

ABSTRACT

An acceptable group plan is not necessarily evidence that English as a foreign language (EFL) learners can negotiate what happens when circumstances change. This article develops a classroom procedure for teaching that distinction. A *task pivot* occurs when learners receive an announced but previously undisclosed change to one consequential condition after agreeing on a course of action. Their responsibility is to make the effect of that change understandable to peers, consider the commitments that still matter, and agree on a defensible response. Research on task-based language teaching, contingent responding, interactional competence, task demands, and learner engagement establishes the pedagogical basis of the procedure. The central example is a 70-minute university EFL lesson in which students first organize two simultaneous study-skills workshops and then learn that only one of two facilitators remains available. The article specifies the task instructions, planning checkpoint, staffing alternatives, teacher support, peer scrutiny, and language-focused follow-up. Three short illustrative exchanges distinguish substantive negotiation from an apparently satisfactory but poorly explained decision. A companion observation guide separates task completion from sequential evidence of responsive talk and learner participation. The article also details how delayed, comparable group performances could be assessed without mistaking immediate compliance for language development. It offers complete materials for classroom use and a transparent basis for subsequent testing; it does not present learner observations or intervention effects.

KEYWORDS: english as a foreign language; task-based language teaching; interactional competence; contingent responding; group decision-making; task pivots

1. INTRODUCTION: WHEN AN AGREED PLAN BECOMES UNTENABLE

Consider three university students organizing a one-hour study-skills event. Their initial instructions call for a presentation-planning workshop and a revision-notes workshop, each led by a facilitator at a separate table. The group has agreed that attendees can select either topic and ask questions while practising. Once that commitment has been recorded, the teacher announces a staffing change: only one facilitator will now attend. Both topics must nevertheless remain available during the hour. The students therefore have to do more than calculate a workable timetable. They must decide which features of their earlier agreement can survive the reduction in staff, explain how the revised arrangement affects participants, and respond meaningfully to one another's concerns and alternatives.

The same practical solution can emerge from markedly different conversations and can therefore represent different levels of interactional accomplishment. A dominant group member might suggest two consecutive workshops, obtain quick agreement, and finish with a compliant schedule. Another group might reach that identical schedule only after considering whether participants who need one topic must wait, when they can ask questions, and whether the original promise of topic choice has been preserved. The difference is interactional: it lies in how a decision is established and understood, not simply in the finished document. Studies of paired speaking and contingent response show why the relationship between one contribution and the next matters when evaluating interactional competence [1, 2].

The instructional procedure developed here makes that sequential relationship between contributions the central focus of a speaking lesson. Learners first establish an identifiable, mutually understood decision. A scheduled checkpoint then introduces one condition that bears directly on their decision. They consult their earlier record, explain what remains defensible, consider alternatives, and make an agreement open to questioning by another group. The teacher protects reading and preparation time, rather than withholding information to create surprise. The purpose is

to teach how people use English to reconsider a joint position under changed circumstances.

Three closely connected questions organize the analysis and the accompanying classroom design. First, what conditions make a late change consequential to learners' own agreement rather than just an additional instruction? Second, what distinguishes a relevant, peer-responsive explanation from a superficially fluent or merely compliant response? Third, what evidence would show that repeated practice improves performance beyond the lesson in which it occurs? The lesson and its supporting materials answer the first question in operational terms; close analysis of illustrative exchanges addresses the second; a delayed comparison plan specifies what would be needed to address the third. *Adaptive interaction* is used here for this situated work of maintaining, qualifying, or replacing a shared decision in response to another participant and a changed condition. It is an instructional focus within interactional competence, not a separate, independently established proficiency trait.

The distinctive feature of the task pivot is the ordering of commitment and information: learners commit to an arrangement before the consequential condition changes. Neither changing instructions during a task nor encouraging learners to adapt is inherently new. What matters is that learners have made a decision to which they can return, that the subsequent change has a traceable consequence, and that the revised arrangement remains subject to others' understanding. This combination provides teachers with a practical route from meaningful group work to teachable moments of explanation, clarification, and responsive disagreement.

2. THE PEDAGOGICAL BASIS

2.1. MEANINGFUL TASKS, REPEATED PERFORMANCE, AND CHANGING CONDITIONS

A task-based speaking lesson is organized around an outcome for which learners must exchange meaning, coordinate interpretations, and make consequential choices. In the study-skills event, the outcome is an arrangement that makes both workshop topics accessible within a one-hour session. Learners may use several linguistic forms to achieve it; a particular conditional sentence is neither required nor sufficient. This relation between purposeful activity and learners' language choices is consistent with central accounts of task-based language teaching [3, 4]. The teacher can therefore retain the communicative purpose while changing the circumstances in which the students must pursue it.

Task repetition offers one adjacent route to development by giving learners another opportunity to manage familiar content and linguistic demands. Repeating or varying a task gives speakers further opportunities to allocate attention to planning and expression [5]. Research on repeated oral performance documents changes in second-language speech processing and fluency-related performance [6]. Those findings do not imply that repetition is rote practice. They do, however, concern repeated task experience rather than necessarily requiring speakers to account for an agreement that has become difficult to keep within the same discussion.

Task iteration brings repeated performance and adaptive language use closer together. Larsen-Freeman [7] describes task activity as developing through changing circumstances and learners' adaptive use of linguistic resources. A pivot can occur within such an iterative process. Its tighter requirement is that an agreed, recoverable position exists before the relevant condition changes. All members may know the new information at the same time; the task does not rely on one person concealing a fact from the others. The new demand is to connect a previous commitment to the altered conditions and make that connection understandable.

This timing distinction matters when the task pivot is compared with ordinary advance planning, because the communicative demand arises from a commitment that has already been established. When learners know before discussing anything that only one facilitator is available, they can produce a sensible single-facilitator schedule without examining the status of a previous joint decision. When they learn it after agreement, they must distinguish an assumption that has ceased to hold from a goal that continues to apply. That additional occasion for explanation is a design feature, not proof that delayed information teaches language more effectively.

2.2. CONTINGENT RESPONDING AS THE INSTRUCTIONAL TARGET

Speaking competence during joint decision-making involves more than taking turns, producing accurate sentences, or contributing a similar quantity of talk. Speakers need to recognize what an earlier contribution has established, identify the issue to which a reply should be addressed, and make their response intelligible in that sequence. [8] emphasize the jointly organized character of interactional competence, while [2] shows the significance of contingency on a previous speaker's contribution. For a pivot, the central question is whether a response deals with the consequence or concern actually placed before the group.

A learner who says “Yes, I agree” after a clearly stated interpretation may establish shared understanding efficiently and appropriately. The same expression after two incompatible alternatives may leave the decision unresolved. Likewise, “But we have only one facilitator” identifies the changed fact without necessarily explaining what the fact means for the previously agreed arrangement. A stronger contribution links the staffing constraint to the group’s commitment: “If both workshops run at once, which table will receive help when students have questions?” Neither length nor a mandatory phrase defines adequacy. Adequacy depends on the action the utterance performs at that moment.

Research on grammar-for-interaction treats linguistic resources as part of accomplishing locally situated social actions rather than as isolated grammatical structures [9]. The connection between locally situated language use and developmental questions is also central to interactional and usage-based accounts [10]. In the classroom task, useful resources include identifying a prior assumption, limiting a claim, seeking clarification, contrasting two possibilities, restating an interlocutor’s meaning, and accepting a change with a reason. These functions can be accomplished in relatively accessible English. They are particularly suitable for learners who can explain preferences but need support in making an objection or implication explicit.

2.3. TASK DEMANDS, LEARNER ENGAGEMENT, AND TEACHER MEDIATION

The late staffing change adds a practical reasoning demand to an already meaningful task and therefore increases complexity in a deliberately bounded way. It does not follow that greater cognitive demand will automatically produce better interaction. Robinson [11] relates task characteristics to performance under particular learner and instructional conditions. Révész et al. [12] illustrate why intended difficulty and experienced demands require separate examination. An activity intended to elicit contingent talk may instead expose unfamiliar vocabulary, insufficient reading time, or a problem that learners cannot solve with the information given. Changing just one operational condition, retaining the first plan for consultation, and allowing questions all help keep the intended communicative problem identifiable.

Engagement is similarly broader than audible participation or the number of turns produced by a learner. Philp and Duchesne [13] distinguish behavioural, cognitive, social, and emotional aspects of learner engagement. Sulis and Mercer [14] further attend to the changing relationship between learner and teacher engagement in classrooms. An active group might still ignore one student’s objection or delegate all reasoning to the most confident speaker. Observation must therefore address whose concerns influence a decision, not merely how many utterances each participant produces.

Peer interaction can create useful opportunities for language practice and feedback, but productive interaction is not guaranteed simply by arranging learners in groups, as Sato and Lyster [15] demonstrate. The teacher remains responsible for ensuring that materials are accessible, the update is understood, and overlooked contributions can re-enter the conversation. This role accords with accounts of teacher mediation in task-based education by Van den Branden [16] and of classroom discourse that allows learners space to elaborate their own meanings by Walsh [17]. The teacher should help learners communicate their reasoning without routinely supplying the decision on their behalf.

2.4. INSTRUCTIONAL COMMITMENTS AND THEIR OBSERVABLE IMPLICATIONS

Five connected features translate these pedagogical concerns into a teachable and observable sequence. A common practical purpose keeps attention on meaning; a recoverable agreement gives speakers something specific to reconsider; one consequential change creates a reason to explain the status of that agreement; peer questioning makes the explanation socially accountable; and a closing discussion connects an actual communication difficulty to language choices. None of these features is sufficient by itself. Their instructional value depends on what the learners actually do with them.

3. DEFINING A TASK PIVOT AND ITS BOUNDARIES

A task pivot is a scheduled change to one material condition of a meaning-focused task, released after participants have reached an identifiable joint commitment while the original communicative purpose remains in force. The change must be relevant to the existing agreement, but it should not prescribe the group’s final answer. Learners need the same reasonable access to information, time, and assistance that they had before the checkpoint. The term refers to this organization of activity; the quality of interaction that follows is a separate matter.

3.1. A COMMITMENT THAT CAN BE RECOVERED AND QUESTIONED

The first condition is a decision with traceable content that another participant can restate, question, or correct. “Two workshops at different tables” describes a format but does not establish what the students themselves have agreed matters most. “Participants should be free to remain with their chosen topic and ask a facilitator questions during practice” adds a learner-negotiated commitment. That commitment will be relevant when a facilitator disappears. The planning record should include the arrangement, why the group chose it, and a second member’s restatement. It can be brief. Its function is to make the group’s understanding available for inspection, not to reward polished writing.

An agreement recorded by one student is not necessarily understood or endorsed by all three members of the group. The checkpoint therefore requires another member to restate or question the decision and gives the first speaker an opportunity to confirm or correct that account. Important disagreement is documented rather than concealed to make the task sheet look complete. A group that has not reached an identifiable position needs further initial planning before a later change can properly challenge that position.

3.2. ONE CHANGE WITH A VISIBLE CONSEQUENCE

The staffing update removes exactly one facilitator and deliberately leaves all other task conditions unchanged. It does not shorten the event, withdraw the printed cards, introduce a new topic, restrict the room, or alter participants’ rights. Several defensible arrangements remain possible. Two topics can be taught consecutively, a facilitator can rotate between the tables while the other group uses printed practice materials, or a combined session can integrate both topics. What matters instructionally is how the students explain which original commitments each alternative preserves or modifies.

A trivial detail that affects none of the group’s choices would not create a meaningful need for reconsideration. Multiple simultaneous changes would make it difficult to determine which consequence learners are addressing. Unexpected information should not become an information-access penalty: students know that the checkpoint is coming, see the text of the change, and may consult the initial instructions while discussing its implications.

3.3. A RESPONSE THAT REMAINS OPEN TO PEERS

The group’s response may retain its initial arrangement if the members can explain why that arrangement remains feasible under the new condition. Changing the plan is not inherently better than defending it. For example, a group that had already arranged for the two facilitators to alternate duties may be able to retain parts of its participation plan after the staffing reduction, provided its explanation accounts for the remaining facilitator’s actual availability. Conversely, a detailed new timetable does not demonstrate adequate interaction if an explicit and relevant objection was ignored.

Peer accountability requires a genuine opportunity for someone other than the first proposer to seek clarification, restate an implication, raise a concern, or confirm a relevant interpretation. Table 1 distinguishes the task pivot from nearby speaking-task arrangements and clarifies the additional interactional demand created by the checked change in conditions. A question is useful when it bears on a real issue; disagreement need not be manufactured. The teacher checks whether the chosen arrangement works, not whether it matches a preferred answer. This distinction prevents the activity from becoming a search for the teacher’s hidden solution.

3.4. SEPARATING TASK COMPLETION FROM RESPONSIVE INTERACTION

An arrangement, a responsive exchange, and an individual learner’s developing ability are three different objects of judgement that should not be collapsed into one impression of success. The arrangement is satisfactory when it meets the event requirements. A responsive exchange makes clear how a changed fact affects the participants’ earlier commitment and shows uptake, clarification, or considered closure. Development would require evidence that learners can accomplish such work in subsequent interactions beyond the teaching occasion. The observation guide in Appendix B therefore keeps enactment, sequential interaction, and participation opportunities in separate records. The guide is a teaching and research aid, not an established proficiency test.

TABLE 1. DISTINGUISHING A TASK PIVOT FROM NEARBY SPEAKING-TASK ARRANGEMENTS

Task arrangement	What learners encounter	What the pivot adds when embedded in that arrangement
Task repetition	A familiar task is performed again with similar or altered conditions.	A consequence must be related to a commitment formed within the current discussion.
Task iteration	Learners continually adjust talk and action as the task develops.	The moment of consequential change follows a checked joint decision.
Information-exchange task	Different participants may initially hold different facts.	Equal access to the new fact is possible; an information imbalance is unnecessary.
Role-play	Participants act within assigned circumstances or social roles.	A meaningful earlier agreement and subsequent accountability are explicitly required.
Higher task demand	More reasoning or coordination may be needed to complete an activity.	Added demand has a specific communicative purpose: explaining the status of a prior decision.
Task pivot	One relevant condition changes after shared agreement.	Learners explain, question, retain, or amend that agreement while the task goal remains intact.

The distinctions are pedagogical rather than mutually exclusive classifications; see [5], [7], [3], and [11].

4. A UNIVERSITY EFL LESSON: THE STUDY-SKILLS EVENT

4.1. PARTICIPANTS, RESOURCES, AND FIXED TASK REQUIREMENTS

The lesson is suitable for university EFL learners who can state a preference, read a short practical instruction, and request clarification, even if they still need support when explaining consequences, qualifying a proposal, or responding to objections. These are functional entry requirements rather than an assumption that a proficiency label predicts how every learner will perform. Students work in triads with a common instruction sheet, a shared planning record, and printed practice cards. Equivalent accessible digital or oral formats may be substituted; neither a device nor a particular interface is necessary.

The fictional event lasts 60 minutes. Its attendees must be offered presentation planning and revision-note organization, with at least one topic available for each attendee to practise. The room is available for the full hour. Personal devices cannot be required, and public demonstrations must remain optional. Initially, two facilitators are available, each capable of teaching either topic, and the starting plan places two workshops at separate tables simultaneously. Students decide how attendees choose topics, whether switching is allowed, when questions can be asked, and how practice takes place. Printed practice cards for both topics remain available throughout the event; their full text is included in Appendix A.

Every triad receives the same factual instructions, and no essential task information is reserved for one participant. Responsibilities for considering participants' needs, physical resources, and facilitation are distributed initially, but information is never reserved for one role. Anyone can challenge an interpretation or contribute to any part of the arrangement. Role assignments are prompts to broaden attention, not a hierarchy of expertise. The group must record at least one participation commitment of its own and a reason for choosing it. This distinction matters because simply copying the two-table starting arrangement would not show that learners had negotiated anything. Work on learner-generated content suggests the importance of task ownership, while also examining conditions distinct from this teacher-authored event [18]. The lesson offers ownership of consequential decisions, not a claim that the fictional event is personally generated by students.

4.2. FROM AGREEMENT TO A SINGLE STAFFING CHANGE

The announced checkpoint introduces a short, fully visible notice: "Only one facilitator can now attend. All other information in your initial brief remains valid. Decide which parts of your arrangement should remain and which need to change, and explain the reasons to your partners." Students can read the notice, compare it with their earlier record, and ask the teacher what the instructions mean. They cannot restore the second facilitator or drop a topic. The task therefore remains solvable but no longer supports the assumption that both tables can have a facilitator continuously.

The possible responses carry different implications for the group's earlier commitment to participant choice and access to facilitator support. Two consecutive 30-minute workshops provide facilitator-led access to both topics but

may require attendees interested in the second topic to wait. One guided table and one self-study table preserve simultaneous topic choice but raise questions about equitable access to questions. Alternating facilitator visits permit both tables to operate during the hour while sharing a single staff member. A combined workshop may give everyone contact with the facilitator but reduce the independence of the two topic groups. The teacher may assess logistical feasibility but should not rank these arrangements by an unstated stylistic preference.

Table 2 sets out one defensible rotation arrangement with explicit minute allocations so that the practical trade-off can be examined rather than left implicit. It is an illustrative planning answer, not an observed group decision or the required answer key. It makes the trade-off visible: participants can remain at their topic table, but they do not receive continuous facilitator access. Students choosing this arrangement would still need to explain how they would direct urgent questions, support those working independently, and communicate the change to event attendees.

The activity should allow different groups to prioritize different features of participation, provided that the fixed event requirements remain satisfied. One triad may preserve the right to stay at a selected topic; another may preserve the option to switch during the hour; a third may prioritize receiving facilitator feedback before leaving. The identical staffing notice then requires a different account in each triad. This diversity is useful only if the first priorities have actually been discussed and made available to other members before the notice arrives.

TABLE 2. ILLUSTRATIVE SINGLE-FACILITATOR ARRANGEMENT FOR THE 60-MINUTE EVENT

Time	Facilitator	Presentation-planning table	Revision-notes table
0–5 min	Welcomes both topic groups and explains how questions will be collected.	Select a task from the presentation card.	Select a task from the revision-notes card.
5–25 min	Works with the presentation table.	Facilitator-guided outline and optional short practice.	Independent note-organization activity using the printed card.
25–45 min	Moves to the revision-notes table.	Continue card-guided preparation and record remaining questions.	Facilitator-guided retrieval questions and note comparison.
45–60 min	Takes questions across both tables and clarifies unresolved issues.	Refine an outline; request feedback if needed.	Refine notes; request feedback if needed.

The four intervals sum to 60 minutes. The final period offers shared access to the single facilitator, not a promise of simultaneous individual attention at both tables. The arrangement is one logically feasible teaching example; it has not been implemented or timed with learners.

4.3. A 70-MINUTE TEACHING SEQUENCE

The classroom lesson is analytically separate from the 60-minute event that learners are planning. It occupies approximately 70 minutes, with a clear division between initial planning and reconsideration. Table 3 describes the six phases and the artefacts the teacher can inspect. The allocation is a practical lesson plan, not a duration established by an intervention study. The teacher announces at the start that one operational detail will change and that reading time, clarification, and access to the first plan will remain available.

Orientation deliberately does not reveal the later staffing fact, although learners know that one operational condition will change. The teacher explains the need for a checked agreement and demonstrates the difference between an empty response (“Okay”) and one that shows understanding (“Okay, then participants can still select a topic, but they will not always have a facilitator at the table”). A short optional language strip supplies phrases for referring back, clarifying a meaning, and identifying an implication. Students may use other accurate wording, writing, or appropriate gesture. Memorizing the strip is not the task’s goal.

During initial planning, the recorder writes the proposed arrangement, the group’s main participation priority, and the reasoning used to justify it. A different member then restates the arrangement. A third member can confirm, amend, or identify an unresolved point. The teacher checks three things before distributing the notice: an arrangement is recorded, at least one reason or priority is stated, and another participant has shown a genuine opportunity to understand or challenge it. These checks are more reliable than treating a completed worksheet as automatic evidence of agreement.

During reconsideration, the teacher’s first intervention should identify the nature of any difficulty before additional support is supplied. A student may not understand the word “facilitator”; another may understand the notice but not how it bears on the participation promise; a third may be prevented from speaking by a forceful partner. Vocabulary clarification, a neutral consequence question, and protection of speaking space are different forms of assistance.

Helping students read the notice need not disclose a solution. Suggesting “Why not send the facilitator back and forth between tables?” does disclose a solution and must be treated as such if the activity is observed for research.

TABLE 3. A 70-MINUTE CLASSROOM SEQUENCE AND ITS EVIDENCE OF PARTICIPATION

Lesson phase	Minutes	Student activity and teacher check
Orientation and rehearsal	10	Read the fixed event requirements; compare a bare agreement with a reply that answers a specific question.
Negotiated initial plan	15	Agree on participation details; record an arrangement and priority; have another member restate the agreement.
Checkpoint and notice	5	Teacher verifies readiness, distributes the one-facilitator notice, protects reading time, and answers questions about its meaning.
Group reconsideration	15	Explain affected assumptions, weigh alternatives, reach a defensible decision, and record the reasoning.
Questions from another triad	10	Exchange the first and later plans; ask and answer a consequence-focused question, correcting the account if necessary.
Language reflection and exit	15	Analyze a relevant moment of talk, formulate a clearer reply, and explain individually how a partner’s contribution affected the decision.

The phase durations total 70 minutes. An agreed initial plan is checked before the notice is distributed. If a group needs additional initial-planning time, the teacher records and accommodates the resulting variation.

When the triads exchange records, the receiving group reads the initial commitment, the staffing notice, and the revised arrangement before formulating a question. The question should be substantively connected to the plan: “When could somebody at the notes table ask a question?”, “Does the facilitator still visit both topics?”, or “Would someone who only wants presentation practice have to move?” The responding triad may defend its arrangement, qualify a promise, or correct a misunderstanding. The purpose is not to produce a predetermined number of disagreements or to judge another group’s grammatical accuracy.

The final phase turns a communicative difficulty that actually arose in the task into focused language work. A teacher might bring back a brief, anonymized exchange in which “one table” was ambiguous, ask students which interpretation a partner might reasonably have made, and compare two ways to clarify it. Students then reword an explanation and try it with a partner. This places attention to form within meaningful activity, a relationship supported by discussions of task-based teaching and language-focused instruction [4]. Correction is selective: interrupting every grammatical inaccuracy while learners are trying to settle a difficult implication may impede the communicative work the lesson is designed to support [15].

4.4. CHECKPOINT EXCEPTIONS AND TEACHER ASSISTANCE

Not every triad will reach a sufficiently recoverable agreement at precisely the same moment. If several groups lack a checked plan, the teacher may defer the collective notice for up to five additional minutes, explicitly adjusting later phases. If one group remains unready, it receives a later release after clarification; its reconsideration period may consequently be shorter. The group still joins the common reflection. If it cannot establish a meaningful initial position, it completes initial planning instead and its pivot activity is recorded as incomplete. The teacher should neither invent an agreement for the group nor penalize a student for appropriately requesting clarification.

These departures matter when interpreting classroom performance because apparently similar final products may have been achieved under different levels of teacher support. The observation record distinguishes access assistance (making materials usable), language assistance (clarifying an expression), process assistance (returning an ignored question to the group), reasoning assistance (pointing out a consequence), and solution assistance (offering an arrangement). The final two may be appropriate for instruction, but they change how confidently the ensuing response can be credited to peer reasoning. This record keeps teacher help visible rather than treating all apparently successful group products as equivalent.

5. WHAT ACCOUNTABLE INTERACTION LOOKS LIKE IN TALK

The dialogue examples in this section are authored teaching illustrations designed to make sequential differences visible. They involve no recorded students and should not be presented as classroom findings. In each case, the triad

has already planned simultaneous facilitator-led workshops and has received the one-facilitator notice. The examples isolate differences in the way speakers clarify an interpretation, handle a previous commitment, and respond to a concern.

Illustrative exchange A: negotiating a consequence

A: We could put the two topics at one table.

B: Do you mean teach them together, or do the notes workshop after presentations?

A: I mean one after the other. The facilitator could lead both.

C: That keeps both topics, but we promised people they could choose where to work.

B: They might stay at separate tables and use the printed cards until the facilitator comes over.

A: If somebody on the notes table has a question, when would it be answered?

C: The facilitator could start with presentations, then visit the notes table. We can save a final period for questions from both.

B: So participants keep their chosen table, while the facilitator moves?

C: Yes. Topic choice stays; continuous facilitator access does not. We should explain that to attendees.

B's first question identifies two different possible meanings of "one table" and makes the ambiguity available for repair. A's reply removes that ambiguity but does not resolve the effect on participants. C then makes a prior commitment—topic choice—relevant to the new arrangement. B offers an alternative using materials that the brief already guarantees. A's question places a foreseeable consequence of independent practice before the group. C answers it by specifying facilitator visits, and B checks the interpretation before C confirms exactly what is retained and what is surrendered. This is not simply a conversation with more turns: later contributions demonstrably take up earlier ones.

Short linguistic resources carry much of the interactional work and should not be undervalued simply because they are formally simple. "Do you mean", "that keeps", "but", "if", and "so" allow speakers to display uncertainty, continuity, contrast, consequence, and understanding. Studies of grammar in collaborative talk show that seemingly modest turn beginnings can organize participation and subsequent action; [19], for example, examine "and"-prefaced turns in second-language interaction. The instructional point is not that a learner must use these exact forms. It is that the form must fit a recognizable communicative action in its particular sequence.

Illustrative exchange B: an unanswered concern

A: We agreed people could choose a topic and ask questions while they practise. What happens now with one facilitator?

B: We can teach presentations for thirty minutes and notes for thirty minutes. That fits the hour.

A: But someone who only needs notes might have to wait. Can that person start practising?

C: Two half-hour workshops are fine. Put that on the sheet.

B: All right. Finished.

The plan in Exchange B meets the fixed requirements of one facilitator, two topics, and one hour. Its defect is not that consecutive workshops are intrinsically poor. A raises the group's own participation commitment and then identifies a practical consequence: access for an attendee who wants only the second topic. C closes the matter without answering, rejecting, or openly renegotiating that concern. Judging only the completed schedule would miss the difference between a workable product and an accountable group decision.

Illustrative exchange C: a brief reply that does answer

A: The students remain at their chosen topic table, and the facilitator changes tables after the first practice period. Is that our agreement?

B: Yes. The notes group starts with its card and asks the facilitator questions when she reaches that table.

Here the confirmation is responsive because A has already offered an intelligible and specific account that B can meaningfully accept. B's additional sentence shows how the arrangement handles access to questions. Even the brief "Yes" could have been sufficient in a context where the interpretation was already clear. It would be misleading to

score the word as weak merely because it is short, just as it would be misleading to score a fluent restatement as strong if it distorted a partner's meaning. The surrounding talk determines the appropriate judgement.

These comparisons are suitable for teacher-led discussion and analytic training, not for inferring how learners generally behave in unscripted classrooms. An actual assessment would need the surrounding turns, timing, relevant gestures, and participants' access to the written plans. Conversation-analytic approaches to second-language pedagogy highlight these requirements for sequence-sensitive interpretation [20]. A gesture to a shared timetable or a concise reformulation may accomplish work that a printed dialogue cannot capture. The three examples therefore show what an observer should look for, while making no claim about the frequency or development of such conduct.

6. PARTICIPATION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND INSTRUCTIONAL LIMITS

6.1. A PREDICTABLE CHANGE RATHER THAN A STRESSFUL SURPRISE

An announced change to an exercise can invite interpretation and negotiation; an unexplained withdrawal of support can instead make students feel that the teacher has changed the rules unfairly. This lesson preserves an explicit agreement: learners will encounter one changed operational condition, but their first record, preparation time, right to request clarification, and available participation supports will remain intact. The teacher does not invent an emergency or require learners to disclose sensitive personal experiences. There is no reward for finishing before other groups, and the adequacy of a contribution is not judged by speaking speed.

The distinction is compatible with evidence that second-language anxiety and achievement are negatively associated [21], although the present lesson does not measure anxiety. That association does not establish that a timed task change itself produces anxiety; it is a reason not to treat pressure as a harmless or necessary component of the lesson. If learners report difficulty, the teacher should determine whether it concerns language, uncertainty about the instructions, the practical problem, or the social conditions of talk. Each requires a different response.

The update is available in accessible written form, and an oral or otherwise accessible version can be supplied where needed. Students can annotate conditions in the initial brief and in the notice. If brief planning in a stronger language helps them subsequently participate in English, that option can be offered without treating it as a classroom failure. Learners using assistive communication, written participation, or additional processing time should be judged on the interpretability and relevance of their contributions, not on their conformity to a single spoken delivery mode. An eventual study should document such supports consistently across instructional conditions.

6.2. WHOSE QUESTION CHANGES THE PLAN?

The chief participation risk is that a final group arrangement may look jointly agreed merely because no explicit disagreement appears on the record. One fluent or confident member may repeatedly summarize, choose, and close discussion before others have an opportunity to test the implications. A teacher can reopen a specific unresolved issue: "Someone asked when the notes table would get help. Has that question been answered?" Such a prompt protects interactional space while leaving the content of the decision to the learners. It differs from ordering every student to speak for precisely the same duration regardless of relevance.

Initial responsibilities should rotate in later lessons so that a recurring recorder, summarizer, or spokesperson does not acquire disproportionate control over the group's decisions. Recording the agreement must not automatically give the recorder exclusive authority to interpret it. The peer-scrutiny phase allows another triad to notice practical consequences that the original speakers overlooked. The individual exit reflection can reveal a student's understanding of the decision and whose explanation influenced it, but it is supplementary: a good written account does not prove that the student had influence during the discussion. Observation should also note interruptions, ignored questions, gestures, and moments in which the group offered no meaningful opening for another participant.

The observation record accordingly distinguishes an action *not observed despite a relevant opportunity* from *no relevant opportunity*, because these statuses support different interpretations. These are not interchangeable. The former describes an absence within a documented occasion; the latter describes a limitation of the interactional situation. Neither should be turned into an enduring individual label. Engagement scholarship gives good reason to avoid using visible talk quantity as a substitute for cognitive and social involvement [13, 14].

6.3. WHEN THE EXERCISE DOES NOT CREATE ITS INTENDED OPPORTUNITY

The lesson can fail to create its intended interactional opportunity for several identifiable reasons. If learners had already anticipated the loss of a facilitator and planned a fully viable single-facilitator arrangement, little may need to change. An accurately defended decision is legitimate; introducing additional restrictions until the group struggles would violate the one-change rule. If instructions are inaccessible, the bottleneck is information access rather than contingent response. If the teacher supplies the rotation timetable before learners have considered alternatives, a polished sheet may show teacher-led problem solving rather than peer negotiation.

A different difficulty is social closure, in which a feasible group plan conceals an unanswered concern or restricted opportunity to influence the decision. A group's final plan may be feasible while an attendee-access question raised by one member remains unanswered. Recording only the final product conceals this problem. A factual inconsistency across copies of the notice may also make groups appear differently capable when they were actually working from different requirements. The teacher should document these events and adapt delivery practices, rather than retrospectively classify them as learner deficiencies.

Institutional context also affects implementation, feasibility, and the amount of classroom time available for reconsideration. Reviews of communicative and task-based teaching describe constraints associated with local schooling expectations and instructional conditions [22]. A teacher with limited lesson time can use a single pivot within an ordinary speaking unit; a school need not replace its entire syllabus. The preparation work nevertheless includes checking the initial instructions for contradictions, ensuring that the new condition matters, confirming that several solutions remain feasible, preparing alternative formats, and selecting a specific feature of interaction for reflection. These demands belong in a realistic account of instructional feasibility.

7. ASSESSING INTERACTION BEYOND THE LESSON

7.1. THREE DIFFERENT CLAIMS REQUIRE THREE DIFFERENT FORMS OF EVIDENCE

The classroom procedure offers a means to study contingent response, but successful enactment cannot by itself establish language development. It is necessary to distinguish: (a) whether the task was enacted with the intended timing and access conditions; (b) what participants actually accomplished during discussion; and (c) whether they can perform more adequately on later, comparable occasions. A checked planning sheet and distribution record address the first question. Audio or video recordings, accompanied by task documents, can address the second. A later common assessment with a credible comparison is needed for the third. Scholarship on interaction and instructed second-language acquisition supports investigation of learning through interaction, not an assumption that every negotiation episode produces acquisition [23].

A preliminary feasibility examination should take place across several triads and lessons before the procedure is used for a comparative effectiveness claim. The teacher would record whether groups established an initial commitment, received exactly the stated change, understood the notice, and completed peer scrutiny. Short learner accounts could help differentiate linguistic confusion from disagreement about the event arrangements. Failure to reach a commitment, late release, and intervention by the teacher would be retained as implementation information rather than removed for convenience. Such information would support refinement of the classroom procedure before making a comparative effectiveness claim, in line with educational design research practice [24].

The natural unit for examining contingent response is a *reconsideration episode*: a stretch of interaction in which a participant makes the changed condition relevant to an earlier commitment and the group addresses, defers, or closes its implications. An episode begins with that relevance becoming visible in talk, gesture, or use of the planning sheet; its end follows the participants' handling of the matter rather than a fixed interval. If participants return later to the same unresolved concern, the later exchange remains analytically linked. Attention to the participant's preceding contribution and the recipient's next action is essential; isolated sentences can be misleading [2, 20].

7.2. A MATCHED INSTRUCTIONAL COMPARISON

A feasible next research step is a comparison between two instructional arrangements that differ in the timing of the consequential staffing information. The pivot condition follows the sequence described above: initial agreement, a scheduled new staffing condition, reconsideration, peer scrutiny, and reflection. The comparison condition receives the same final staffing information before its first group agreement. It then undertakes a scheduled reconsideration without receiving a further staffing change. Both conditions have the same event requirements, instruction time, practice cards,

language support, opportunities to question another group, and language-focused reflection. Neither condition should be made deliberately dull or unsupported.

This comparison would estimate the consequence of teaching through a complete lesson organized around a consequential late change, rather than isolate every component of the lesson. It would not identify the independent contribution of the notice, the commitment record, teacher rehearsal, peer scrutiny, or the reflection period. The two conditions differ in what their members have previously agreed and therefore in the immediate reasons they have to explain a change. Differences in talk during the teaching lesson would consequently describe the opportunities created, not an unbiased direct measure of acquired competence.

Before instruction, participants could complete a common collaborative speaking activity to provide a baseline description of their starting performance. A practicable initial teaching schedule would include three encounters using different familiar planning problems. Both conditions would then complete the same immediate assessment and an additional assessment approximately three weeks after teaching. These numbers are planning choices, not empirically established minimum exposure or retention periods. The assessment should require both conditions to reach a recoverable decision and then address the same consequential change, even though their instructional histories differed.

A useful later assessment task could concern student groups sharing two study rooms at a university library. Once a group has assigned activities and agreed how members will use the two rooms, the assessor announces that one room has become unavailable. The group must preserve the legitimate study purposes within the remaining space or justify a reasonable adjustment. This changes content and relevant vocabulary without reproducing the facilitator case. Parallel assessment versions should be checked for comparability in familiarity, reading load, and practical difficulty before results are interpreted. An ordinary collaborative segment without a changed condition can also reveal whether a focus on responsive reconsideration has displaced other useful forms of interaction.

New partners would be particularly informative because a triad may develop efficient local routines that do not persist with other interlocutors. For the principal group-level comparison, assessment triads should be formed from learners assigned to the same instructional condition so that mixed training histories do not complicate interpretation. New partner arrangements and assessment prompts should be specified in advance. Performance on this library task would test a restricted form of transfer across task content and partners, not demonstrate effectiveness in every classroom, professional, or everyday interaction.

7.3. DESCRIBING THE DELAYED GROUP OUTCOME

The primary delayed outcome would be the contextual adequacy of the triad's response to the consequential change in the common assessment task. This is a group-level judgement about the focal interaction, not a score assigned automatically to each participant. Appendix B provides a recording sheet and four evidence-status distinctions. For development work, the delayed outcome can be described using the following categories:

Accountable response established.

The group correctly relates the changed condition to its earlier agreement, explains a defensible decision to preserve or alter the arrangement, and makes a relevant consequence intelligible and available to another participant's response.

Partially established.

The relationship is addressed, but a consequential misinterpretation, unresolved ambiguity, or ignored relevant concern prevents an adequate common account.

Not established.

Despite an identifiable earlier agreement and an accessible change, participants do not provide a defensible connection or treat the matter as closed while bypassing its central implication.

Indeterminate.

The recording, prior agreement, or other necessary context is missing, so the evidence cannot support a judgement. This is not a low-performance category.

The three substantive descriptions provide interpretable anchors for development work, but they are not a validated proficiency scale. Observers would need examples covering difficult boundaries, including an accurate but brief confirmation, a partially resolved concern, a strong individual answer without peer uptake, and a teacher-supplied

solution. A coder should document the words or sequence that supports the judgement as well as a plausible alternative reading. Individual annotations would retain who raised the consequential issue, who answered or bypassed it, whether the student had a relevant chance to participate, and how teacher help changed the exchange. Group adequacy must not be mistaken for uniform individual development.

7.4. CREDIBILITY, ANALYSIS, AND EVIDENCE AGAINST THE EXPLANATION

A research protocol would specify the assessment task, episode boundaries, rating guidance, primary delayed comparison, and treatment of absent or unusable evidence before instructional differences are examined. Methods for classroom interaction and task research emphasize documenting such collection and interpretation decisions [25]. Independently trained assessors should judge the delayed recordings without access to each group's instructional condition wherever concealment is practicable. Common assessment instructions can help; visible or audible references to previous instruction that compromise concealment should be reported. Double coding, a measure of agreement suited to ordered categories, records of disagreements, and justification for indeterminate cases would provide a basis for examining consistency. No agreement coefficient or validity finding is available for this article.

If intact classes are assigned to conditions to prevent information spreading between neighbouring groups, the analysis must respect class-level clustering. Several classes per condition and, where practicable, several teachers would reduce the danger of confounding teaching style with treatment. With repeated assessments, the dependence created by recurring learners or assessment groups also needs attention. Allocation may be random where institutional conditions permit; otherwise pre-instruction differences and selection limitations must be acknowledged. Sample-size calculations would require estimates of outcome distribution, class and group variation, missing recordings, and a difference considered educationally meaningful. Choosing a convenient number of students without those assumptions would give a false impression of precision.

A comparison should retain unsuccessful or incomplete instructional occasions in its implementation record rather than discard them because they complicate interpretation. Absence from a later assessment, inaccessible notices, missing audio, and groups that never established an initial position are different problems and should be accounted for by condition. The analysis should define in advance how these cases enter the main comparison and accompanying sensitivity checks. Quantitative differences, if eventually estimated, would need to be interpreted alongside selected successful, unsuccessful, and ambiguous episodes rather than treated as self-explanatory evidence of communication quality.

The pedagogical claim is deliberately vulnerable to several findings that would narrow or challenge the proposed explanation. The pivot condition might elicit richer explanations during instruction but show no advantage when all groups face the same later task. The apparent benefit could depend on teacher prompts that already identify the solution. More confident speakers might assume greater control while quieter participants lose influence. Learners might become adept at reciting a sequence of familiar phrases without responding accurately to unfamiliar objections. Any improvement might vanish with new partners or a new practical problem. These outcomes would narrow or challenge the claim that the lesson develops transferable responsive interaction; they could not simply be dismissed as imperfect student performance.

A more limited but still educationally meaningful result is also possible. The exercise may help teachers observe how learners currently connect proposals, reasons, and concerns, even if its contribution to later learning is uncertain. That use would justify adopting it as a diagnostic and teaching opportunity, not describing it as an experimentally established route to acquisition. The distinction protects the interpretation of evidence and helps teachers decide what the exercise can reasonably accomplish.

8. CONCLUSION

A change to a task brief becomes instructionally valuable when it requires learners to explain what that change means for a decision they have already made together. The task pivot creates that need through a checked initial agreement, one consequential alteration, and an opportunity for the group to question, preserve, or renegotiate its commitment. The study-skills lesson translates those conditions into specific instructions, a timed classroom sequence, feasible staffing choices, accessible practice materials, and a review of how contributions fit the preceding talk.

The chief instructional distinction is between completing an event plan and making a joint decision accountable, interpretable, and open to scrutiny by other participants. A correct timetable can leave a relevant objection unanswered; a short but locally accurate confirmation can establish shared understanding. Teachers must therefore attend to the

relationship between contributions and to the distribution of opportunities to influence the plan, while distinguishing peer reasoning from assistance that supplies an answer. The observation guide and the delayed comparison plan identify the evidence needed to investigate these matters. Until that testing is completed, the defensible contribution is a fully specified way to teach and examine responsive reconsideration in university EFL group work, not a demonstrated claim about learning gains.

Study Materials and Ethical Considerations. Not applicable.

Data Availability. No new empirical dataset was generated for this article.

Conflicts of Interest. The author declares no competing interests.

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies. Generative artificial intelligence tools were used solely to assist with language editing, stylistic refinement, and $\text{\LaTeX}$ preparation. The author reviewed and verified all AI-assisted wording, interpretations, citations, and references and accepts full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and scholarly content of the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Galaczi, E. D. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 553–574. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt017>
- [2] Lam, D. M. K. (2018). What counts as “responding”? Contingency on previous speaker contribution as a feature of interactional competence. *Language Testing*, 35(3), 377–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126>
- [3] East, M. (2021). *Foundational principles of task-based language teaching*. Routledge.
- [4] Ellis, R. (2017). Position paper: Moving task-based language teaching forward. *Language Teaching*, 50(4), 507–526.
- [5] Ahmadian, M. J. (2012). Task repetition in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 380–382. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs020>
- [6] Lambert, C., Kormos, J., & Minn, D. (2017). Task repetition and second language speech processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(1), 167–196.
- [7] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Task repetition or task iteration?: It does make a difference. In M. Bygate (Ed.), *Learning language through task repetition* (pp. 311–329). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.11.12lar>.
- [8] Galaczi, E., & Taylor, L. (2018). Interactional competence: Conceptualisations, operationalisations, and outstanding questions. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(3), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2018.1453816>
- [9] Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1437759>
- [10] Pekarek Doehler, S., & Eskildsen, S. W. (2022). Emergent L2 grammars in and for social interaction: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 106(S1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12759>
- [11] Robinson, P. (2011). Task-based language learning: A review of issues. *Language Learning*, 61(Suppl. 1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00641.x>
- [12] Révész, A., Michel, M., & Gilabert, R. (2016). Measuring cognitive task demands using dual-task methodology, subjective self-ratings, and expert judgments: A validation study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38(4), 703–737. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000339>
- [13] Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 50–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094>
- [14] Sulis, G., & Mercer, S. (2025). The choreography of engagement in the language classroom: Exploring the dynamic interplay between learner and teacher engagement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 117, Article 102586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102586>
- [15] Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(4), 591–626.
- [16] Van den Branden, K. (2016). The role of teachers in task-based language education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 164–181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000070>
- [17] Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- [18] Lambert, C., Philp, J., & Nakamura, S. (2017). Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(6), 665–680. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816683559>
- [19] Tüma, F., Kääntä, L., & Jakonen, T. (2023). L2 grammar-for-interaction: Functions of “and”-prefaced turns in L2 students’ collaborative talk. *The Modern Language Journal*, 107(4), 991–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12885>
- [20] Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2021). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

-
- [21] Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 363–387. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000311>
- [22] Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36–57.
- [23] Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285–329. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000125>
- [24] McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. C. (2019). *Conducting educational design research* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [25] Mackey, A. (2020). *Interaction, feedback and task research in second language learning: Methods and design*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589284>.

A. STUDENT INSTRUCTIONS, PRACTICE CARDS, AND RESPONSE FORMS

The following sheets are ready for adaptation to an EFL speaking lesson. They describe a fictional campus event; they are not transcripts or records of a class in which the activity has been tested. The event lasts one hour, and the classroom discussion about planning it lasts approximately 70 minutes. The teacher supplies the initial sheet first and distributes the staffing notice only after checking that each triad has established an agreement.

A.1. INITIAL INSTRUCTIONS: ORGANIZING THE STUDY-SKILLS EVENT

Your group's responsibility. You are organizing a one-hour study-skills session for university students. Two topics must be available: *planning a short presentation* and *organizing revision notes*. An attendee must be able to try at least one topic. Public demonstrations are optional; nobody is required to use a personal device. One room and printed practice cards for both topics are available throughout the hour.

Starting arrangement. At the outset, two facilitators are available, and either facilitator can lead either topic. Begin by considering two workshops at separate tables, running at the same time. Your group decides how attendees select a topic, whether they may change tables, when they practise, and when they can ask a facilitator for help. If staffing changes, another way of organizing the session is permitted, provided that both topics remain accessible within the hour.

Planning responsibility. One member should begin by considering attendees' needs, another the room and printed resources, and another the facilitators' duties. These are starting perspectives, not exclusive access to information. All members may read everything and question every decision. Agree on an arrangement, name at least one participation commitment your group wants to preserve, and explain why it matters. A member who did not record the arrangement must then restate it so that others can confirm or correct the account.

A.2. INITIAL AGREEMENT RECORD

Use short notes rather than polished paragraphs. The teacher will ask your group to keep this page available for the second part of the activity.

1. Our initial arrangement, including how attendees practise and ask questions: _____
2. The fixed event requirements our arrangement meets: _____
3. One participation commitment we chose, beyond simply following the instructions: _____
4. Why that commitment matters for attendees: _____
5. Another member's restatement or question, and our response: _____
6. Any important point on which we have not reached agreement: _____

Teacher checkpoint: confirm that an arrangement, a reason or priority, and a second member's restatement are identifiable. An unresolved disagreement must not be silently recorded as consensus.

A.3. STAFFING NOTICE: DISTRIBUTE ONLY AT THE CHECKPOINT

Change to the event: Only **one facilitator** can now attend. All other information in your initial instructions remains valid. Both topics must still be offered during the one-hour event. Reconsider your

group's arrangement. Explain what can stay the same, what must change, and why. You may reread your first plan and ask for clarification before discussing the notice. There is no reward for finishing first.

A.4. DECISION AND EXPLANATION RECORD

A different arrangement is acceptable if you can explain how it meets the requirements and addresses the staffing change. You may also retain a part of your first plan with a suitable justification. Record the reasoning you are willing to explain to another group.

1. Our earlier decision depended on this staffing arrangement: _____
2. The staffing notice affects it in the following way: _____
3. We will retain or renegotiate this participation commitment because: _____
4. Our arrangement for the full 60 minutes, including practice and questions: _____
5. Another workable option we considered, and why we did not select it: _____
6. A partner's question or explanation that affected the decision: _____
7. A remaining uncertainty, if any: _____

Peer question. Exchange both planning records and the staffing notice with another triad. Ask how the later arrangement handles a genuine consequence, such as when attendees can practise or approach the facilitator. The other group may clarify, defend, or amend its explanation. Your aim is to understand the arrangement, not to find a grammatical mistake.

A.5. PRINTED PRACTICE CARD 1: PLANNING A SHORT PRESENTATION

Purpose: Prepare a brief presentation plan without a personal device. You can complete the first steps independently and ask a facilitator for feedback when one is available.

1. Write the subject and the audience in one line. What should listeners know or be able to do afterward?
2. Draft an opening sentence and two main points. Put those points in the order that will be easiest for an audience to follow.
3. For each main point, write one example or supporting detail. Identify a transition that makes the connection between points clear.
4. Prepare a closing sentence. If you wish, practise explaining the outline to a partner; a public performance is not required.
5. Note one question about your structure or clarity for a facilitator to address when available.

What you can keep: A one-page outline, one example for each main point, and a specific question about your planned explanation. The card can be used without immediate facilitator attention.

A.6. PRINTED PRACTICE CARD 2: ORGANIZING REVISION NOTES

Purpose: Turn familiar course content into notes that help you check your understanding. You do not need digital materials or a public demonstration.

1. Choose a familiar course topic. Write its title and identify three important ideas from materials you already have or remember.
2. Arrange the ideas under short headings. For each heading, record one explanation, example, or keyword that helps you recall its meaning.
3. Write two questions you should be able to answer later without looking at the notes. Try answering them from memory.

4. Mark a point that remains unclear and identify what information you would need to resolve it. A partner may check the clarity of your headings.
5. Prepare one question about organizing or checking your notes for the facilitator's next visit.

What you can keep: A short structured note sheet, two recall questions, and a marked uncertainty to discuss. The card provides an independent activity while the facilitator is helping the other table.

A.7. OPTIONAL LANGUAGE SUPPORT

- Referring back: "We first agreed that ..."; "Our plan depended on ..."
- Linking a condition to a consequence: "If only one person leads, then ..."; "That would mean ..."
- Checking an interpretation: "When you say ..., do you mean ...?"; "So the people would stay at ...?"
- Protecting a commitment: "We can still keep ..., provided that ..."
- Raising a concern: "That answers the staffing question, but what happens when ...?"
- Explaining a decision: "We considered ...; we chose ... because ..."

These expressions are available for use, not mandatory lines. A concise answer, an appropriate gesture toward the timetable, or a written clarification may do the same communicative work. Learners should choose wording that genuinely addresses a partner's question.

A.8. INDIVIDUAL EXIT REFLECTION

In a short written or accessible oral response, explain: (a) which participation commitment your group kept or altered; (b) how the loss of a facilitator changed the event arrangement; and (c) one contribution by a partner that you understood, questioned, or still find unresolved. If you had no meaningful opportunity to raise a concern, you may say so. The reflection is not a speed test and does not replace evidence of how the group interaction unfolded.

B. OBSERVATION GUIDE FOR TASK ENACTMENT AND PEER RESPONSE

This guide separates documentation of the classroom activity from judgments about what participants accomplished through talk. Its descriptors provide an explicit record for teacher reflection and possible pilot research. They do not constitute a validated diagnostic or proficiency scale. Observers should preserve context and relevant sequences rather than total the prompts into an overall score. Table 4 identifies the specific forms of sequential evidence that observers should locate within a reconsideration episode.

B.1. CONTEXT AND ENACTMENT

Lesson/date: _____ Group identifier: _____

Observer: _____

Evidence: live notes / audio / video / group sheets / other: _____

1. Before the staffing notice, was there a specific group arrangement and a reason or participation commitment?
Evidence: _____
2. Did another participant restate, clarify, or question the initial arrangement? Evidence:

3. Did the distributed notice change only the number of facilitators? If not, describe the inconsistency: _____
4. Could each participant read, hear, or otherwise access the notice and ask for clarification? Support: _____
5. Was the notice released at the planned checkpoint, later to everyone, or later to this group? Additional time:

6. Was the full activity completed, partly completed, or not enacted? Describe the circumstances: _____

B.2. A RECONSIDERATION EPISODE

Recording position or note identifier: _____

Relevant initial agreement and changed condition: _____

Start and end of the episode, including later returns: _____

TABLE 4. EVIDENCE TO LOCATE WHEN EXAMINING ACCOUNTABLE RESPONSE

Focus	Evidence in the interaction	Common interpretive mistake
Return to a prior commitment	An accurate reference to what the group agreed, or why the arrangement mattered; this may involve speech or a shared record.	Uttering “our first plan” does not alone establish that the relevant commitment was understood.
Consequence of the staffing notice	A question or explanation connecting the loss of one facilitator to an affected part of the arrangement.	Merely repeating “one facilitator” does not identify the practical consequence.
Retention or change of a decision	A defensible reason for preserving a commitment, altering it, or explicitly negotiating a different priority.	Visible change is not always superior to justified retention.
Response to a peer	A contribution that addresses a particular preceding interpretation, question, concern, or alternative.	A memorized phrase may sound fluent while failing to represent another person’s meaning.
Shared understanding and scrutiny	A relevant question, accurate restatement, appropriate confirmation, substantive objection, or openly acknowledged uncertainty.	A finished timetable, rapid agreement, or silence does not establish that every member understood the decision.

For each focus, attach a short example or recording reference and annotate one of four statuses: *observed*; *not observed despite a relevant opportunity*; *no relevant opportunity*; or *indeterminate because the evidence is insufficient*. The statuses refer to what an observer can establish, not to an enduring quality of an individual learner. A speaker may contribute through an accurate restatement or gesture even when no explicit objection occurs.

B.3. GROUP OUTCOME DESCRIPTIONS FOR A LATER COMMON ASSESSMENT

Accountable response established.

The group correctly connects the change to its earlier decision, explains an arrangement that addresses it, and makes a consequence available for another member’s understanding or scrutiny. The interpretation depends on the actual surrounding sequence, not a required script.

Partially established.

The group addresses some relevant consequence, but a material ambiguity, inaccurate representation, or previously raised concern remains unresolved when the group closes the issue.

Not established.

An adequate opportunity exists, but the group bypasses the relevant condition or provides no defensible connection between the changed fact and its earlier commitment. Direct teacher provision of the answer must be documented rather than credited as an unaided group achievement.

Indeterminate.

The initial commitment, important surrounding talk, recording, or access conditions are insufficiently documented for an outcome judgement. The reason must be recorded, not reinterpreted as poor performance.

Outcome and sequential evidence: _____

A credible alternative reading and evidence needed: _____

These descriptions do not demand equal numbers of turns, explicit disagreement, a certain connective, or modification of every feature of the initial plan. An unanswered concern matters when it changes the meaning, accessibility, or practical feasibility of the arrangement; ordinary preferences that do not affect the decision need not each become a separate debate.

B.4. INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION AND TEACHER SUPPORT

For each member, document at least one relevant contribution and what followed: addressed / bypassed / interrupted / postponed / unclear. Note whether another appropriate chance to respond arose. Include a gesture, written note, or assistive contribution where it shaped the exchange. The individual exit response may supplement an interpretation of understanding but cannot retroactively prove participation that was not observed.

Classify teacher assistance as (1) access, (2) language, (3) process, (4) reasoning, or (5) solution support; record what was actually said or done and when. “How does that arrangement respond to the staffing notice?” invites an explanation. “Could the facilitator move between tables?” introduces a particular option and thus supplies a part of the reasoning. Record difficulties with English separately from uncertainty about task instructions, event logistics, and social pressure.

B.5. REQUIREMENTS BEFORE USE IN RESEARCH

Before research comparisons, pilot recordings should be used to refine episode boundaries and outcome descriptions, train independent coders, and establish rules for disagreement and missing evidence. Report coder agreement alongside relevant extracts and uncertainty. This guide has not been piloted or validated, and no reliability estimate is available.