



Conversational Repair and Turn-Taking in a Synchronous Online EFL University Classroom

Nisya Rahmaini Marpaung¹, Sholihatul Hamidah Daulay²,
Maslathif Dwi Purnomo³

Program in English Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training
State Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
Received: 2026-07-18 Revised: 2026-08-17 Accepted: 2026-08-17 Keywords: conversation analysis, turn-taking, repair, online EFL classroom, institutional talk, other-initiated other-repair, Indonesian higher education DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v14i1.11861 Corresponding Author: Nisya Rahmaini Marpaung nisya0304193146@uinsu.ac.id Program in English Education Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training State Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan, Indonesia	<i>This study investigates turn-taking organization and conversational repair in a synchronous online university EFL class at UIN North Sumatra Medan, Indonesia. Applying Conversation Analysis (CA) as its primary analytical framework, the study examines a complete transcript of a recorded online graduate discussion session lasting approximately 28 minutes. The dominant repair type observed is other-initiated other-repair (OIOR), in which the lecturer both identifies the trouble source and provides extended corrective elaboration a repair sequence that spans nearly the entire 26-minute main body of the session. The study demonstrates that the online medium compounds existing institutional asymmetries by removing the proxemic and kinesic cues through which students might ordinarily bid for the floor. Drawing on Schegloff's (2007) CA framework and Walsh's (2011) concept of Classroom Interactional Competence, the paper contributes empirical evidence of how institutional power and technological mediation interact to shape conversation structure in Indonesian higher education EFL contexts. Implications for pedagogy and future research directions are discussed.</i>

1. Introduction

The global expansion of online education, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and sustained by institutional investment in digital infrastructure, has fundamentally altered the interactional landscape of university language classrooms. In Indonesia, the rapid adoption of synchronous video-conferenced instruction across higher education institutions has created new contexts for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interaction that remain comparatively underexplored from a rigorous empirical perspective. While there is a well-established body of Conversation Analysis (CA) research examining the organization of face-to-face classroom interaction (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006, 2011; Markee, 2008), significantly less attention has been directed toward how the core CA mechanisms of turn-taking and repair operate in technologically mediated, synchronous online classrooms particularly in Indonesian university contexts, where cultural norms and institutional expectations add further layers of complexity to classroom talk.

This gap is consequential for both theory and practice. From a theoretical standpoint, CA has demonstrated the systematic and rule-governed nature of turn-taking in ordinary conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), and has shown how institutional settings modify these rules in principled ways (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Online learning environments constitute a distinctive institutional setting with their own affordances and constraints audio delays, reduced visual access, digital participation channels that may alter interactional dynamics in ways not yet fully documented. From a practical standpoint, understanding how interaction is organized in online EFL classrooms has direct implications for instructional design, teacher training, and the promotion of meaningful student participation in virtual learning environments.

This study addresses these concerns by analyzing a recorded session of an online graduate English class at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan (UIN North Sumatra). The session involves a lecturer and multiple students engaging in a discussion of Sigrid Norris's multimodal interaction theory, and it provides unusually rich data for CA analysis: a single extended repair sequence, initiated by the lecturer at timestamp 1:32 and structurally active for the remainder of the session, constitutes the dominant interactional event and reveals the mechanisms through which institutional authority, pedagogical goals, and technological mediation converge to shape conversation structure.

The study is guided by the following central research question: How do teacher and students organize turns and manage conversational repair during a synchronous online university English class? To address this question, the analysis draws on Schegloff's (2007) account of sequence organization and turn-taking, the repair taxonomy of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), and Walsh's (2011) framework of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). The data a complete, timestamped transcript of the 28-minute session are analyzed from the perspective of participant orientation: claims about interactional significance are grounded in how the participants themselves demonstrably treat the talk, rather than in researcher-imposed categories.

The study makes three principal contributions to the literature. First, it extends CA-based classroom research to the online graduate EFL classroom in Indonesia, a context that has received limited empirical attention. Second, it documents a case of protracted OIOR other-initiated other-repair spanning an entire session that challenges conventional CA accounts of repair as a brief, locally resolved phenomenon. Third, it provides concrete evidence of how online mediation amplifies the interactional asymmetries characteristic of institutional talk, by demonstrating the structural mechanisms through which student participation is rendered unavailable even when participation is nominally invited.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on CA and institutional talk, turn-taking and repair in EFL classrooms, and interaction in online learning environments. Section 3 describes the methodology, including the data and analytical procedure. Section 4 presents and discusses the findings in relation to the three analytical themes: turn-taking organization, conversational repair, and the role of the online medium. Section 5 draws conclusions and discusses implications for pedagogy and future research.

Literature Review

Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis is a research tradition concerned with the systematic study of talk-in-interaction as a social accomplishment. Originating in the ethnomethodological sociology of Garfinkel (Heritage, 1984) and developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), CA proceeds from the assumption that social interaction is not random but organized through shared, endogenous practices that participants deploy and orient to in real time. Its three foundational analytical domains turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair each reveal a different dimension of how participants coordinate and produce meaning together.

Turn-taking, as theorized by Sacks et al. (1974), is governed by a rule-based system that allocates turns at transition relevance places (TRPs): points in the talk where a current speaker's turn could be completed and a next turn could legitimately begin. The system specifies a hierarchy of techniques by which next turns are allocated: the current speaker may select the next speaker, or another participant may self-select, or the current speaker may continue. This system produces the orderly alternation of speakers observed in ordinary conversation, and it does so through participants' real-time orientations to projected turn completions and potential transition points.

Sequence organization, elaborated by Schegloff (2007), describes how turns are connected into larger structural units. The adjacency pairs a two-turn structure in which a first pair part (e.g., a question) projects a relevant second pair part (e.g., an answer) is the basic unit of sequential organization. Schegloff argues that each turn is both context-shaped (produced in response to the prior turn) and context-renewing (projecting what is relevant next), making interaction a continuous, locally managed achievement. This principle of sequential implicativeness is central to understanding how participants produce and interpret social actions.

Repair, as described by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), refers to the practices through which participants address problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding. Repair is not confined to error correction but encompasses any treatment of a 'trouble source' in interaction. The repair taxonomy distinguishes between self-initiated self-repair (SISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). Crucially, the system exhibits a structural preference for self-correction: the architecture of repair sequences prioritizes giving the speaker of the trouble-source turn the first opportunity to repair. This preference is demonstrated in the ordering of repair initiation and completion opportunities.

Drew and Heritage (1992) extended CA to institutional settings, arguing that institutional interaction differs from ordinary conversation in three respects: it is oriented to specific institutional goals, it involves constraints on the types of contributions participants may relevantly make, and it exhibits asymmetric participation rights. Language classrooms exemplify these features. Seedhouse (2004) demonstrated that classroom talk is organized according to pedagogical goals, generating distinct interactional patterns across different activity types. The Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE)

sequence, first identified by Cazden (2001) and widely documented in classroom research, places the teacher in a position of interactional authority that structures who speaks, when, and about what.

Turn-Taking and Repair in EFL Classroom Research

The application of CA to EFL and second language classrooms has produced a substantial body of findings on turn-taking, repair, and participation structure. Walsh (2006, 2011) introduced the concept of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) to describe teachers' capacity to use talk as a tool for learning. His analysis showed that teachers' interactional choices questioning techniques, wait time management, feedback moves directly shape the quality and quantity of student participation. When teachers maintain tight control overturn allocation, nominating students, evaluating responses rapidly, and filling silence with their own talk, students have limited opportunity for self-selection, topic initiation, or independent meaning negotiation. Walsh argues that CIC development involves teachers learning to open rather than close interactional space.

Research on repair in EFL classrooms has consistently documented the prevalence of other-initiated repair and its pedagogical implications. Markee (2008) used CA to analyze repair sequences in second language classrooms and argued that repair episodes moments of breakdown and resolution are central sites for language learning precisely because they make the gap between learner production and target forms visible. However, he also noted that the way teachers manage repair can either scaffold or foreclose learner development: OISR, which gives learners the opportunity to self-correct after a problem has been flagged, is more developmentally supportive than OIOR, which bypasses learner agency entirely.

In Indonesian EFL contexts, CA-informed studies have revealed similar patterns of teacher dominance. Rahayu (2019) found that teachers in Indonesian EFL classrooms consistently used OIOR rather than OISR, restricting learners' self-repair opportunities and reinforcing teacher-centered interactional norms. Fauziati (2020) documented how instructors controlled the direction of meaning negotiation, with students rarely initiating clarification requests or independently managing comprehension difficulties. Wahyuni (2021) analyzed teacher questioning strategies and found display questions questions to which the teacher already knows the answer to be far more common than referential questions, further reducing opportunities for genuine student-initiated interaction. These findings establish the baseline interactional patterns against which the present study's data from an online context can be compared.

The relationship between repair and learning in EFL classrooms remains a site of ongoing theoretical debate. Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis proposes that negotiation of meaning during interaction facilitates second language acquisition by drawing learners' attention to form-meaning mismatches. From a CA perspective, Kasper and Wagner (2011) argue that the interactional organization of repair sequences not only their outcomes constitutes learning-relevant activity. When students are given the opportunity to initiate and complete self-repair, they engage in the kind of productive struggle that may support the development of interactional competence (Hellermann, 2008). The systematic absence of this opportunity, as documented in the present data, thus has implications not only for participation equity but for language learning potential.

Interaction in Online and Video Classrooms

The transposition of classroom interaction to online synchronous environments introduces a set of interactional challenges that ordinary CA accounts of classroom talk do not address. Hampel and Stickler (2012) provide the most systematic treatment of these challenges, arguing that video-conferenced language learning requires participants to develop new forms of interactional competence specifically adapted to the affordances and constraints of digital mediation. They identify three principal challenges: the reduction of non-verbal communicative resources (gaze, posture, gesture, body orientation), the introduction of technological problems (audio delay, connection failure, echo), and the altered relationship between spoken and written modes of interaction (the simultaneous availability of chat alongside speech).

The reduction of non-verbal resources is particularly consequential for turn-taking. In face-to-face interaction, participants use gaze, body leaning, and postural shifts to signal readiness to speak, project turn completion, and bid for the floor (Mondada, 2018). In video-conferenced interaction, these signals are either unavailable (body below the frame) or ambiguous (gaze at camera vs. gaze at screen creates apparent eye contact even when a participant is looking elsewhere). Satar (2015) found that online language learners defer more to institutional authority to manage turn-taking precisely because technological mediation removes the proxemic cues that ordinarily regulate floor transitions. This creates a structural tendency toward increased teacher control in online classrooms, even when teachers intend to promote student participation.

Hutchby's (2001) theoretical framework of technological affordances provides a useful analytical lens for understanding how digital tools shape interaction. Hutchby argues that technologies are not neutral conduits for pre-existing communicative intentions but have affordances possibilities and constraints that configure what participants can relevantly do. Applied to the online language classroom, this means that tools such as screen sharing, the chat function, the raise-hand button, and the mute function are not merely technical features but interactional resources whose availability, use, and withdrawal constitute actions with sequential consequences. The present study applies this perspective to document how screen-sharing management functions as an interactional event in the opening sequence of the analyzed session.

Research specifically examining CA in online EFL classrooms remains relatively limited compared to the extensive literature on face-to-face contexts. Existing work has tended to focus on computer-mediated communication more broadly (Firth & Wagner, 1997) or on asynchronous interaction (Boden & Zimmerman, 1991) rather than on the synchronous video-conferenced classroom interaction that has become standard in post-pandemic higher education. The present study addresses this gap by providing a fine-grained CA analysis of naturally occurring interaction in a synchronous online EFL class, contributing empirical data from an Indonesian university context.

2. Method

This study used a qualitative single-case research design grounded in Conversation Analysis (CA). CA is an inductive methodology that examines naturally occurring interaction and analyzes how participants themselves display understanding through the sequential organization of talk. Rather than applying predetermined categories, CA focuses on how meaning is produced and interpreted turn by turn. A single-case design is appropriate because CA traditionally relies on detailed analysis of individual cases to reveal broader interactional principles.

The data were collected from a graduate English class at UIN North Sumatra, conducted synchronously through a video-conferencing platform. The class involved Master's students in English Education and centered on a student-led presentation and discussion of Sigrid Norris's multimodal interaction theory. Participants included one lecturer, a student presenter, several students contributing to opening and closing sequences, and the researcher as an observer.

The primary data consisted of a complete timestamped transcript of a 28-minute online class session. Transcription followed adapted Jeffersonian conventions, with timestamps marking turn boundaries and sequential positions. The analysis was based on the verbal record rather than video data, meaning that non-verbal actions were only considered when verbally described by participants. This focus aligns with the study's interest in turn-taking and repair as verbal-sequential phenomena.

Data analysis was conducted in four stages. First, the transcript was repeatedly reviewed to identify the overall structure of the session. Second, turn-allocation patterns and opportunities for speaker transition were examined. Third, all repair sequences were identified and categorized according to established CA frameworks, with particular attention given to an extended other-initiated other-repair sequence. Finally, the findings were interpreted in relation to previous literature and the interactional characteristics of the online learning environment.

3. Result and Discussion

Turn-Taking Organization Structural Features and Lecturer Control

The session exhibits a radical asymmetry in turn-taking that is consistent with, but more extreme than, the teacher-dominated patterns typically reported in face-to-face EFL classroom CA research. The lecturer occupies the floor for approximately 26 of the session's 28 minutes. Student turns are limited to Speaker 8's pre-session procedural announcement (0:00–0:14), a pause at 1:07 during the screen-share directive exchange, and two minimal closing responses by Speakers 2 and 3 (27:55–27:57). During the entire 26-minute main body of the session from the lecturer's first substantive turn at 1:32 to the pre-closing sequence at 26:40 no student produces a content-related turn of any kind.

The Floor Transition Sequence

The session opens with a pre-sequence that establishes the communicative frame. Speaker 8's turn (0:00–0:14) performs an institutional function: it invites participation through multiple channels (direct speech or the chat box) and thereby establishes the norms for subsequent interaction. In CA terms, this is a context-setting pre-sequence (Schegloff, 2007) that anticipates and licenses subsequent interaction without itself constituting a content topic.

A notable pause occurs between 1:07 and 1:32, during which the lecturer produces the directive 'Stop your screen, Fadhila' (1:07). This directive is simultaneously a floor-management act and a digital resource management act: it instructs Fadhila to relinquish the screen-sharing channel, thereby withdrawing the visual content that had been anchoring her presentation. In Hutchby's (2001) terms, the removal of the screen share constitutes an affordance-based interactional event: the lecturer's control over who can share their screen amounts to control over who holds the visual floor. The action is completed with minimal exchange the directive is produced, no student verbal response is recorded, and the floor transitions to the lecturer at 1:32.

Excerpt 1 (Floor Transition via Screen-Share Directive, Timestamp 1:07)

Speaker 1: Stop your screen, Fadhila.

(Pause: 1:07-1:32)

Speaker 1: Your discussion today is about the multi-modal interaction via Sigrid Norris, so if you have any question or any clarification, but I think it's too short, yeah?

The brevity of the screen-share directive is analytically significant. It names the recipient (Fadhila), specifies the action (stop your screen), and implicitly projects the next relevant action (relinquish the floor). No negotiation or explanation follows. This unilateral digital resource management reflects the asymmetrical authority structure of institutional talk and illustrates how technological affordances serve as instruments of interactional control.

Collapsed IRE and Sustained Floor-Holding

From 1:32 onwards, the lecturer's interactional conduct is organized around a modified IRE structure in which the student Response slot is systematically collapsed. In the canonical IRE pattern (Cazden, 2001), the teacher initiates (I), the student responds (R), and the teacher evaluates (E). In the present session, the Initiation and Evaluation moves are fused: the lecturer both introduces the topic and provides an immediate negative evaluation of Fadhila's prior presentation, then proceeds to supply the elaborated correct content himself without creating an opportunity for a student Response. This collapsed IRE functions to maintain the lecturer's floor while simultaneously performing both the pedagogical and evaluative functions of the sequence.

The pattern of sustained floor-holding is achieved through several sequential mechanisms. The lecturer consistently produces Transitional Continuers phrases such as 'for example, for instance' (3:11), 'the second one' (7:51), and 'the point is' (20:13) that project further talk and signal to co-participants that the current turn is not yet complete. He also employs self-repair and reformulation throughout his extended turn (e.g., repeating 'every action is multi-modal' at 2:57 and 3:01; reformulating explanations of embodied vs. frozen modes across multiple timestamps), which has the sequential effect of extending the turn and forestalling transition relevance. Table 1 summarizes the key turn-taking features.

CA Feature	Indicator	Finding
Turn allocation	Teacher vs. student selection	100% teacher-allocated; no student self-selection during main session
Turn length	Speaker duration	Lecturer: ~26 min continuous; students: <5 seconds each at session close only
Sequential structure	IRE pattern	Modified IRE: Response slot collapsed; lecturer supplies initiation, evaluation, and elaborated content
Topic opening	Who introduces topics	All topics and sub-topics initiated by lecturer; zero student topic initiations
Topic closing	Pre-closing sequences	Pre-closing at 26:40; final closing at 27:46; entirely lecturer-managed

Transition relevance	TRP creation	No TRPs created during main body; continuers and reformulations forestall transition
Digital floor management	Screen-sharing control	Lecturer withdraws Fadhila's screen share at 1:07; constitutes floor transition event

Table 1. Summary of turn-taking organization.

These findings corroborate and extend Walsh's (2011) analysis of teacher-fronted interaction as a context in which student participation is structurally constrained. The online environment amplifies these constraints in a specific and documentable way: the absence of physical co-presence removes the interactional signals body orientation, gaze, leaning forward, reaching for the floor through which students might in a physical classroom bid for a turn even without formal invitation. Hampel and Stickler (2012) predicted this outcome, arguing that video-conferenced participants defer more to institutional authority because technological mediation removes the proxemic regulatory cues of ordinary floor transitions. The data fully corroborate this prediction and provide a detailed sequential record of how it operates.

Conversational Repair

The dominant interactional event of the session, from a CA perspective, is the extended OIOR sequence directed by the lecturer at the student presenter Fadhila. This sequence is initiated at timestamp 1:32, reinstated at 20:13, and structurally active throughout the 26-minute main body of the session. Its protracted duration constituting the entire lesson rather than a locally resolved episode represents an unusual and theoretically significant case of OIOR that merits detailed documentation.

Initiation of the Repair Sequence

The repair is initiated immediately following the floor transition at 1:32. The lecturer's opening turn combines a topic framing function (identifying the discussion topic) with an explicit repair initiation: the identification of a trouble source in Fadhila's prior presentation. Schegloff et al. (1977) define other-initiation of repair as a turn or turn component that marks a problem in the prior talk and projects the relevance of repair. In the present case, the other-initiation is unusually direct and explicit: rather than using an understanding check or a request for repetition (the typical formats of OISR initiation), the lecturer specifies both the trouble source and its nature immediately:

Excerpt 2 (Repair Initiation, Timestamp 1:32-2:57)

Speaker 1: Your discussion today is about the multi-modal interaction via

*Sigrid Norris, so if you have any question or any clarification,
but I think it's too short, yeah? [Repair Initiation]*

Speaker 1: Your explanation, Fadhila, is too short. [Trouble Source Specified]

You didn't explore many things from Sigrid Norris.

*And your explanation is too short, I think,
because you didn't mention anything about that.*

*Speaker 1: But the key features, the key word from Sigrid Norris is
every action is multi-modal. [Repair Completion Begun]*

This repair initiation departs from the preference for self-correction in two ways. First, rather than producing an OISR initiation that would give Fadhila the opportunity to self-repair (for example, by asking 'Was there anything you'd like to add about Norris's theory?'), the lecturer moves directly to OIOR: he not only identifies the trouble source but begins to supply the correction himself. Second, the repair completion is not brief and localized. In ordinary conversation, OIOR is typically resolved within a few turns (Schegloff et al., 1977). Here, the repair completion extends across the entire remaining session, as the lecturer provides a comprehensive exposition of the theory that Fadhila had allegedly under-explained.

Structure of the Extended Repair

The extended repair sequence has an identifiable internal organization. It opens with the trouble-source specification (1:32–1:45), transitions to the repair completion proper the lecturer's extended exposition of Norris's multimodal interaction theory (1:45–20:07) and is reinstated explicitly at 20:13, when the lecturer re-addresses Fadhila by name and respecifies the corrective expectation:

Excerpt 3 (Repair Reinstatement, Timestamp 20:13-20:41)

Speaker 1: The point is, Fadhila, you still need to explore many things about Norris. I understand that you already have material to mention that Norris has embodied and unembodied, frozen action, called by unembodied and embodied action, and communicative modes, etc. But you still have to explore many things about that, how to apply this in the LTA or this language teaching.

The reinstatement at 20:13 serves several sequential functions. The explicit re-naming of Fadhila ('The point is, Fadhila') functions as a recipient design move that re-activates the repair frame established at 1:32. The acknowledgment of what Fadhila had already explained ('I understand that you already have material to mention...') followed by the corrective contrast ('But you still have to explore...') reproduces the structure of the original repair initiation: partial credit followed by specification of inadequacy. This parallel structure confirms that the repair initiated at 1:32 is still open at 20:13 and that the lecturer's intervening 19 minutes of exposition constitute the repair completion itself.

This is a theoretically significant finding. CA accounts of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2007) describe repair sequences as locally resolved episodes in which a trouble source is addressed and intersubjectivity is restored before the interaction moves on. The present case challenges this description by demonstrating that, in institutional talk, a repair sequence can be co-extensive with the entire main body of the lesson. The repair does not resolve intersubjectivity in the conventional sense restoring mutual understanding after a breakdown but rather performs a pedagogical function: it models the expected depth of theoretical engagement and corrects the student's presentation through the lecturer's own extended demonstration.

Absence of Student Repair Participation

Conspicuously absent from the transcript is any instance of student SISR, OISR initiation by students (i.e., student-initiated clarification requests directed at the lecturer), or student-managed repair of comprehension difficulties. In ordinary conversation, SISR is the most common repair type (Schegloff et al., 1977). Its complete absence in the present

data is not a random finding but a structurally produced outcome: students have no substantive speaking turns in which to produce language that could contain repairable items, and the lecturer's sustained floor-holding does not create TRPs at which students could flag comprehension problems or bid to participate in repair. Table 2 presents the complete repair inventory of the session.

Repair Type	Evidence in Transcript	CA Interpretation
Self-initiated self-repair (SISR)	Not observed	No student speaking turns to generate repairable items
Self-initiated another repair (SIOR)	Not observed	No student speaking turns sufficient for this repair format
Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)	Not observed	Lecturer does not create opportunity for Fadhila to self-correct
Other-initiated other-repair (OIOR)	Lecturer to Fadhila, 1:32-20:41; reinstated at 20:13	Extended OIOR spanning entire session; lecturer supplies trouble source identification and complete repair content
Student clarification requests	Not observed	No student bids for floor to request clarification during 26-min main body

Table 2. Complete repair inventory of the session.

This finding extends Rahayu's (2019) observation that Indonesian EFL teachers restrict learners' self-repair opportunities: in the present data, this restriction is not merely a matter of degree but is structurally total. The absence of student repair participation is the product of the same structural condition that produces the absence of student topic initiation: the lecturer's sustained floor-holding renders students interactionally invisible during the main body of the session.

Walsh (2011) identifies this pattern as a tension between pedagogical efficiency and interactional development. In the present session, the lecturer's OIOR strategy delivers the elaborated theoretical content efficiently the students receive a comprehensive account of Norris's theory but does so at the cost of any student engagement with the repair process itself. Markee (2008) argues that repair sequences are central sites for language learning. If this is correct, then the absence of student participation in repair is not merely an interactional asymmetry but a potential learning opportunity foregone.

The Online Medium

The online setting of the session introduces a set of specific interactional features that interact with the turn-taking and repair patterns documented above. Three are particularly analytically significant: the management of screen sharing as a floor-control mechanism, the availability but non-use of the chat box as an alternative participation channel, and the lecturer's explicit meta-interactional commentary on the limitations of online communication.

Screen Sharing as Digital Floor Management

As documented in Section 4.1.1, the lecturer's directive to Fadhila to stop her screen share (1:07) constitutes a floor transition event accomplished through digital resource management rather than through verbal cue. This is an affordance-specific interactional action: it has no equivalent in face-to-face classroom interaction and is made possible and made consequential by the technological architecture of the video-conferencing platform. The withdrawal of Fadhila's screen share removes the visual content anchoring her presentation, eliminating what Norris (2019) would call a frozen/disembodied communicative mode and creating a visually 'blank' interactional space that the lecturer then fills with his own extended verbal turn.

This action illustrates Hutchby's (2001) argument that technological affordances are active participants in shaping interaction: the availability of screen-sharing control is not merely a technical feature but a power resource whose use (and withdrawal) constitutes an interactional event with sequential consequences. The unilateral exercise of this resource — the lecturer withdraws Fadhila's screen share without requesting her agreement — is consistent with and reinforces the asymmetrical participation rights of institutional talk.

The Chat Box

Speaker 8's opening announcement explicitly establishes the chat box as an alternative participation channel: 'please send it, maybe say it directly or write it on the chat box' (0:05). In CA terms, this creates what might be called an alternative sequential space a written, potentially asynchronous mode through which students could contribute without interrupting the lecturer's spoken floor. The chat box represents a distinctive affordance of online interaction that has no direct equivalent in face-to-face classrooms.

However, no chat-box contributions are referenced or acknowledged during the main body of the session. This non-use is itself interactionally significant. Satar (2015) notes that the chat function is typically underutilized in online classrooms when spoken interaction is dominated by one participant, because the interactional norms established by the dominant speaker implicitly suppress alternative participation modes. The present data are consistent with this observation: Speaker 8's invitation to use the chat box is part of a pre-sequence that occurs before the main interactional norm lecturer monologue is established. Once the lecturer's extended turn begins at 1:32, the chat box invitation is effectively rendered moot.

4. Conclusion

Summary of Findings

This study has analyzed turn-taking organization and conversational repair in a 28-minute synchronous online graduate EFL class using Conversation Analysis. The findings reveal a highly institutionalized and lecturer-centered interactional structure organized around three interlocking features. First, the lecturer exercises total control over turn allocation, topic initiation, and topic closure throughout the session, with no student self-selection for content-related turns during the main body. Second, the IRE sequential structure is modified such that the student Response slot is systematically collapsed: the lecturer initiates, evaluates, and provides elaborated content within his own turn, denying students the interactional space associated with the Response position. Third, the dominant repair pattern is an extended OIOR sequence initiated at 1:32, reinstated at 20:13, and constituting the entire main body of the session in which the lecturer both identifies the trouble source and provides the repair completion, bypassing the structural preference for self-correction.

The online medium contributes to these patterns in specific and documentable ways. Screen-sharing control functions as a digital floor-management mechanism through which the lecturer accomplishes the floor transition at 1:07. The chat box, while established as an alternative participation channel in the pre-sequence, goes unused during the main body, suggesting that the interactional norms established by the lecturer's sustained monologue implicitly suppress alternative participation modes. The lecturer's own meta-interactional commentary on the interpretive limitations of the online medium his reflection on the ambiguity of a student's laughter provides participant-produced evidence of the specific challenges that technological mediation creates for interaction.

Theoretical Contributions

The study makes three theoretical contributions. First, it extends the empirical record of CA-based classroom research to the online graduate EFL classroom in Indonesia, a context that has received limited attention in the literature. The findings demonstrate that the structural tendencies toward teacher dominance documented in face-to-face Indonesian EFL classrooms (Rahayu, 2019; Fauziati, 2020; Wahyuni, 2021) are reproduced and potentially intensified in the online setting, mediated by both institutional authority and technological affordance.

Second, the study documents an extended OIOR sequence that challenges conventional CA accounts of repair as a locally resolved, brief episode. The repair sequence analyzed here spans an entire lesson, raising the question of what counts as a 'repair completion' in institutional talk where the correction of a student's understanding may be accomplished through a sustained pedagogical exposition rather than through a targeted repair turn. This finding suggests that the CA repair taxonomy may need to accommodate institutionally specific repair formats in which the preference for self-correction is not merely bypassed but structurally unavailable.

Third, the study provides concrete sequential evidence for Hampel and Stickler's (2012) theoretical claim that online learning environments create distinct interactional challenges. By documenting the specific sequential mechanisms through which the online medium removes floor-bidding cues (the absence of proxemic signals), introduces new floor-control resources (screen sharing), and creates interpretive ambiguity (the lecturer's inability to interpret Windy's laughter), the study moves from theoretical assertion to empirical demonstration.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that future research should address. The analysis is based on a single session of 28 minutes, and the findings may not be representative of the broader range of interaction patterns in online Indonesian EFL classrooms. The data are transcription-based, meaning that non-verbal conduct is accessible only through the lecturer's verbal descriptions of it; future studies employing video recording and multimodal CA methods (Mondada, 2018) would provide a fuller account of how embodied conduct and digital tools interact to organize online classroom interaction.

The single-participant structure of the data one extended lecturer turn limits the opportunity to examine student-initiated turns and student-managed repair. Future research should analyze online EFL sessions specifically designed to promote student participation, such as student-led peer discussion tasks, small-group breakout activities, or flipped classroom formats in which students present and discuss material independently of direct teacher oversight. Such data would make it possible to examine whether and how the

interactional constraints documented here are reproduced or modified in less teacher-dominated activity types.

Comparative research examining the same participants in face-to-face and online settings would enable direct assessment of how the online medium specifically alters interactional organization, controlling for participant, topic, and activity type variables. Longitudinal research following students across multiple sessions would address questions about the development of online interactional competence whether students become more skilled at managing floor transitions, initiating repair, and using alternative participation channels as they gain experience with the online format. Such research would extend the present study's contribution and provide the empirical base needed for more informed and evidence-based online language teaching practice.

5. References

- Boden, D., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1991). *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Polity Press.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fauziati, E. (2020). Classroom interaction and meaning negotiation in Indonesian EFL contexts. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 34-50.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2012). The use of videoconferencing to support multimodal interaction in an online language classroom. *ReCALL*, 24(2), 116-137.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). Social actions for classroom language learning. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I. (2001). *Conversation and technology: From the telephone to the Internet*. Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117-142). Routledge.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning-behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404-427.
- 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.
- Norris, S. (2019). *Systematically working with multimodal data: Research methods in multimodal discourse analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rahayu, D. (2019). Turn-taking and repair in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A conversation analysis study. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 78-90.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>

- Satar, H. M. (2015). Multimodal language learner interactions via desktop videoconferencing within a framework of synthetic immersive environments.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1977.0041>
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. Blackwell Publishing.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Wahyuni, S. (2021). Teacher questioning strategies and student responses in an Indonesian university EFL class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(3), 455-465.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.