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This paper examines multiple-response sequences (MRSs), occurring in adult Korean TESOL classrooms, to show the responses produced by students in the language classroom are not always confined within the boundaries of a single response, but are likely to be seen as mutually orienting to, and collaborating to produce a comprehensible outcome to the sequence. To analyse and consider what types of multiple response (MR) can be identified, and how the different types occur within those MRSs, this study adopts Conversation Analysis principles. By using conversation analytic perspectives, this study identifies four major types of MR (identical, complementary, collaborative and competitive).

THE STUDY

The language classroom is clearly one type of pedagogical multiparty setting, therefore, we may not expect the same sequential patterns that apply in mundane conversation, but anticipate a particular form of conversational sequence of the language classroom talk-in-interaction, such as the multiple-response sequences (MRSs) in this study. My initial claim, on the other hand, is that in spite of a good deal of Conversation Analysis (CA) in the context of language classroom talk-in-interaction (e.g., He, 2004; Ko, 2005; Lazaraton, 2003; Markee, 2000, 2004; Markee and Kasper, 2004; Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2004; Ohta, 2001; Seedhouse, 2004; among many others), the main focus of this study, the MRS, has received less analytic attention, even though it was found in this study to be pervasive in the data set, which was a substantial corpus (over 40 hours) of monolingual adult Korean TESOL classes in Sydney, Australia and Seoul, South Korea. In the present study, over 1050 cases of MRSs were found and analysed. Indeed, a small number of studies have been found which address and characterise the MRS (e.g., Lerner, 1993, 1995, 2002; Lerner and Takagi, 1999; Parker, 1984), but no study was found that examined the MRS in a similar context to the present study.
To build up a comprehensive notion of the MRS, the primary purpose of this study is to analyse and consider what types of MR can be identified, and how the different types are activated inside those MRSs. In brief, this study is devoted to employing recent CA approaches and perspectives to explicate patterns, distributions, and forms of the MRS.

THE SCOPE OF THE DATA

Over a period of one year, I collected all of the data (i.e., audio and video data) in Sydney, Australia and Seoul, South Korea. The participants in the classrooms were adult Korean learners and both native and non-native experienced English speaking TESOL teachers. All the non-native English speaking teachers in this study were native speakers of Korean.

More specifically, subjects for the Australia data set comprised 3 native English speaking teachers (all Australian teachers), 2 Korean teachers and 65 students in their classes. In the data set, over 20 hours of classroom talk were recorded. The students were of different proficiency levels in English language classrooms (from elementary to upper intermediate) at four private language institutions which give courses on English language for adult Korean immigrants and overseas adult Korean students in Australia.

The data collected in Korea were also from different proficiency level English language classrooms (from elementary to upper intermediate) at five private English language institutions and a university. Subjects for this data set comprised 4 native English-speaking teachers (2 American, 2 Canadian teachers), 5 Korean teachers and 80 students in their classes. In the Korea data set, over 20 hours of classroom talk were recorded.

To sum up, in this study, 145 adult Korean students, 7 Korean teachers, and 7 native English-speaking teachers (2 American, 3 Australian, and 2 Canadian teachers) participated. The approximate length of the total classroom data set is 40 hours and all data were transcribed in varying degrees of detail (depending on the purposes of the data) basically followed the recent transcription conventions of CA with some modifications.

ETHICS AND PERMISSION

Permission to record the classroom talk was secured well in advance before the recording time. Obtaining oral and written consent to visit the classrooms was required and fulfilled. Copy of the consent forms were also kept in order that I could demonstrate at any stage that I followed the correct procedure.

When the recordings were transcribed, it was very important to change identifying details, such as names, as part of the transcribing process. To protect participants’ an-
onymity, pseudonyms were used in the transcripts and analyses. More specifically, the names of each subject are not given. Instead, the names of each student are referred to as S1, S2, and the like, and teacher as KT or ET. Further, names of all persons referred to in the conversations, as well as local place names or other references that might provide some information which could lead to the identity of the subjects have also been changed (although larger scale place names such as Sydney, Australia, Seoul, or Korea have been retained). Even though with video recordings in the study it was very difficult to preserve the anonymity of the participants, most of the participants, fortunately, were willing to allow me to record both audible and visible aspects of their conversation.

MULTIPLE-RESPONSE SEQUENCES

When a question (or an instructional/conversational topic) is initiated by the teacher, whether or not the teacher has selected next speaker, a multiple-response (MR) may ensue. When two or more students self-select to respond to the question (or other elicitation), the participation in the response turn is widened from an individual to multiple participants and becomes a MR. Thereafter, the teacher’s post-expansion turn may, but need not, occur to evaluate or comment on the MR, or another topic (or question) is raised in the last turn in the sequence. More specifically, MRSs are primarily accomplished in a classic three-part IRF pedagogical sequence: a question (Initiation) followed by answers (Responses) from students, which in turn are followed by a comment or evaluation (Follow-up) from the teacher (cf. Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975).

The description of the three-part sequence advocated by non-CA researchers, however, is insufficient as a description of the majority of characteristics of MRSs, since in the three-part sequence only one student is normally involved in answering the question at any one time. In MRSs, on the other hand, response turns are routinely extended by at least two participants as a collaborative or competitive achievement. The following extract is offered to illustrate the most basic format of MRSs:

{1} [AUSTRI2.KRC:6S]

1. KT: can you give me one example of martial arts?
2. (0.2)
3. S1: Taekwondo
4. S2: [Taekwondo]
5. (0.2)
6. KT: yah (.) that’s Korean martial art
Here, the teacher’s question (line 1: first-pair part) is initiated and targeted at all six students in the class. The absence of the insertion of a name or of non-verbal selection of speaker in the question leads to the possibility for self-selection by any learner. The two self-selecting learners (S1 and S2) produce the same response simultaneously in lines 3 (second-pair part1) and 4 (second-pair part2). After this, a ratifying (‘ygah’) and a short further commenting turn (‘that’s Korgan martial art’) are provided by the teacher in the post-expansion turn (line 6).

In the aftermath of the teacher’s first-pair part (i.e., a question or other elicitation), we can see various orderly and describable ways in which a second-pair part in the response turn can get expanded, which can basically be classified into four types of MR: identical, complementary, collaborative and competitive. The following analytic sections address how four types of prototypical MRs appear to be locally managed in MRSs, by analysing sequential structures and activities which can identify the notion of each type of MR.

THE IDENTICAL MULTIPLE RESPONSE

In the course of identical MRs, several learners (at least two) self-select one after another or chorally with the same utterance(s) as produced by other speakers, which means that students do not build linguistically on prior students’ turns but provide the same grammatical form and pragmatic meaning as the others’ utterances. The following extract provides an example:

```
(2) [KDRTR12:UHFL:8S]
  1  ET:  what’s the team
  2    (0.6)
  3  S1:  chicago bulls=
  4  S2:  =chicago bulls=
  5  S3:  =chicago bulls=
  6  ET:  =right.) chicago bulls
```

This extract shows that identical MRs are likely to be designed to display affective convergent acceptance of the prior speaker’s response by repeating the same grammatical form and semantic meaning with the prior utterance. To be specific, in the first-pair part, the teacher directs a question to the whole class to elicit the name of a basketball team pictured in their textbook. After a gap in line 2, an identical MR is produced consecutively
by three students in lines 3–5. In the second-pair part, the self-selecting three learners produce exactly the same responses and no information is added to the prior learner’s response, indicating agreement with what was said in the prior turn. The teacher then accepts the identical MR in the post-expansion turn (line 6).³

In the identical MR, co-participants may try to participate in the second-pair part, even though they have nothing new to say: subsequent responses neither add to nor reduce the content of the first response, being a reproduction of the same form. In a strict sense, however, there is no absolute repetition in conversation because nobody can reproduce the previous turn literally the same way at a phonetic level, taking prosodic elements into consideration, and also its sequential placement (here specifically as a repetition) will give it a different shade of meaning (i.e., context dependence). In this regard, accomplishing the identical MR may not always seem to require that each speaker’s utterance should literally match its prior speaker’s utterance word for word. Rather, the identical MR tends to imply mostly the same syntactic and semantic meaning (i.e., not perfectly identical syntactic, semantic, and prosodic meaning).

THE COMPLEMENTARY MULTIPLE RESPONSE

A complementary MR is a MR that intentionally or accidentally enriches or replicates the meaning of an earlier attempted response, but not the same wording. More specifically, in this MR, even though learners sometimes provide response turns consecutively or simultaneously with different utterances from those of the prior learner, the responses imply essentially the same meaning.

The complementary MR can occur with code-switching: although code-switching occurs by a co-participant in his/her response turn when the prior speaker’s response turn has finished or is continuing, it implies mutual co-ordination of meaning to the prior response in context. Consider the following extract, in which a complementary MR occurs where the teacher and students speak the same native language (i.e., Korean):

(3) [AUSTR:KRC:6S]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KT: what i.s recommending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KT: what is it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, the teacher’s question turn is produced for a vocabulary-check in line 1 and, after a pause, in line 3. Thereafter, S1 (line 5) first responds to the question in Korean. S2 (line 7) then produces a response (‘suggestion’) which is English equivalent of ‘chuchôn’ even though S1 does not solicit help (i.e., S2 self-selects). In line 9, the teacher provides a ratification (‘kû-ci-yoû’) which roughly corresponds to English ‘(that’s) right, (isn’t it?),’ and a paraphrase and repair for the position of the stress in the word, ‘suggestion.’

To some extent, elaborating the meaning of an earlier response, a co-participant in complementary MRs also at times reproduces the prior response with an additional item or items in native Korean/English-speaking teachers’ lessons. The fragment in the following contains an instance of this:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ET: you have fried rice? or boiled rice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S1: boiled rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S2: usually boiled rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ET: usually boiled rice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 1, a native English-speaking teacher asks all three students about what type of rice Koreans usually eat. Thereafter, while the first response is being produced by S1 (line 2), S2 delivers a contribution to developing the content of the prior turn (line 3). S2’s response here is an additional response (i.e., adding a single word, ‘usually,’ to the prior response) to provide the prior response with a supportive meaning (i.e., ‘Koreans do not always have boiled rice, but usually do.’). This extract shows that complementary MRs may exhibit conjoint participation, which means that co-participants propose
elaboration of the meaning of prior talk when this seems to be ambiguous or insufficient for understanding, thereby making their association contribute to its prior speaker in a MRS.

In summary, a complementary MR delivers an alternative possibility by replicating either exactly or partially the same pragmatic meaning of an earlier attempted response, but not the same wording. In other words, by using the complementary MR, a semantic repetition of the prior response commonly occurs to collectively render a comprehensible and/or plausible response to the teacher's first-pair part.

THE COLLABORATIVE MULTIPLE RESPONSE

In contrast to complementary MRs, co-construction of a turn-constructional unit (TCU) is the core characteristic of the collaborative MR. In the course of collaborative MRs, participants demonstrate association by jointly producing a syntactic unit that is produced by various collaborative activities.

For instance, collaborative MRs are frequently identified as shared word-searches in which the other conversational partners make some effort to join the activity by supplying a candidate lexical item or items for which the current speaker is searching. To explicate this, Extract 5 can be considered. In this extract when the first starter displays a problem in finding a word, a co-participant immediately proffers a candidate word to assist in resolving the difficulty experienced by the original speaker:

(5) [AUSTR12:SC:4S]

1   ET:  there's a difference between "sometimes" and
2       "often." 
3       (0.6)
4   ET:  is that okay? you ( ) difference between
5¹  sometimes and often?
5²  (The teacher looks around the class and asks)
6       (0.6)
7   S1:  sometime( ) often is very (0.5) ah::= 
8   S2:  =frequent?
9       (0.2)
In this segment, the teacher asks all four students if they know the difference between ‘sometimes’ and ‘often’ through the initial question (lines 1–2) and the expanded question (lines 4–5). When the first speaker (S1) takes the floor to provide a response in line 7, he becomes engaged in a word-search, which is displayed not by a direct appeal for the word (e.g., ‘What do you call that?’) but by a curtailed TCU, including a pause and drawled hesitation marker. When S1 hesitates, S2 proposes a candidate response in line 8. S1 then accepts the candidate response with a positive response token and a repeat in line 10, which is overlapped by an acknowledgment token produced by S2 in line 11. Thereafter, an identical MR is produced in consecutive mode through lines 12–13, showing that the original speaker (S1) and a co-participant (S3) are of the same opinion or are in agreement with the lexical item (‘frequent’).

The candidate lexical item occurring in a word-search is designed to facilitate a second-pair part to enable the original speaker to continue and/or complete speaking, since the contributions of co-participants, at times including the teacher, come well after the onset of the word-search. Co-participants here are not stepping up to take turns, but, rather, they are maintaining the nominated speaker’s conversational topic, showing pedagogic solidarity, which supports the progress of the speaker’s on-going second-pair part.

The collaborative MR can also be identified as a form of ‘collaborative completion-TCU production’ (cf. Lerner, 1995, 2002), where another participant assists to complete a not-yet-completed utterance, as in the following:

(6) [KORT15:UHFL:11S]
(also writing video)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ET:</th>
<th>whqt might happen to the reltionship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ET:</td>
<td>Mr. Kim?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After watching a scene of a movie, in line 1 the teacher provides a question asking the students to guess what will follow the selected scene. When the question fails to elicit a response from the learners, the teacher allocates S1 in line 3 and slightly reformulates the question in line 7. In lines 9–11, S1 provides a response to the question. When S1 hesitates for five tenths of a second and stretches the word ‘a::nd’ to begin a new TCU (line 11), S2 self-selects to take the floor and provide a collaborative MR composed of a sentence to complete the multi-unit turn. When the pre-allocated speaker, S1, nods (line 15) in response to the teacher’s request for his opinion (line 14) to establish whether the response produced by S2 is the same, the teacher proffers an assessment and provides the learners with his own view in lines 16–18.

On occasion, in a similar sense to Lerner’s research (2002) on the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction, participants in collaborative MRs may treat more-than-one-at-a-time speaking as properly simultaneous. Lerner (2002, p. 226) remarks that at times participants are not aiming to produce a separate turn at talk but are instead aiming to simultaneously co-produce part or all of a TCU more or less in unison with another participant. Taking a similar view, in the course of collaborative MRs, co-participants...
often tend to simultaneously co-produce a TCU or TCU element(s) which can be strongly projected from the TCU in progress.

When participants provide collaborative MRs, however, the form of participation is not always serially organised in an orderly manner. More specifically, the occurrence of shadowing (Tannen, 1989) appears to be used by a co-participant to quickly reproduce or echo what the prior speaker has said, which is usually involving at least some overlap. In this way, a co-participant displays his/her attempts to participate in constructing a collaborative MR (i.e., choral co-production and shadowing: Ko, 2005). The fragment in the following exhibits an instance of this:

(7) [AUSTR2.KRC:6S]

1 KT: I’ll ask you the question again.
2 (0.9)
3 KT: who is W3:ter (.) visit:ing.
4 (0.7)
5 KT: n’ thee answe: ? (.) everyone?
6 (2.2)
7 S1: h3 v3i:ti
8 (.)
9 S2: he[:]: v3i:ti
10 S1: [h3:
11 (0.2)
12 S1: h3 is v3i:ti:g [ti:n: g:]
13 S2: [ti:n: g:]=
14 S3: h3 is v3i:ti:g his neighbou:z ac[r]oss the street
15 S1: [v3i:ti:g h3 s:ne:bou:z:
16 across the street=)
17 KT: =okay (.) a:ll togethe:rz
18 (0.5)
19 LL: he is visiting his neighbourhoods across the stree=)
20 KT: =good okay. (0.3) how often do:es he[:]: visit them
Here, when the teacher prompts all six students to respond to the teacher’s question in line 5, a type of collaborative MR, choral co-production and shadowing, is produced by self-selection techniques in lines 7–16. After S1 (line 7) and S2 (line 9) initiate a response turn in the form of identical MR, the response turn is constructed by a choral co-production and a shadowing in lines 9–16. In line 10, S1 echoes ‘hg:’ (i.e., shadowing) immediately after S2 has produced the word in line 9. In line 13, S2 provides a choral co-production of one part of the word which is strongly projected from S1’s previous response turn (line 12). Thereafter, S3 immediately produces a full sentence in line 14. While S3 is providing the full sentence, S1 (lines 15 and 16) co-produces a projected TCU component (‘visiting’) simultaneously and provides another shadowing by repeating a part of the prior response immediately subsequent to the repeated talk (‘his neighbours: across the street’). When the full response has been constructed by three students, the teacher requests all students to repeat the full sentence in choral mode (line 17). All students then provide a choral response to provide the full sentence in line 19. In line 20, the teacher provides an assessment (‘good okay.’) and opens a new base adjacency pair (‘how often does he:¿ visit them’).

To some extent, collaborative MRs can also be realised in the form of ‘same-turn other-repair’. More specifically, in collaborative MRs students not otherwise involved in the production of a trouble-source utterance may have an opportunity to produce a same-turn other-repair to immediately repair a problematic item or items just after the repairable has been produced. This is quite different from an interruption, as the MR does not take place on the main floor, but their contribution can be viewed as an act of co-operation, in order for the speaker of the trouble-source to continue and/or complete his/her response turn, showing pedagogic solidarity. The following extract provides an example:

(8) [AUSTR4 XRC:6S]
1    KT:   number ten
2                 (0.7)
3    S1:   uh: first. uh:=
4    S2      =>finally<
5                 (0.2)
6    S1:   finally: she¿ took-ü a chest-ü X-ray and
After an individual task, ‘fill-in-the-blank with an appropriate word’ from their textbook, the teacher has proposed that each learner answers in succession. That is, a pre-allocation of turn is being used in the teacher’s question in line 1. In line 4, S2 carries out an unmodulated same-turn other-repair (‘>finally<’) to correct S1’s word-choice (line 3– ‘first.’) and it focuses on establishing the accuracy of the statement. To be more specific, the other-initiation of repair is not separated from the repair. Instead, the initiation and the repair are combined in one and the same turn and the producer of the unmodulated same-turn other-repair, S2, does not produce any further talk after the repair work. In so doing, even though S2 does not create an opportunity for S1 to self-repair, because the repair work is performed immediately and explicitly after the repairable has occurred, the speaker of the trouble-source turn, S1, still has an opportunity to complete the TCU with an alternative item suggested by a co-participant. In lines 6–7, S1 closes off the repair himself by incorporating the new information in his turn and completes with an appropriate response to the teacher’s question. (cf. Schegloff, 1992; Schegloff et al., 1977).

In brief, collaborative MRs demonstrate that they are ‘team talk,’ and are a method for sharing an activity to construct a TCU, even though it is not necessarily sequentially required or implicated.

THE COMPETITIVE MULTIPLE RESPONSE

Compared to collaborative MRs, participants in the course of competitive MRs also attempt to provide a second-pair part together, but it is not to improve a prior response linguistically, but to challenge the response. Therefore, each response is contrastive to the other. That is, participants in competitive MRs do not share their turns with other students, but produce competing responses. To end the MR, the teacher overwhelmingly produces a comment turn, because the disagreement needs to be resolved by the teacher as ‘arbiter’ in the post-expansion turn. The following extract is a case in point:

(9) [AUSR3:LCD:3S]

1  ET:  <now (0.6) a::um (1.7) se:cond pa:rt> (2.2)
2  <the pe::ple are: talking (1.4) o::n the phone
3  (0.6) o::>
Here, the teacher asks an alternative question in lines 1–3 and 6 to make sure that students understand the situation in the dialogue they have just been practising. After a pause, two students (S1 and S2) simultaneously provide different responses in lines 8 and 9 respectively. In lines 11 and 13, S1 self-selects to emphatically disagree with the answer given by her co-participant, S2 (line 9– ‘on the phone’), with a strong minimal disagreement marker in Korean, ‘ani-a’ (line 11), which literally means ‘no’ and repeat his prior response (lines 11 and 13). In line 14, S2 then seeks confirmation by retaining the wording of the competitive utterance in the preceding turn, but with rising intonation. After this, a repetition for confirmation (‘face to face’) and a short supportive comment (‘talking to each other(.)’) are given respectively by the teacher in line 16. Such a final note in the teacher’s post-expansion turn appears to be used to terminate the MRS.

As Pomerantz (1984) and Schegloff (1995) have argued, agreements in conversation are generally organised as preferred activities and disagreements as dispreferred ones: whereas agreements are normally accomplished directly, briefly, and with a minimum of delay, disagreements are commonly accomplished in mitigated forms, are long, and are delayed from early positioning within turns and/or sequences.
In contrast, instead of being modulated in such ways, the disagreement sequences performed in competitive MRs can be shaped in ways that are unmitigated and direct and that are analogous to those used to format agreements in the kinds of sequence examined in ordinary conversation. In effect, competitive MRs are often extended by a straightforward disagreement that is characteristically performed immediately or after a micro pause, without any initial agreement with a mitigator (i.e., [explicit disagreement marker] + alternative response). Moreover, unlike ordinary conversation, in which argument tends to be determined by a compromise or an acceptance of a position to which a speaker was initially opposed (cf. Pomerantz, 1984), students do not necessarily deal with issues in the form of competitive MRs even though learners provide the MR through a challenging or arguing action. Rather, the teacher’s post-expansion turn is frequently used as a way of intervening in learners’ disagreements and reaching a consensus on their competitive responses, although s/he is not the original author of the argument: it shows how the teacher is ‘doing being a teacher’ (Ko, 2005).

**DISCUSSION**

This study has described the relatively simple and basic structure of MRSs that constitute a single type of MR in a single MRS, in order to briefly offer a categorisation of prototypical MRs and draw sketches of how actively learners and the teacher involve themselves in providing the MRS as an institutionalised sequence in language classroom talk-in-interaction. In fact, MRs may become sequentially more complex when two or more individuals are involved in the sequence and produce various types of MRs. In these, several learners self-select one after another or chorally and provide the same grammatical form and pragmatic meaning as the prior utterance (i.e., identical MRs) and/or replicate essentially the same pragmatic meaning of an earlier candidate response, but not the same wording (i.e., complementary MRs) and/or learners attempt to co-operate with each other to provide a TCU (i.e., collaborative MRs) and/or attempt to provide a SPP together not through improving grammatical form or pragmatic meaning of the prior turn, but through challenging the prior learner’s response to build collective disagreements (i.e., competitive MRs). Among these, the participants try to support each other’s turns at talk. Hence, during the MRS, every learner is a potential speaker who is jointly and collaboratively engaged in mutually sharing knowledge, and in enabling both teachers and learners to teach and learn more effectively. In other words, MRSs generally occur in the developmental significance of social interactional architecture. MRSs are not seen simply as the by-product of teacher-learner interaction attempting to exchange information.
by means of the progression of a classic three-part pedagogical sequence, but participants in MRSs are seen as mutually orienting to, and collaborating in order to complete, orderly and meaningful sequences.

Based on the notion examined through this study, although MRs may occur for a variety of reasons, one overwhelming factor unifies them all: solidarity and supportive alignment. Whilst Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 47) have claimed that ‘the pupil has no right to contribute to the discourse…’, the present study shows that students’ dynamic co-ordination and effort also contribute to the structuring of classroom discourse. In other words, the flow of each phase of the sequence is not led by the teacher alone. Learners also interact with each other to collectively work on language learning tasks even in situations where the learner may appear to be quite passive and no one clearly has great expertise (cf. Brooks, 1992; Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001). This environment can be considered as a potential site of second language learning in the classroom beyond being a potential contribution to CA. In this regard, it is hoped this study may be seen as contributing, in part, to future research projects on establishing potential theoretical insights of second language acquisition in MRSs.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The organisation of MRSs may well be a widespread phenomenon in language classroom talk-in-interaction, and technically more characteristic of language classrooms than of other institutional talk-in-interaction or ordinary conversation.

This study, however, is exclusively situated as a study of adult Korean English language classroom talk-in-interaction. The interactional sequential features of MRSs are unlikely, of course, to be equally frequent or similarly distributed in every classroom in every culture or every linguistic group. In other words, attitudes towards the MRS may vary or be similar depending on the cultural backgrounds of conversational participants. In this respect, it would be interesting to study whether different subjects from different countries in various language classroom settings (e.g., European TESOL classrooms) tend to employ certain sequences more frequently or less frequently than others. Furthermore, the MRS may not be oriented to as a predictable speech exchange system in other institutional multiparty settings, since different conversational conventions may hold for different institutional settings. Hence, a broad range of future research could readily determine if the frequency and range of use of the MRS are limited to language classroom talk-in-interaction, or if the practice of MRSs can also be similarly distributed in the other multi-party institutional settings.
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ENDNOTES

1 To provide a rationale for the study of MRSs, several previous studies will be further discussed in the following sections.

2 The core of this set of transcription symbols is adapted from Jefferson (1984). In addition, some specific notation has been developed by the author and some contemporary CA researchers (e.g., Gardner, 2001; Markee, 2000; Ohta, 2001; Seedhouse, 2004; ten Have, 1999). All names in the present study have been fictionalized to ensure teachers’ and students’ anonymity: ET (Native English speaking teacher); KT (Native Korean speaking teacher); S1 (Identified student, using numbers [S1, S2, etc.] indicating ordering of turn); S? (Unidentified student); LL (Whole class).

Grammatical glosses used in this study: ATTR (Attributive); COMM (Committal); COP (Copula); IE (Informal ending); NEG (Negative particle); POL (Politeness); TOP (Topic marker).

3 In Extract 2, the responses are produced in consecutive mode. In contrast, choral responses also clearly reflect a functional and structural characteristic of identical MRs (e.g., Extract 1).
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