“Okay, so, moving on to question two”: Achieving transitions from one item to another in paired EFL speaking tasks

FRANTIŠEK TŮMA

ABSTRACT: This multimodal conversation analytic study explores how participants transition from one item to another in paired speaking tasks based on lists. These transitions are crucial for achieving progress in the task. Based on video recordings from English as a foreign language (EFL) classes, the analysis shows that the way participants achieve transitions depends on the embodied participation framework. Within a co-operative participation framework, participants transitioned to the next item using sequences of (1) closings, (2) verbal expressions of transition, and (3) new item initiations. It is shown that the list of items plays a crucial role as participants start gazing at it already during the closings, thus flagging the relevance of an upcoming transition. In such cases, verbal expressions of transitions were not always present. Less commonly, participants remained focused on the lists, produced minimal responses and moved on to new items after question-answer sequences. The study sheds light on how transitions are achieved in institutional settings where participants’ roles are symmetric and where the talk is based on lists, which, in turn, serve as resources to maintain the progressivity of the interactional project.

Key words: transitions, closings, lists, gaze shifts, multimodality, conversation analysis

1. Introduction

This study focuses on one particular type of interactional projects, i.e., series of component activities (Robinson 2003), where the component activities can be formally itemized and materialized. For example, interviews consist of several sets of questions, meetings typically have agendas, and speaking tasks in foreign language classes may be based on lists of items for discussion. In these interactional projects, transitions from one component activity to another often correspond to transitioning between the items. Such transitions are crucial for the overall interactional project – by moving on, participants achieve progress in their talk and gradually fulfil the underlying institutional goals. Next items may be pre-defined by the overall structural organization (Robinson 2013), from which participants may depart and to which they then may return. Viewed this way, interactional projects, such as interviews, meetings, and speaking tasks, are not pre-scripted routines but moment-by-moment achievements produced by the participants.

The study of transitioning from one item to another can thus reveal how participants structure and make sense of the interactional projects. Transitions have been studied in various settings, including medical examinations (e.g., Modaff 2003; Robinson & Stivers 2001), various types of interviews and meetings (e.g., Deppermann, Schmitt & Mondada 2010; Kamunen & Haddington 2020; Mikkola & Lehtinen 2014; Tiitinen & Lempiälä 2018) and education (e.g., Jacknick 2011; Reed 2019). While in many interactional projects, such as medical examinations and frontal teaching, asymmetries in terms of turn-taking and epistemics may shape the way that transitions are achieved, there are also interactional projects within which the participants’ institutional roles are the same,

such as colleagues or classmates, and where the transitions may be managed differently. Although there are some studies on transitions from informal chat with colleagues to work-related activities (Kamunen & Haddington 2020; Siitonen & Siromaa 2021), this area remains rather under-researched with respect to transitions between component activities within larger interactional projects.

The contribution of the present study is threefold. First, it reports how transitions from one item to another are managed by participants with similar epistemic status in an institution. That is, the ways in which students in paired speaking tasks achieve transitions as reported here are different both from topic shifts in everyday conversations and from transitions in institutional settings where epistemic asymmetries between participants (e.g., doctor-patient, teacher-student) exist. Second, this study sheds light on the role of lists of items present during the institutional interaction. Based on a detailed analysis of the situated use of language and embodied resources when transitioning from one item to another, it is argued that the list of items plays a crucial role as participants start gazing at it already during the closings, thus flagging the relevance of an upcoming transition. Last but not least, the study adds to the existing conversation analytic research on how English is used, taught, and learned in educational institutions in Czechia. While previous studies examined predominantly whole-class talk (e.g., Hanusková 2019; Kupčíková 2021; Ryška 2021; Tůma 2017, 2018), the present study focuses on interactions among peers, which remain rather under-researched in Czechia (for exceptions, see Červenková 2021; Tůma & Sherman 2022).

2. Transitions in everyday and institutional interactions

When studying the practices employed by participants when transitioning from one item to another, participation frameworks, i.e., the ways participants orient to each other and relevant phenomena in the environment, are essential, since participants "are able to hold each other accountable for detailed and relevant participation in the events of the moment, something that is central to their ability to build ongoing courses of action in concert with each other" (Goodwin 2018: 235). Relevant to this study are two distinct participation frameworks. First, a participation framework that favors co-operation can be defined as one within which participants gaze towards shared space, including establishing mutual gaze. This framework seems suitable for the production of talk, as participants can coordinate their turn-taking not only based on the way that they talk, but also through having access to embodied actions of the co-participant (for recent multimodal studies of turn-taking, see, for example, Auer 2021; Hofstetter 2021; Lee 2017). Second, participants may focus their visual attention on the list of items and thus not maintain a co-operative participation framework. As one gazes at a list in front of them, they may be less receptive to a co-participant's embodied actions. However, this participation framework makes it possible to examine the list of items and select and read the next item.

There is a large body of literature relevant to transitions. Research on everyday conversation has highlighted the role of topic proffering sequences, which can also serve as a vehicle to initiate talk related to a new item in institutional settings where a list

includes items for discussion. In topic-proffering sequences, one participant proposes a topic, and the co-participant either embraces or rejects the topic in second position (Schegloff 2007). Topics are typically proffered by polar (yes/no) questions, but question word (wh-) interrogatives seeking extended responses are also relevant (Thomson, Fox & Couper-Kuhlen 2015). According to Schegloff (2007: 180), topic expansion is then preferred, while rejection (and thus immediate closing) is dispreferred (see also Stivers & Robinson 2006). It should be emphasized that these findings are based on data from everyday conversations. In institutional settings, there may be some constraints, such as time pressure, which may generate tension between producing more task-related talk and progress in the sense of completing one component activity and moving on to another. It is this tension from which the need for participants to manage transitions arises – when engaged in an interactional project with a list of items, participants need to be able to move on to another item, thus changing topics and generating new sequences with topical talk. It follows that the study of transitions between items on lists reveals how participants orient to the underlying institutional goals.

Research on everyday conversation has shown that participants may change topics in a stepwise manner, i.e., they gradually abandon topics and start new ones without clear boundaries (Jefferson 1984; Sacks 1995: II/566; see also Tiitinen & Lempiälä 2018). Another way, particularly relevant to transitioning from one item on a list to another, is closing the talk related to the current item (i.e., closing one component activity of the interactional project) and then opening a new item (i.e., initiating a new component activity). This can be achieved by employing dedicated sequence-closing sequences, which are used "to close long sequences or topics" (Schegloff 2007: 186). Schegloff (2007) divides this sequence type into three consecutive turns. Initially, the possibility of closing the sequence or topic-in-progress is created, which can be done, for instance, through summaries (Button 1991), assessments (Thomson, Fox & Couper-Kuhlen 2015: 200–211), and figurative expressions (Holt & Drew 2005). After that, a recipient expressing agreement or alignment with the first turn is understood to be collaborating to bring the sequence or topic to a close. Finally, the speaker who initiated the sequence-closing sequence may produce a final closing token or assessment to ratify the recipient's alignment (Schegloff 2007: 186–187). Then, talk related to another item, and thus another component activity, can be initiated. In the case of lists or agendas, the next item can be read out loud, often elliptically (Svennevig 2012), but there are also other resources that participants can build on during the initiation, including expanded pitch range and discourse markers, such as "so" or "oh" (Bolden 2006; Riou 2017).

Of particular interest and relevance are transitional phases, which occur after the closing of one component activity has been achieved and before a new component activity is initiated. The ways in which activity boundaries are interactionally managed have been addressed by many scholars, including Goffman (1974: 51–269), who introduces the notion of boundary markers or brackets and discusses various ways in which transitions from one activity to another can be achieved, including announcements (e.g., between radio programs) and routinized gestures (e.g., handshakes in wrestling). This suggests that both verbal and embodied resources can play an essential role in transitions.

As far as verbal resources are concerned, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 21–22) identified particles such as "right", "well", "good", "okay" and "now" that were commonly used by teachers to indicate the boundaries in the lesson. Several other studies followed (e.g., Beach 1993; Keevallik 2010; Mondada & Sorjonen 2021), which have revealed the pivotal character of expressions such as "okay" in these environments – they contribute to the closing of the previous activity and, at the same time, indicate that a new activity is to begin. In interviews, Antaki, Houtkoop-Steenstra and Rapley (2000) show that closings of interactional units and transitions between them can be achieved by interviewers producing answer receipts, followed by particles, such as "okay" or "right", and high-grade assessments. Mondada and Sorjonen (2021: 119–120) show that transitions between activities can also be achieved by combining transition markers and explicit formulations of the action that is about to follow. However, transition markers are more commonly combined with other particles and agreement tokens as well as with embodied resources, such as gaze shifts or changes in posture, often resulting in changes in participation frameworks (Mondada & Sorjonen 2021).

Embodied resources employed in transitions between component activities commonly include bodily actions associated with relevant next action. Typically, participants manipulate relevant material objects around them. For instance, Tanner, Olin-Scheller and Tengberg (2017) analyze how students in small groups discuss articles that they each have in front of them. The articles are reported to function as resources for reminding and making references to the text, and, at the same time, students were found to hold up the texts to focus joint attention on them. In the context of workplace meetings, Mondada (2006) shows that by moving an object being talked about to the side, participants can project the closing of the ongoing activity and move on to the next one. Relatedly, in interactional projects such as meetings or interviews where topics are materialized in the form of a document (e.g., interview forms or written agenda), gaze shifts as well as participants' manipulation with the document play a central role in the transitions between component activities represented by the items (Mikkola & Lehtinen 2014; Svennevig 2012; Weilenmann & Lymer 2014; see also Antaki, Houtkoop-Steenstra & Rapley 2000, where page shuffling sounds are included in transcripts of transitions from one section of an interview to another).

In addition, participants may employ other embodied resources, including changes in body posture, occupying a particular position, and monitoring an object or an area relevant to the next action. For instance, Deppermann, Schmitt and Mondada (2010) analyze how participants transition from one phase of a meeting to a break and then back to work, including adjustments in participation frameworks that can be made via one's visible preparation of materials relevant to the next stage of the activity, adopting the position and posture of a speaker as relevant to the next activity, and visible monitoring of co-participants. Monitoring is also relevant in the study by Kamunen and Haddington (2020), who show how workers in a café and in a laboratory transition from one activity to an imminent one (e.g., the arrival of a customer, the completion of a measurement), which can be done by embodied prompts, such as gaze shifts and body re-orientation towards the customer or laboratory equipment. When the co-participant does not display

orientation to the transition, gestures and verbal prompts can be used, including those initiating the emergent activity. Finally, transitions between two phases of music masterclasses were studied by Reed (2019), who characterizes the transitions from performance to instructional interactions as transitions that involve two distinct participation frameworks. During such transitions, besides assessments, the mentor's nodding, changes in posture, and gaze shifts are crucial.

Overall, these studies indicate that participants closely coordinate their use of verbal and embodied resources in achieving transitions to the next relevant activity, and that one's body posture, gaze, and manipulation of objects relevant to the next activity are also central. However, with the exception of Mikkola and Lehtinen (2014), none of these studies focuses specifically on the transitions in interactional projects comprising several component activities materialized in the form of a list that the participants can access. This represents a gap that this study aims to fill.

3. Data and method

This study is a part of a larger project where recordings of 18 lessons taught by five different teachers in five different upper secondary schools (ISCED 3) in Brno, Czechia, in fall 2018 were made. The recordings come from the final grades, and the language proficiency levels, as reported by the teachers, ranged between intermediate and advanced.

Interactions in all of these recordings were transcribed and recordings of speaking tasks in which the students were given a list of points for discussion in pairs or groups were selected for deeper analysis. This resulted in a set of 22 recordings of student dyads (in total approximately 1 hour 45 mins), in which 63 transitions from one item to another occurred, as the students brought the discussion of one item to a close and initiated topical talk related to another item on the list. These sequences were transcribed using conventions for multimodal transcription (Mondada 2018; see the Appendix). Multimodal conversation analysis (Goodwin 2018) was used and the sequences were examined turn-by-turn with the aim to uncover the practices that the participants employed to achieve the transitions, while paying special attention to the ways the students established, maintained, and adjusted embodied participation frameworks as they were going through the items, especially with respect to gaze direction, and also pointing at the lists. To protect the participants' privacy, the names were anonymized.

4. Analysis

Seated side by side behind their desks, the students typically turned their torsos toward each other to maintain an L arrangement (Kendon 1990). With the handouts or textbooks typically in front of them (see Figure 5.2 for an example of such arrangement), the students achieved transitions from one item to another in two distinct ways, involving two distinct participation frameworks. More frequently (54 out of 63 transitions), when discussing an item from the list, the students established and maintained a participation framework that favored co-operation, within which mutual gaze was observable. These

transitions are explored in section 4.1. However, as section 4.2 shows, there were also nine sequences in which mutual gaze was not achieved between the participants, who remained focused on the lists.

4.1. *Transitioning in participation frameworks favoring co-operation*

The analysis revealed that the participants achieved the transitions by following three distinct steps: (1) participants bring the current sequence to a close, during which they start gazing at the list, (2) participants verbalize that they are moving on to the next item, and (3) participants initiate a new sequence related to the next item. These three steps were visible in 21 sequences, and the coordination of resources that are crucial in achieving the transitions are discussed in the following two sections (4.1.1 and 4.1.2). However, the majority of transitions in the data (33 instances) were achieved without marking the transition verbally, as described in section 4.1.3.

4.1.1. *Closings followed by verbal expressions of transition*

This section shows that the participants commonly achieved closings in three ways: (1) providing a summary, (2) producing assessments, and (3) expressing agreement. These three ways were sometimes combined and typically accompanied by gaze shifts, so at the end of the closing, both participants were gazing at the list of items, that is, suspending the co-operative participation framework that had been established. After that, a proposal to move on was produced, and the transition was completed by initiating a new component activity based on another item from the list.

An example of this sequence is captured in Excerpt 1, which comes from a task where the students were instructed to choose questions from a list divided into six thematic sections. The extract shows how two students, Marcela and Irena, respond to the item "What factors might influence your decision to keep your money in a specific bank?" (not included in the transcript) and how they transition to the question "Do you know anyone who has been a victim of credit card fraud?" (lines 15–16). Prior to what Excerpt 1 captures, Marcela said that she was "absolutely useless when it comes to banks and money", which was followed by a somewhat ironic telling, detailing her experience of going to a bank to arrange Internet banking but leaving the bank with some insurance for her bank card (line 1). Irena responds to this by giving advice and relating to the lack of need for insurance, which is followed by the students' closing the sequence, focusing on the list, negotiating the transition and reading a new item out loud.

Excerpt 1 (Gymn3hod2K1D1)
+ Ire's gesture
* Ire's gaze
^ Mar's gesture and posture
∆ Mar's gaze

01 Mar: =and I have to pay extra money for some kind of in[surance]
02 Ire: [O::H]
03 Mar: of the card, (0.5) a:nd (0.7) >°yeah.°<

```
04 Ire: eh you shou- should go there because I don't
05      have any insurance (.) for paying, (1.6)
06      e::r insurance pay? (1.5) because $∆I have no money$=
   mar:                                    ∆gz at Ire-->
07      =hheh so*=
                *gz at Mar-->
08 Mar: =hh∆eh=
        -->∆gz at list-->
09 Ire: =^$I don't need *no insu*rance?$^
                     -->*       *gz at list-->
   mar:  ^moves closer to list----------^
10 Mar: eh hh .hhh=
11 Ire: =okay ^eh+ (.) should we^ (0.3) +*e:h
                  +points at list with pen+
                                        -->*gz at paper-->
   mar:       ^sits straight----^
12 Mar: <con∆ti+nue,>=
         -->∆gz at paper-->
   ire:         +writes on paper-->
13 Ire: =yea∆:h.
   mar:  -->∆gz at list-->>
14      (0.5)^ (0.7) +*(0.3)
   mar:      ^fixes collar -->
   ire:            -->+
                    -->*gz at list-->>
15 Ire: we:ll,^(.) do you^ know anyone who: (0.7) has bee:n a victim of
   mar:    -->^,,,,,,,,,,^
16 Ire: credit card fraud?
17 Mar: well >first of all< I don't know what is /fraʊd/, ((shortened))
```

The participants engage in closing in lines 7–10: Irena's advice is concluded by a comment that she does not need insurance as she has no money on her account (lines 4–6 and 9), which is produced and heard as an ironic summary of her contribution. The laughter produced by both participants in lines 7, 8 and 10 indicates Marcela's recipiency and affiliation, and also can be read as an environment where a topic change is likely to occur as the participants "laugh together" (Jefferson 1984: 215–216). The relevance of closing is also evident from the participants' gaze shifts towards the list of items (lines 8 and 9). As both participants visually focus on the list, they suspend the co-operative participation framework that they had established and make the transition relevant. As other excerpts will show, it was common that the participants adjusted the participation framework by gazing at the list during the closings.

Having brought the topical talk and previous sequence to a close and having shifted their gaze towards the list, transitioning to the next item becomes relevant. Irena produces a transitional "okay" (Beach 1993) and the beginning of a suggestion ("should we", line 11), which, together with pointing at the list, defines the next action (Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh 2019). The suggestion is collaboratively completed by Marcela (line 12) and then confirmed by Irena (line 13).

At this moment, it would be possible for the participants to proceed to another item on the list. However, writing comes into play in lines 12–14, where Irena takes notes. In line 15, it can be observed that the silence is interrupted by the discourse marker "well", which, in this position, has been documented as signaling a topic shift (Heritage 2015: 95–98). After that, Irena reads another question from the list, thus completing the transition to a new item and initiating a new component activity.

While Excerpt 1 above exemplified the use of a summary, in the following excerpt, a closing is achieved through expressing agreement. In Excerpt 2, Marta and Kristýna are addressing the question "Do you have any strategies for saving money when you are shopping?" Excerpt 2 starts with Marta's account of her preference of avoiding sales (line 1), after which Kristýna expresses an explicit agreement (line 6), and a proposal to move on to the next item follows (line 9).

Excerpt 2 (Gymn3hod2K1D2)
√ Mar's gaze
+ Kri's gaze
* Kri's head movements

01 Mar: I prefer buying it in the original price, because=usually(.)
02 >you know< save like two hundred crowns, (.) but it's not
03 worth +to wait, and the crowd,√and +everything=
√gz at Kri-->
kri: +gz at Mar--------------------+gz at list -->
04 Kri: =yeah=
05 Mar: =*√so,*=
-->√gz at list-->
kri: *nods twice*
06 Kri: =*I +totally agree.+*
nods three times--
-->+gz at Mar-----+gz at list-->
07 (0.4)
08 Mar: √tha[nk you]
09 Kri: +[let's] move +to √another,=
mar: -->√gz at Kri-----------√gz at list-->
kri: -->+gz at Mar----+gz at list-->>
10 Mar: =yeah, so now (.) talking (.) o:f e:r losing and √winning money.
-->√
11 e::r do you know anyone, who has been a victim of credit card
12 fraud?

Marta completes her telling in line 3. After that, in a post-telling position, it would be expected that an expression of Kristýna's stance towards Marta's telling should follow, but, instead, Kristýna produces a response token "yeah" (line 4) and nods, which would be typical of mid-telling (Stivers 2008). Marta's "so" (line 5), accompanied by a gaze shift towards the list, suggests that moving on to the next item becomes relevant (both participants are gazing at the list). However, the transition is interrupted by Kristýna's explicit expression of agreement (line 6), which confirms the accountability of adopting

an affiliative stance after a peer's telling. A gap follows, after which Marta adds "thank you" (line 8), thereby closing the telling-agreement sequence.

Similar to Excerpt 1, the topic has been exhausted, and the sequence has been brought to a close (line 8), but unlike Excerpt 1, the students have re-established mutual gaze at the end of the closing. Since both participants gazed at the list earlier in the closing, moving on to another item on the list remains relevant. The transition is realized by Kristýna's suggestion ("let's move on to another", line 9) and is accompanied by gaze shifts towards the list, by which the list, again, becomes oriented to by both participants. Marta accepts Kristýna's suggestion and adds "so now" (line 10), which, again, makes another item on the list relevant. She then reads the title of the thematic section from the handout and selects a question.

While in other sequences in the collection agreement was not expressed so explicitly, Excerpt 2 shows that it can play an essential role in achieving a closing. The following excerpt demonstrates that closings were commonly achieved by combining the two ways introduced so far, i.e., a summary and agreement. Excerpt 3 comes from a class where students got a list of questions which were all prefaced with "Do you know anybody who …", and two students, Irena and Marcela, address the item "… was given a grant to study abroad?" After Irena says that she does not know anybody, Marcela asks Irena whether she would like to get such a grant. Irena responds that she would like to stay in her home country, and then, as Excerpt 3 shows, adds that Czech universities provide education for free. Marcela then summarizes that winning a grant to study here at home "doesn't really matter" (line 7), with which Irena subsequently agrees.

Excerpt 3 (gymn3hod1K1D1)

```
+ Ire's gesture
* Ire's gaze
∆ Mar's gaze
01 Ire: but=e:r schoo:l, (0.6) °e:h° <univer*sities> °e:r° (0.5)
                                                  *gz at Mar-->
   mar: >>gz at Ire-->
02      +for free.+
        +shrugs shoulders+
03 Mar:    ∆[yeah]
04 Ire:     [s-un]til *you're (.) *twenty-six* [so]
05 Mar:                                       [mhm?]
   mar: -->∆gz at book-->
   ire:            -->*gz down at Mar's book
                              *..........*gz at her book-->
06         (.)
07 Mar: it (0.2) doesn't ∆really *matter here.
                     -->∆gz at Ire-->
   ire:                      -->*gz at Mar-->
08 Ire: +ye*ah.+∆
        +nods--+
        -->*gz at book-->>
   mar:      -->∆gz at book-->
```

```
09       (1.3)
10 Mar:  okay. so:::: e:::m (0.8) hm-hm,h:m? (1.2) someone who
11       charges very high fees for what they∆ do.
                                              -->∆
```

As Irena produces a telling (lines 1–2, 4), Marcela shifts her gaze towards the book with questions (line 3), thus creating a possibility of closing. Marcela's turn in line 7 can be heard as a collaborative completion of Irena's turn from line 4 ("so … it doesn't really matter here"). Irena's subsequent response token "yeah" (line 8), produced with falling intonation and accompanied by nodding and gaze shifts, signals that the topic has been exhausted and the sequence is brought to a close. The closing is thus achieved by producing a summary and subsequent agreement with the summary.

In Excerpts 1 and 2, verbal expressions marking the transition followed the closings and included suggestions of moving on. In Excerpt 3, this verbal expression of transition is reduced to a combination of "okay" and "so" (line 10), which both flag the end of the talk related to the previous item and make the following item relevant. Through producing perturbations and pauses (line 10), Marcela displays that she is locating the next item on the list, whose fragment relevant to subsequent talk she then slightly modifies and reads – the exact wording is "Do you know anyone who … charges very high fees for what they do?", while Marcela says "someone who charges very high fees for what they do".

The last commonly used way of achieving closings was through assessments, as exemplified in Excerpt 4. Two students, Veronika and Nikola, do the same task as in the previous excerpt. Here, Veronika addresses the question "Do you know anyone … who often gives donations to charity?" She produces a negative answer, which Nikola subsequently assesses.

```
Excerpt 4 (gymn3hod1K1D2)
☼ Nik's gaze
∆ Ver's gaze
01 Ver:  >not really< not in m- my °family°.
         >>gz at Nik-->
02 Nik:  o:h? °well,° that's ☼unfortunate.
                             ☼gz at Ver-->
03 Ver:  yeah,∆(.) I also <think>☼ so. ∆°(yes)°
           -->∆gz ahead----------------∆gz at Nik-->
   nik:                        -->☼ gz at book-->
04       (1.0)
05 Ver:  I feel sorry ☼for (it)=
   nik:              -->☼gz at Ver-->
06 Nik:  =$hh☼eh$=
          -->☼gz at book-->
07 Ver:  =I think I'm gonna repair it soon.
08 Nik:  ☼oh- (.) that's∆ ☼ (2.0) °(   )°☼
      -->☼gz at Ver-------☼gz ahead------☼gz at book-->
   ver:              -->∆gz at book-->
```

```
09      (1.2)
10 Ver: okay, so, Nikola, do you know anyone who: ☼ (0.4)
   nik:                                          -->☼
11      is a bit tight∆-fisted.=
                      -->∆
```

Nikola's reaction to Veronika's answer is prefaced with prolonged "oh" produced with raising intonation, signaling the receipt of the answer, and perhaps surprise, and "well", suggesting that another piece of talk is forthcoming. What follows is an assessment (line 2) employing the form of "that's + adjective", which is commonly used to treat the telling as possibly complete (Thomson, Fox & Couper-Kuhlen 2015). Veronika then produces a response token "yeah" and then affiliates with Nikola's assessment ("I also think so", line 3). As will be shown in section 4.1.3, the production of assessment followed by affiliation seemed sufficient to complete a closing, provided that both of the participants have shifted their gaze towards the list (see also lines 7 and 8 in Excerpt 3 for a summary followed by a response token and gaze shifts), but this is not the case in line 3, as it is only Nikola who gazes at her book, while Veronika keeps gazing at Nikola. A gap follows, after which Veronika produces turn expansion (line 5), thus recruiting Nikola's gaze. Although Veronika's words are uttered seriously, her account now borders on irony, which may be the reason why Nikola starts laughing (line 6). After that, Veronika adds another turn expansion (line 7). Nikola's response has a structure similar to the one in line 2 – a change-of-state token "oh" is followed by an assessment starting with the pro-forma "that's". At this moment, Veronika starts gazing at the book, thus treating the closing as complete. However, Nikola seems to have a problem producing a suitable adjective and engages in a solitary word search, which she abandons after a two-second pause (line 8). After that, she gazes at her book, thereby completing the closing. This shows that assessments ("that's + adjective") together with gaze shifts can function as closing devices, making a transition to the next item relevant.

Similar to the previous excerpt, in line 10, Veronika verbalizes the transition by saying "okay, so", followed by an address term. In this way, she marks the boundary between the talk related to the previous item and makes the new item relevant. In addition, the address term treats her peer accountable for answering the question, which further confirms that "so"-prefaced initiations are oriented to the recipient (Bolden 2006).

To summarize, this section has shown that closings are crucial in achieving transitions when co-operative participation framework is established. The excerpts document that the participants produced extended tellings, which they brought to a close in the following three ways (or their combinations): summary of the previous talk (line 9 in Excerpt 1, line 7 in Excerpt 3), agreement (line 6 in Excerpt 2, line 8 in Excerpt 3) and assessment (line 8 in Excerpt 4). What these have in common is that they reveal that one has listened to the previous utterances and somehow affiliates with them (Stivers 2008). The production of these types of turns was commonly associated with gaze shifts towards the list, which completed the closing and made the transition relevant.

Excerpts 1–4 also include verbal expressions of transitions. These turns or sequences tended to follow closings of multiple topics developed in response to one item (Excerpts 1,

2 and 3), but they were also present after relatively compact sequences (Excerpt 4). The verbal expressions of transitions comprised a range of components, including suggestions (e.g., "should we continue?" in lines 11–12 in Excerpt 1, "let's move on to another" in line 9 in Excerpt 2), transition markers, such as "okay" (line 11 in Excerpt 1, line 10 in Excerpt 3, line 10 in Excerpt 4) and "so" (line 10 in Excerpt 3, line 10 in Excerpt 4, see also "so now" in line 10 in Excerpt 2) and address terms (line 10 in Excerpt 4). In some cases, they were followed by hesitation markers associated with one's locating the next item on the list (lines 10 and 11 in Excerpt 2, line 10 in Excerpt 3). While address terms were used only three times altogether in the collection, always in interactions between Veronika and Nikola, the other resources were commonly employed by the participants. These verbal expressions of transitions were then followed by reading out loud the next item from the list, which in all cases in the data was a question or a fragment thereof, thus initiating a new component activity.

4.1.2. *Disagreement followed by verbal expression of transition*

The collection includes two cases in which the transitions occurred immediately after disagreement – in this respect, these represent deviant cases. Both sequences occurred in Eva and Roman's interactions, and both cases come from a lesson in which the students were asked to discuss questions about telling the truth and lies. During the session, Eva and Roman related to their shared experience beyond the classroom (they seem to be a couple), which resulted in disagreement. The analyses of the two cases show that disagreement can be followed by a verbal expression of transition and then initiation of a new component activity (Excerpt 5) or by an abrupt initiation of a new component activity (see Excerpt 8 in section 4.1.4).

In Excerpt 5, Eva and Roman are discussing the question "Which of these do people lie about most often? Why? – money, their age, their feelings". In response to this, Eva reveals that she sometimes lies about her feelings, and Roman admits that he can recognize that, as he claims to know Eva well. Then he says that he does not lie about his age, and Eva somewhat ironically adds that that is the only thing that he does not lie about. This is when the teacher approaches the students and asks "are you getting into an argument?" As the students do not continue, the teacher withdraws, and this is where Excerpt 5 starts. It captures two attempts to close the talk and move on to the next item by Eva (lines 1–2 and 17).

Excerpt 5 (Gymn2hod1K1D2)

```
* Eva's gesture
+ Eva's gaze
☼ Rom's gaze
01 Eva: >okay so<☼ *#(.)* moving *on ☼°to#°
        >> gz at list-->
                    *bangs RH     *points at list-->
                   on desk*
   rom:            ☼gz at Eva----------☼gz at list-->
   fig:               #Fig 5.1             #Fig 5.2
```

Figure 5.1

Figure 5.2

02 Rom: °okay° *Hhh
eva: -->*
03 Eva: question two. but I know +you do lie +a lot.=
-->+gz at Rom--+
04 Rom: = ☼well I don't lie (about money)=
-->☼
((6 lines omitted))
11 Eva: when you [buy] something quite useless you (.) try to
12 Rom: [°no.°]
eva: >>gz at Rom-->
13 Eva: >°you know°< make me think that [it was chea:p but (that's)]
14 Rom: [no because ☼I feel guilty.]
rom: ☼gz at Eva-->
15 Ele: yeah +☼ but +you're lying °( )°+
-->+gz ahead+gz at Rom----------+
-->☼gz ahead-->
16 Rom: +NO.
eva: +gz at list-->>
17 Eva: *o#kay,*[=moving on] ☼ to question two.
18 Rom: [HHhehh]
eva: *gesticulates*
rom: -->☼gz at list-->>
fig: #Fig 5.3

Figure 5.3

19 Eva: is it <acceptable to tell a lie to protect your privacy?>

After the teacher has withdrawn, Eva produces "okay so", which commonly occurred after closings, as shown above. To draw a boundary between the talk produced so far and the new item, Eva bangs against the desk (Figure 5.1), by which she attracts Roman's attention. Then she uses a fragment of a suggestion of transitioning to the next item ("moving on", line 1) and points at the list (Figure 5.2), similarly to what Irena did (line 11 in Excerpt 1). Roman displays understanding by shifting his gaze (line 1) and producing "okay" in line 2, by which he confirms the proposed course of action. In this environment, a sequence with a new item can be initiated, which is done by Eva at the beginning of line 3 ("question two").

However, Eva interrupts this initiation and returns to the previous talk by adding a summary ("but I know you lie a lot", line 3). Eva's gaze shift towards Roman can be read as an attempt to re-establish a participation framework favoring co-operation, which was common when the participants were addressing an item from a list, and this is what happens in line 4, in which Roman reiterates one of his contributions from the talk that preceded Excerpt 5. This triggers Eva's two tellings exemplifying Roman's lying about how much some items that he had bought cost (not included in the transcript). Eva summarizes these tellings in lines 11–13 ("when you buy something quite useless you try to … make me think that it was cheap"), after which Eva accuses Roman of lying (line 15). As Roman repeatedly resists (lines 12, 14 and 16), the participants do not seem to be reaching a closing.

Eva shifts her gaze towards the list in line 16. After that, she re-initiates the transition by producing "okay", during which she performs a salient gesture with both her hands, as if she were drawing a wall in the space in front of her, thus marking the boundary between the talk so far and the forthcoming action (Figure 5.3). Similar to line 1, she produces an explicit proposal to move on to the next item, during which Roman shifts his gaze to the list. At this moment, both the participants have focused their visual attention on the list, and Eva reads another item.

The analysis of Excerpt 5 has shown that a verbal expression of transition can be produced even when no agreement has been reached. Both attempts to move on in Excerpt 5 were implemented similarly – transition markers ("okay so" in line 1; "okay" in line 17) were accompanied by salient gestures to mark the boundary between the previous talk and the next item. An explicit proposal to pursue another item followed. It was during this transitional phase that both participants shifted their gaze towards the list, and a new item could be initiated. This validates and extends the analyses of the other examples in that it is mainly in closings where gaze shifts towards the list occur to secure transition to the next item. If a closing is not achieved, a proposal to move on can draw a clear boundary between the talk related to the previous and next items. This explains the presence of salient gestures in Excerpt 5, which were not found in other sequences.

4.1.3. *Embodied transitions*

The above analysis has shown that before initiating a new sequence based on another item from the list, the participants shifted their gaze to the list during the closing, thus

making a transition relevant. A verbal expression of transition followed. In contrast to the previous examples, this section illustrates that transitions from one item to another can be achieved without using verbal expressions of transition. In Excerpt 6, Eva and Roman finish discussing the item "Should doctors always tell their patients the truth?" Before the excerpt, both Eva and Roman problematize the issue's sensitivity, and Eva explains that it may not always be necessary to tell the whole truth. Roman then raises the question of what should be done when the patient asks the doctor. The excerpt starts with Eva's response to this.

```
Excerpt 6 (Gymn2hod1K1D2)
* Eva's embodied actions
+ Eva's gaze
☼ Rom's gaze
○ Rom's gesture
01 Eva: =yeah when they [ask directly] like doctor, tell me the
02 Rom:                 [when they ask]
   rom: >> gz at Eva-->
03      truth °then +they should tell them ○the truth○
                    +gz at Rom-->
   rom:                                    ○nods-----○
04         ☼(yes/that's+    )°
                    -->+gz at list-->
   rom: -->☼gz at list-->
05 Rom: so ○like, (.) <they ○should>○ ☼but with conscience.
           ○.................○points
                              at list○
                                    -->☼gz at Eva-->
06 Eva: *yeah.*☼
        *nods-*
   rom:     -->☼gz at list-->
07      (1.3)
08 Rom: is- (.) a-e:r should parent always answer their children's
09      (.) +$questions ☼truthfully.$
                     -->☼
   eva:  -->+
```

Eva's response (lines 1, 3–4), which is affiliative to what has been mentioned previously, is followed by a summary[1] produced by Roman (line 5), which Eva agrees with by saying "yeah" and nodding – this pattern was very common in the data (see lines 7–8 in Excerpt 3).

[1] Roman's pointing gesture in line 5 is closely coordinated with the production of "should"; he thereby relates his summary to the wording of the currently discussed item ("Should doctors always tell their patients the truth?"). This pointing gesture, unlike those in Excerpts 1 and 5, is not directly related to the transition, but provides the recipient with a reason why he produces his summary (instead of, for instance, agreeing with Eva's previous turn). It follows that while gaze and also pointing are resources that the participants employed to achieve the transitions, not all of their occurrences necessarily signal the relevance of transitions.

In the previous examples, it could be observed that after completing a closing and shifting their gaze towards the list, participants produced transition markers, such as "okay" or "so", possibly along with a verbal expression of transition (see section 4.1.1). In Excerpt 6, in contrast, Roman reads the next item after a gap in line 7. It can be argued that it is the gap that signals that the closing has been achieved, and as both participants visibly orient to the list, a new item from the list can be read out loud. A similar practice can be observed in Excerpt 7, where Jakub and Zdeněk address the question "Is 'being economical with the truth' the same as lying?", which they respond to (not included in the transcript) and then evaluate.

Excerpt 7(Gymn2hod1K1D1)

```
+ Zde's gaze
* Zde's embodied actions
☼ Jak's gaze
● Jak's embodied actions
01 Jak: ●it's like● really dumb *(.) ●na*me.●+
        >>gz at Zde-->
        ●shakes head●                ●shakes head●
   zde: >>gz at Jak-------------------------+
                              *shakes head*
02      +(0.3)
   zde: +gz at list-->
03 Jak: [(°☼ °)      ]
04 Zde: [(yes/it is) ]
   jak:  ->☼ gz at list-->>
05      ●(0.6)*     (0.5)    ● (0.8)*
   jak: ●moves closer to list●
   zde:       *moves closer to list-*
06 Zde: who are (0.3) better at lying,(0.9)+ men or women.
                                          -->+
```

Jakub's assessment ("it's like really dumb name", line 1) refers to "being economical with the truth", which is written in quotation marks on the list. When producing this assessment, Jakub shakes his head, and so does Zdeněk, by which he affiliates with Jakub. After that, Zdeněk starts gazing towards the list of questions (line 2), thus making it relevant in two ways: he might return to the wording of the question to inspect it further, or he may be gazing down to show his readiness to bring the current exchange to a close and move on to the next item. After a short gap (line 2), Zdeněk agrees with Jakub's assessment (line 4) and, at the same time, Jakub shifts his gaze to the list, aligning with Zdeněk's orientation to the list. Thus, at the end of lines 3–4, the exchange related to the current item is brought to a close, and both speakers gaze at the list, which at the same time makes the next item relevant.

At this moment, a verbal expression of transition may be introduced, but a gap follows during which both participants lean forward to get closer to the list (line 5). Similar to Excerpt 6, the next item from the list is then read out loud (line 6), thus skipping the verbal expression of transition and initiating a new sequence related to a new topic.

Excerpts 6 and 7 illustrate that once a closing has been achieved during which both participants start gazing at the list, it is not necessary to produce a verbal expression of transition, as described in section 4.1.1. However, a slot for the optional verbalizing of the transition is still present as a gap (line 7 in Excerpt 6, line 5 in Excerpt 7), during which the participants may lean forward to the list (Excerpt 7), thus further validating the relevance of the transitional slot.

4.1.4. *Disagreement followed by an abrupt initiation of a new item*

In Excerpt 8, similar to Excerpt 5, Eva and Roman relate to their shared experience when addressing the question "Is it sometimes better to tell a white lie than to tell the truth?" Eva initially suggests that it may be more appropriate to tell a white lie, which Roman agrees with, but she adds that it may not pay off as the truth comes out in the long run. Eva then adds two accounts of having bought some clothes as presents, which the recipient claimed to like, but actually never wore. As it turns out, these tellings are addressed to Roman (in lines 1–2 below, Eva uses the personal pronoun "you" and moves closer to Roman and gazes at him). Eva then claims that such behavior causes emotional pain, which results in a conflict between her and Roman.

Excerpt 8 (Gymn2hod1K1D2)

```
+ Eva's gaze
* Eva's embodied actions
± Eva's facial expression
☼ Rom's gaze
○ Rom's embodied actions
01 Eva:  or $oh I *like (that) *(shirt) you bought me$* and then-
         >>gz at Rom-->
                  *............*moves closer to Rom---*
   rom:  >>gz at Eva-->
02       (then) you're not wearing it *at all.*
                               *moves closer to Rom*
03 Eva:  that *hurts a lo:::t.
              *moves closer to Rom-->
04       (1.1)
05 Rom:  °go fuck yourself.°
06       ±     (1.8)    ±
   eva:  ±surprised face±
07 Eva:  a lo:t.
08 Rom:  no:.*
          -->*
09 Eva:     +yes. [°it does°   ]
10 Rom:           [because it's] not a ○li:e.○
   eva:  -->+gz at list-->>
   rom:                            ○moves closer to Eva○
11       (0.5)
12 Eva:  .hhh should doctors ☼always tell their patients the truth.=
   rom:                    -->☼gz at list-->>
```

13 Rom: =°well°
14 Eva: no.=
15 Rom: =yes, but in a- (1.2) in a good way, ((shortened))

Eva's complaint is rejected by Roman's interjection (line 5), which Eva sequentially deletes in line 7, insisting on her position. She reiterates her stance in line 9, while Roman rejects it again in lines 8 and 10. At this point, Eva's gaze focuses on the list, while Roman keeps gazing at Eva. A similar unfolding of an argument can be observed in Excerpt 5, where Eva used an explicit expression of transition ("okay, moving on…", line 17) and a salient gesture to flag a boundary between the argument and the next item. In Excerpt 8, however, that practice is not used. Instead, Eva introduces a new item directly after a gap (line 12).

Such an abrupt transition to a new item is unique among the sequences where students maintained a participation framework favoring co-operation. This excerpt also represents the only occurrence of a peer's gaze shift during the initiation of the new item – in all other sequences, both participants had shifted their gaze towards the list during the closings (for examples, see Excerpts 3, 4, 6 and 7) or verbal expression of transition (for examples, see Excerpts 1, 2 and 5). Despite that, Excerpt 8 confirms the role of progressivity in such interactions – by moving forward to the next item, a dispute can be terminated. In this respect, the analysis of Excerpt 8 enriches the findings presented above – when it becomes evident that a closing cannot be achieved, participants may propose to move on (Excerpt 5), or one of the participants may initiate talk related to another item (Excerpt 8). Excerpts 5 and 8 are also instances where the institutional roles of the participants (classmates) seem to be backgrounded as their shared experience and relationship become more salient in the talk. However, by focusing their attention on the list, they re-orient to the institutional task.

As the initiation of a sequence related to a new item was recognized by Roman (lines 13 and 15), this seems to be a possible yet very rare way of moving forward. This practice of directly transitioning to the next item was more common in sequences where the participants remained focused on the list, as shown below.

4.2. *Transitioning in participation frameworks focused on the list*

In the data, there were 9 sequences in which participants, when addressing one item from the list, remained gazing at the list and transitioned to the next item without establishing a participation framework favoring co-operation, as could be seen in Excerpts 1–8 above. The main difference was that the responses were comparatively shorter (each of them was 1 TCU), and no or minimal sequence closing thirds typically followed. Excerpt 9 below captures two students, Samuel and David, going through a list of items.

Excerpt 9 (Gymn3hod1K1D4)
* Sam's embodied actions
\+ Sam's gaze
● Dav's embodied actions

```
01 Dav: do you know (.) anybody (.) <who was given a
        gz at list -->>
   sam: gz at list -->
02      grant to study abroad,>
03      (1.3)
04 Sam: m-m.
05 Dav: hh hh
06      ●(0.2)  +  (0.4)●
   dav: ●leans slightly ●
   sam:     --> + gz at Dav-->
07 Dav: and do you know +anybody <who buys and sells shares
   sam:              -->+gz at list-->
08      °on the stock market.°>=
09 Sam: =*m-m.*+=
        *shakes head*
            -->+gz at Dav-->
10 Dav: =$hheh °hh°$ + (.)$and do you know anybody,$ (0.5)
   sam:           -->+gz down-->>
11 Dav: who charges very high fees for what they do.
```

The organization of the two sequences in which the participants address items from the list is very similar: a question (lines 1–2 and 7) is followed by a minimal answer (the "m–m" in lines 4 and 9 is a negative response token, which is commonly used in Czech). This adjacency pair sequence is followed by audible exhalations bordering on laughter (lines 5 and 9), which can be analyzed as sequence closing thirds. The initiation of a new sequence based on another item from the list follows. As Excerpt 9 shows, the questions tended to be asked by the same person after the other person responded, which Sacks (1995: I/102) calls "a 'chain' possibility".

As far as gaze is concerned, it can be observed that David keeps his gaze focused on the list, while Samuel gazes at David when David adjusts his posture slightly (line 6) and when Samuel produces the negative response token "m-m" and shakes head (line 9). However, the participants never reach a mutual gaze and David's constant gaze at the material flags his orientation to the progress of the task and, at the same time, his minimal involvement in it. This orientation is validated by the minimal responses that Samuel produces.

While Excerpt 9 captures students doing a speaking task without taking notes, this sub-collection features 4 cases (out of 9) in which the students remained focused on the material while taking notes, as prompted by the teachers. Since notes were commonly taken somewhere in the space near the questions, the person who asks a question then takes notes and thus remains focused on the list, as shown in Excerpt 10.

Excerpt 10 (Ekon1hod2K2D1)

```
* Sim's embodied actions
● Ale's gaze
01 Sim: e: do you Julian Bievers? (0.2) idea of street drawings,
        >>gz at Sim's book-->
   ale: >>gz at Ale's book-->
```

```
02 Ale:  ye:s=I do*:.
   sim:            *writes -->
03       (1.2)
04 Sim:  °mhm°●  co (tu) mám <na●psat>,
                 what shall I write (here)
   ale:    -->●gz at Sim--------●gz at Ale's book-->>
05       (0.6)
06 (Sim): $hheh$*
              -->*
07       (1.1)
08 Sim:  e:h would you like to see: (.) <more of them>?
```

The overall sequence structure in Excerpt 10 comprises the same components as Excerpt 9: after the question-answer base sequence (lines 1–2), a sequence closing third in the form of a recipiency token ("mhm", line 4) follows. After Alena finishes her minimal answer, Simona starts taking notes, which she briefly comments on in line 4. When the writing is finished, Simona reads another question from the book. The participation framework is also very similar to Excerpt 9 – both participants keep gazing down at their books, and they do not establish mutual gaze.

Interestingly, in all 9 sequences in this sub-collection, the students addressed items that were polar questions without question-word interrogatives (e.g., "why?"). Under these circumstances, it does not seem necessary to adjust the participation framework to favor co-operation, and the questions can be asked and answered with an orientation to the progress of the task, as exemplified in Excerpts 9 and 10. However, not all polar questions without follow-up questions were addressed in this manner. For instance, the question "Do you know anybody … who was given a grant to study abroad?" (Excerpt 9) was addressed in a more elaborate way in Excerpt 3.

5. Discussion and conclusions

This study adds to the existing multimodal analyses of transitions in meetings and interviews (Deppermann, Schmitt & Mondada 2010; Mikkola & Lehtinen 2014; Mondada 2006; Weilenmann & Lymer 2014) by showing how transitions can be achieved by participants with similar epistemic status, i.e., peer students in classroom settings where several items are discussed in pairs. It has shown that when participants adopted a co-operative participation framework, gaze shifts towards the list played a crucial role in the transitioning from one item on the list to another. These gaze shifts on the part of both participants typically occurred during the closing, which could be followed by a proposal to move on (section 4.1.1), or directly by the initiation of talk related to the next item (section 4.1.3). Similar to transition markers, such as "okay" (Beach 1993; Keevallik 2010; Mondada & Sorjonen 2021), these gaze shifts have a pivotal character: they contribute to the closing of the previous sequence, and, at the same time, they make the list, and hence the next item, relevant, and thereby prepare the ground for introducing a new item from it. As these gaze shifts typically occurred already during closings, they

were sufficient for initiating a next item (section 4.1.3) or followed by verbal expressions of transition (section 4.1.1).

In the collection, there were also other sequences in which the participants remained oriented to the list even after a question was asked (section 4.2). Here, the questions from the list were responded to using minimal answers, and these were then followed by sequence closing thirds and then other questions from the list. This contradicts Schegloff's (2007: 169) observation that when new topics are proffered, expansion is preferred while sequence closure dispreferred. One explanation is that in classroom settings (as well as in some research interviews or meetings), the time dedicated to the interactional project is limited, and the sequences characterized in section 4.2 exemplify one way of orienting to progressivity, i.e., not producing elaborate answers or expansion, but moving on to the next item on the list.

Transitions to next items were also used as resources for the social organization of the interactional project, as the participants oriented to the availability of relevant next items when disagreements and conflicts occurred (sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.4). Here, transitioning to the next item represented one way of closing the argument, re-orienting to the interactional project at hand, and resuming the participants' institutional roles.

More generally, the practices of closing the current talk, transitioning to the next item, and initiating talk related to a new item represent crucial elements of interactional competence (e.g., Salaberry & Kunitz 2019), which make it possible for participants to engage in interactional projects such as paired speaking tasks. The practices described in this study thus contribute to our understanding of how progress is oriented to and maintained in such interactional projects.

Two sets of implications for language teaching can be drawn. First, the study has highlighted the importance of closings (in the present data typically achieved by expressing agreement, providing a summary or producing assessment) accompanied by gaze shifts, and also verbal expressions of transition (namely transition markers and proposals to move on to the next item). However, these interactional resources seem to be rarely addressed in mainstream published teaching materials, although list-based speaking tasks commonly occur in textbooks, and teachers normally use them. Therefore, teachers' and teacher educators' awareness of the importance of interactional competence and its development in classes should be highlighted (e.g., Salaberry & Kunitz 2019). This study contributes to this body of research by uncovering some of the resources that participants need to mobilize to achieve transitions from one item to another. It can be concluded that tasks based on lists are ideal for teaching units focusing on aspects of interactional competence such as achieving closings, marking transitions verbally, and proffering new topics.

Second, as far as the design of items on lists is concerned, section 4.2 demonstrated that some polar questions without question-word interrogatives were responded to minimally and with minimal post-expansion by some pairs of students. This may suggest that adding a question word or using question-word interrogatives may result in more interactive and elaborate exchanges. However, more research is needed to uncover how students respond to the items on the lists and how they engage in such tasks with respect to various types of interrogatives.

The lists of items have been shown as central resources that the participants drew on when transitioning from one item to another. The lists and items were also subject to critical examination and modification: some participants oriented to the exact wording of the items during the closings, transitions, and initiations (e.g., line 1 in Excerpt 7, where Zdeněk starts gazing at the handout after Jakub has assessed the wording of the question as "dumb"), some changed the wording of the items (e.g., line 10 in Excerpt 4, where Nikola changes "someone" for "anyone").

When discussing an item, some participants also went beyond it by proffering other related topics (e.g., Excerpt 1) or had arguments about the topics (Excerpts 5 and 8). In these and other cases, the lists served as resources to return to the interactional project and promote the progress of the task. This, in turn, reveals how material aspects (i.e., the lists) contribute to the social and institutional organization of interactional projects based on lists, such as paired speaking tasks. The analysis has shown that it is already during closings when gaze shifts towards the lists occur. That is, the participants' embodied orientation to the list flags the relevance of an upcoming transition before this relevance is verbalized. It follows those boundaries of transitions from one item to another are somewhat blurred.

Funding sources
This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation under grant 18-02363S.

APPENDIX

Transcription conventions

(2.1)	length of silence
(.)	micro-pause
=	Latched utterances
underlining	Relatively high pitch or volume
°soft°	Quiet or soft talk
?/./,	Rising/falling/slightly rising intonation respectively
:	Stretched sound
-	Cut-off or self-interruption
hh	Audible aspiration
.hh	Audible inhalation
><	Increase in tempo
<>	Decrease in tempo
( )	Uncertainty on the transcriber's part
(( ))	Transcriber's description of events
[ ]	Overlapped speech
/fraʊd/	Non-standard pronunciation
* *	Descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between two identical symbols (one symbol per participant and per type of action) that are synchronized with correspondent stretches of talk or time indications
*-->	The action described continues across subsequent lines

-->*	until the same symbol is reached
>>	The action described begins before the excerpt's beginning
-->>	The action described continues after the excerpt's end
…	Action's preparation
---	Action's apex is reached and maintained
,,,,,	Action's retraction
#	The exact moment at which a screen shot was taken

REFERENCES

Antaki, C., Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. & Rapley, M. (2000): "Brilliant. Next question…": High-grade assessment sequences in the completion of interactional units. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33 (3), 235–262.

Auer, P. (2021): Turn-allocation and gaze: A multimodal revision of the "current-speaker-selects-next" rule of the turn-taking system of conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies* 23 (2), 117–140.

Beach, W. A. (1993): Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19 (4), 325–352.

Bolden, G. B. (2006): Little words that matter: Discourse markers "so" and "oh" and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction. *Journal of Communication* 56 (4), 661–688.

Button, G. (1991): Conversation-in-a-series. In: D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 251–277.

Červenková, A. (2021): "I'll google it.": Using an online dictionary for conducting repair during pair and group work activities in upper-secondary EFL classrooms. *Studie z aplikované lingvistiky / Studies in Applied Linguistics* 12 (2), 43–58.

Deppermann, A., Schmitt, R. & Mondada, L. (2010): Agenda and emergence: Contingent and planned activities in a meeting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (6), 1700–1718.

Goffman, E. (1974): *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Goodwin, C. (2018): *Co-operative Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hanusková, M. (2019): Interactive repair among English as a lingua franca speakers in academic settings. *Brno Studies in English* 45 (2), 35–52.

Heritage, J. (2015): Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 88, 88–104.

Hofstetter, E. (2021): Achieving preallocation: Turn transition practices in board games. *Discourse Processes* 58 (2), 113–133.

Holt, E. & Drew, P. (2005): Figurative pivots: The use of figurative expressions in pivotal topic transitions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (1), 35–61.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011): Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse* 2 (1), 20–38.

Jefferson, G. (1984): On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In: M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 191–222.

Kamunen, A. & Haddington, P. (2020): From monitoring to co-monitoring: Projecting and prompting activity transitions at the workplace. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift Zur Verbalen Interaktion* 21, 82–122.

Keevallik, L. (2010): Marking boundaries between activities: The particle *nii* in Estonian. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (2), 157–182.

Kendon, A. (1990): *Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Encounters*. Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
Kupčíková, N. (2021): "What's pavement? – Chodník." Code-switching in upper-secondary EFL classrooms. *Studie z aplikované lingvistiky / Studies in Applied Linguistics* 12 (2), 59–75.
Lee, J. (2017): Multimodal turn allocation in ESL peer group discussions. *Social Semiotics* 27 (5), 671–692.
Lilja, N. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2019): How hand gestures contribute to action ascription. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 52 (4), 343–364.
Mikkola, P. & Lehtinen, E. (2014): Initiating activity shifts through use of appraisal forms as material objects during performance appraisal interviews. In: M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Heinemann & M. Rauniomaa (eds.), *Interacting with Objects: Language, Materiality, and Social Activity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 57–78.
Modaff, D. P. (2003): Body movement in the transition from opening to task in doctor-patient interviews. In: P. J. Glenn, C. D. LeBaron & J. Mandelbaum (eds.), *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*. Mahwah, London: Lawrence Erlbaum, 411–422.
Mondada, L. (2006): Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: Projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies* 8 (1), 117–129.
Mondada, L. (2018): Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51 (1), 85–106.
Mondada, L. & Sorjonen, M.-L. (2021): OKAY in closings and transitions. In: E. Betz, A. Deppermann, L. Mondada & M.-L. Sorjonen (eds.), *OKAY across Languages: Toward a Comparative Approach to its Use in Talk-in-interaction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 93–127.
Reed, D. (2019): Assessments in transitions: Coordinating participation framework transitions in institutional settings. In: E. Reber & C. Gerhardt (eds.), *Embodied Activities in Face-to-face and Mediated Settings: Social Encounters in Time and Space*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 299–326.
Riou, M. (2017): Transitioning to a new topic in American English conversation: A multi-level and mixed-methods account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 117, 88–105.
Robinson, J. D. (2003): An interactional structure of medical activities during acute visits and its implications for patients' participation. *Health Communication* 15 (1), 27–59.
Robinson, J. D. (2013): Overall structural organization. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 257–280.
Robinson, J. D. & Stivers, T. (2001): Achieving activity transitions in physician-patient encounters. *Human Communication Research* 27 (2), 253–298.
Ryška, D. (2021): In-service EFL teachers' management of participation during teacher-fronted whole-class activities. *Studie z aplikované lingvistiky / Studies in Applied Linguistics* 12 (2), 76–99.
Sacks, H. (1995): *Lectures on Conversation, Volume I & II*. Edited by G. Jefferson. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell.
Salaberry, M. R. & Kunitz, S. (eds.) (2019): *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence: Bridging Theory and Practice*. New York, Abingdon: Routledge.
Schegloff, E. A. (2007): *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo: Cambridge University Press.
Siitonen, P. & Siromaa, M. (2021): Accounting for leaving the break room: Work obligations as a resource in transitions from one activity to another at the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics* 171, 178–199.
Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, R. M. (1975): *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
Stivers, T. (2008): Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1), 31–57.
Stivers, T. & Robinson, J. D. (2006): A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society* 35 (3), 367–392.

Svennevig, J. (2012): The agenda as resource for topic introduction in workplace meetings. *Discourse Studies* 14 (1), 53–66.

Tanner, M., Olin-Scheller, C. & Tengberg, M. (2017): Material texts as objects in interaction – constraints and possibilities in relation to dialogic reading instruction. *Nordic Journal of Literacy Research* 3 (1), 83–103.

Thomson, S. A., Fox, B. A. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015): *Grammar in Everyday Talk: Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tiitinen, S. & Lempiälä, T. (2018): Two social functions of stepwise transitions when discussing ideas in workplace meetings. *International Journal of Business Communication* 59 (3), 355–384.

Tůma, F. (2017): Střídání kódů ve výuce angličtiny u učitelů-expertů pohledem konverzační analýzy. *Slovo a slovesnost* 78 (4), 283–304.

Tůma, F. (2018): Enabling audience participation and stimulating discussion after student presentations in English as a foreign language seminars. *Linguistics and Education* 47, 59–67.

Tůma, F. & Sherman, T. (2022): Recruiting help in word searches in L2 peer interaction: A multimodal conversation-analytic study. *Linguistics and Education* 67, 100999.

Weilenmann, A. & Lymer, G. (2014): Incidental and essential objects in interaction: Paper documents in journalistic work. In: M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Heinemann & M. Rauniomaa (eds.), *Interacting with Objects: Language, Materiality, and Social Activity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 319–337.

Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University
Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic
<tuma@phil.muni.cz>