 2019. L2 classroom contexts: deviance, confusion, grappling and flouting. Classr. Discourse 10 (1), 10–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1555768.
Sert, Olcay, 2013. 'Epistemics status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed language settings. J. Pragmat. 45 (1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.10.005.
Sert, Olcay, 2015. Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
Sert, Olcay, Jacknick, Christine, 2015. Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. J. Pragmat. 77, 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.001.
Sert, Olcay, Walsh, Steve, 2013. The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. Lang. Educ. 27 (6), 542–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174.
Sidnell, Jack, Stivers, Tanya, 2012. The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Willey-Blackwell, Chichester.
Stivers, Tanya, 2010. An overview of the question–response system in American English conversation. J. Pragmat. 42 (10), 2772–2781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.011.
Stivers, Tanya, Rossano, Federico, 2010. Mobilising response. Res. Lang. Soc. Interact. 43 (1), 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810903471258.
Walsh, Steve, 2011. Exploring Classroom Discourse. Language in Action. Routledge, London & New York.

Jaume Batlle Rodríguez is assistant teacher at the University of Barcelona, Spain. His earlier work has mainly focused on the study of the interactions in Spanish as a Foreign Language classroom and the development of reflexive practice in teachers' professional development. His main research is focused on the study of the oral interaction in Spanish as a Foreign Language classroom from the Conversation Analysis point of view.

Mandy Deal is the assistant director of the Applied Linguistics Department at the Universitat Internacional de Catalunya and has worked as a teacher and teacher trainer in the field of Language and Education within a wide range of educational settings. Her most recent line of research is in the area of social interaction among student peers during collaborate work in the higher education setting.