Which Medium *Before* or *After* Possible Action Completion:
One Signature of Intersubjectivity in Foreign Language Classroom

Kazuki Hata

Which Medium *Before* or *After* Possible Action Completion: One Signature of Intersubjectivity in Foreign Language Classroom

Foreign Language Education Centre   Kazuki Hata

Introduction

Talk is a vital activity in most social situations where people interact with one another in an orderly and normative fashion through systematically-organised reciprocal exchanges of perspectives. In this sense, an utterance is neither mere a combination of linguistic productions for semiotic meaning-making, nor does it arise as a random product of human exchanges. What happens in all classrooms is, unexceptionally, interactions between participants: teachers and students, whereby it can be distinguished in some ways from ordinary conversation. Classroom interaction is institutionally an unequal-power speech exchange system, but essentially co-operative (Markee, 2000). It is in one sense true that teachers have dominating roles as a topic provider, turn allocator, and assessor (Johnson, 1995), and ultimately as individuals responsible for promoting students' learning opportunities (Walsh, 2013). On the other hand, students also have the responsibility to engage in learning by aligning with pedagogical foci. Here, negotiation is crucial for successful learning opportunities by attaining a reciprocity of perspectives between teachers and students.

In language classrooms, for example, reciprocity of interaction is the base for maximising the learning space of students, wherein participants design interactional resources to fulfil specific pedagogical agendas. When a teacher asks a question, his/her action is not produced to request information about something unknown, as in general questions, but pedagogically oriented to

prompt a required response from students. Students are expected to take the next turn to provide relevant answers that satisfy the teacher's particular focus at that moment. The teacher then provides follow-up comments, evaluations, and further explanations. This prototypical three-part move is driven in many classroom interactions as a vehicle to accomplish pedagogical goals based on the collaborative engagement of the participants.[1] If the teacher's question is enacted to check the form and accuracy of students' production, erroneous resources may be oriented as blockage and remediated through several actions to resolve the trouble. If the question is content-focused, on the other hand, a grammatical error is not always corrected since accuracy is not then a requirement in students' production. This interactional feature of teaching is even observable in one-way-type classrooms, where no interaction seems to be explicitly observed. As in content-based academic lectures, teachers are institutionally centred on providing instruction, explanation, or presentation, rather than facilitating verbal exchanges, but their delivery is expected to receive students' aligning actions in several forms of embodiment, such as writing for notetaking and head-nods.

One example of institutional negotiation, taking place especially in language classroom interaction, is seen in codeswitching practices.[2] When a medium of learning activities is institutionally constrained into only the target language (L2), students' provision in their first language (L1) constitutes a possible deviancy. However, the (in)appropriateness of codeswitching is not something fully predetermined as a classroom language policy. Rather, it emerges in their interaction practice as an outcome of intersubjective negotiation regarding whether a particular language choice is acceptable or deviant. The L1 switch is thus a 'possible' blockage or breaching resource at the moment of its production, but whether it so acts depends on how teachers and students treat their language choices and mutually negotiate the particular need for codeswitching. In other words, L2 is contextually shaped as a normative medium through a turn-by-turn course of actions, and this context is renewable with partial allowance of codeswitching in line with what

the teacher (or students) is pedagogically oriented (Sert, 2015; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). When teachers orient to codeswitching as deviant, they move to deal with students' inappropriate alteration of language medium in language policing acts as formatted in overt requests, e.g. warning, for students' realignment (Amir & Musk, 2013).

There are many significant insights in codeswitching according to how participants collaboratively negotiate the appropriateness of a particular language choice, either L1 or L2, how they design a language choice in alignment with their pedagogical focus, and in which way they respond to the language choice with a display of acceptance or rejection. These questions should not be considered from the limited perspective of the actual fact of violating the predetermined all-in-L2 policy or form-function mapping to codeswitched L1. Being situated in conversation analysis (CA), this article, as part of an ongoing grant-aided project, highlights intersubjective features of language classroom interaction by focusing on a specific codeswitching design for fulfilling the goal-oriented purposes. The data represents naturally occurring engagements of teachers and students in communicative task-based activities in *English as a Foreign language* (EFL) classrooms in Japan. Based on the exploration of two sequentially different codeswitching deployments: pre- or post-completion, there is evidence of underlying preferences in light of the treatment of (in)appropriate language choices in action formation. Namely, codeswitching does not automatically become an alteration of a mutually-agreed medium of the activity as in its emergence, but the language choice is addressed in close relation to whether the speaker accomplishes what he/she is pedagogically required at the moment in the preferred medium, which is an outcome of reciprocal turn-by-turn exchange in the sequential environment.

Emic approach

Taking an ethnomethodological stance on talk, the central CA premise is that social interaction is orderly and intersubjectively achieved through a reciprocal exchange of turns: units of utterance formatted to project the

speaker's design to perform a social action (Drew, 2013, p. 131). Talk is never randomly constructed as a cluster of utterances but is mutually organised wherein conversation participants carefully monitor the ongoing exchange to understand when their participation becomes relevant and meaningfully design their social action incorporated as part of talk (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013).

Centred on the structure of sequencing actions, there are four concepts of what Schegloff (2007, p. xiv) called 'generic orders' of organisation, which are key for interpreting my analysis. Note that an illustration below is kept minimal for reasons of space.

(a)　Turn-taking organisation

One orderliness in our interaction is that only one speaker speaks at a time in a single conversation on a turn-by-turn basis (Schegloff, 2000, p. 47). Participants monitor the 'floor' to speak (Sacks, 1972), or right timing for them to take a turn, by recognising the possible completion of one turn. This completion point is not necessarily identical to its grammatical completion point, but rather a point where the speaker's action becomes understandable. When the current turn production reaches a possible completion point, a transition relevance place (TRP) arises where the next turn can be initiated (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974. When multiple speakers talk at the same time, participants may orient to the ongoing overlap as deviant and can deploy resolution strategies such as withdrawal (Oloff, 2013; Schegloff, 2000).

(b)　Sequence organisation

An interaction is normatively organised based on coherent relevance between different turns, in that meaning of each action is mutually shaped through turn-by-turn exchange. Context is thus interpreted as a co-constructed

product of "mutual understandings created through a sequential architecture of intersubjectivity" (Heritage, 2005, p. 105). Once the first turn is completed, it provides powerful constraints on the next action (Schegloff, 1968), contextualising the trajectory of the following talk. For instance, if the first action is a request, affirmation or denial is conditionally relevant to the next. Upon a completion of such conditionally-relevant adjacency pair, a sequence is accomplished by opening up space to initiate the next sequence.

(c) Preference organisation

The relevance between the first and second action is contingent so that the next action does not always serve to promote the first action. The next speaker always has options to accept or block the first action, but designedly displays affiliation or disaffiliation in a way of maximising the maintenance of solidarity (Heritage, 1984b, p. 265). When the next speaker accepts the first, a quick and direct response is a preferred action that favours the progression of the sequence. On the other hand, blocking the second is dispreferred in a delayed and/or indirect format (Raymond, 2003). These notions of preference highlight regularities in the systematic display of the speaker's stance toward the course of action, not the speaker's psychological motivations or intentions.

(d) Repair organisation

Sequence organisation is driven by the accomplishment of mutual understanding between speakers, and therefore an inadequate understanding of the prior action becomes a

blockage for continuing the sequence. If absence of an aligning action is noticeable at a particular moment, the speaker him/ herself or co-speakers pursue what is missing by temporally halting the sequence to collaboratively identify and fix the interactional problem (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). Repair is thus not simply equivalent to a correction to reformulate erroneous productions, but is done to resolve an interactional problem arising through a talk-in-interaction at "each of the positions at which repair DOES get initiated is a position at which repair CAN get initiated" (p. 374), which neither deals with speech incompetency nor reformulates what has been produced.

These are all routinely observable organisational practices of participants, involving a series of systematic methods to accomplish their talk in an intersubjective and coherent manner. By designing verbal and non-verbal resources as the carrier of an underpinned action, they mutually shape or renew a particular context; therefore, a context is an outcome of their intersubjective exchange, neither predetermined nor always universal. Instead, these organisations are emergent on a turn-by-turn basis and accessible to the participants, becoming something accountable to analysts who investigate "actual utterances in actual contexts" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 18).

Data

My analysis derives from approximately 15 hours of recorded naturally-occurring classroom interaction in EFL courses at two universities in Japan. The data mostly represent in-person classroom interactions, but include two-hour recordings of online classes via the online meeting system *Zoom* during COVID-19 outbreaks in 2020. The participating students are all Japanese-speaking learners of English as the target language[3], taking English communication courses to fulfil their compulsory units. They are first-year

students who were allocated to pre-intermediate or intermediate-level classes based on their scores in English proficiency exams at the beginning of the spring semester. In these courses, each teacher to some extent allows students to use their L1 but regularly provides activities in L2 as an institutional medium of interaction to generate opportunities for using formally instructed phrases and vocabularies. Students are thus engaged in highly reciprocal and extended courses of action with pedagogical orientations drawn by the teachers (Macbeth, 2000).

The interaction considered in this study is distinguishable from ordinary conversation on the following points. First, their classroom interactions are not an equally powered exchange system, as the teacher plays a directive and responsive role and the students are offered turns when they are asked to promote the teacher's action (Markee & Kasper, 2004), such as normatively displaying their acceptable understanding of the class contents. Second, the status of English as a medium of interaction is first promoted by teachers and then mutually shaped with students as a context in their sequential environment. This sort of language policy is neither something predetermined nor a highlight of what exactly the teacher cognitively wants the student to do, but instead contextualised inside their practice (Spolsky, 2004). Once the L2 is shaped as a normative medium to accomplish their activity, an alteration of the medium from L2 to L1 becomes a possible blockage of their activity and thus is sequentially resolved with teachers' pedagogical interferences (Amir & Musk, 2013; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). When students are requested to produce a preferable response in alignment with the suggested trajectory of the ongoing activity but face certain difficulties in L2[4], they design their utterance as minimally breaching by taking several organisational methods including (but not limited to) making an incomplete L2 utterance to ask for assistance at the time of production (Koshik, 2002) [5], or temporally suspending their contextualised medium to activate a local management of their talk (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002). Apart from these possibilities, the cited examples represent a specific formulation to produce

L1 after possible action completion in L2. This codeswitching design works to foreground a preference of accomplishment while minimising the risk of violating an institutionally contextualised normative medium.

All excerpts were transcribed under the systematic Jeffersonian transcription conventions to allow detailed descriptions of temporal and sequential relationships between different units of talk and the aspects of speech delivery (see Appendix for the list of symbols appeared in the cited excerpts). Note that any identifiable aspects are excluded from the extracts and kept private as per a data-handling policy set for the recordings. In the excerpts, each participant is assigned a random name different from their real name.

Analysis

This section highlights an observable proof of intersubjectivity in the EFL language classroom by exploring a systematic design of codeswitching in particular sequential placement. The cited extracts depict the importance of the temporality of codeswitching in action formation. When the student's preferred action is understandable in its original L2 formation, the post-completion codeswitching is treated as elaborative and non-breaching of the normative medium of the L2 activity. On the other hand, in the case of the placement of L1 as a vital component to understand the speaker's action, codeswitching is oriented as deviant and sequentially repaired in line with the teacher's request for realignment.

Let us begin by considering the following example where a student successfully induces the teacher's positive evaluation of what has been produced in L2 with an aid of post-completion codeswitching. In the middle of warm-up tasks to preview the previously covered expressions for numbers, the teacher (T in the extract) asks the student Masa a question in line 52. This question is formatted with the pedagogical focus of inducing Masa's display of his understanding of the target phrase about the monthly rent for his apartment. Accepting a recipient role, Masa performs a responsive action

in lines 56–59, in which he first completes a syntactically completable turn in L2 components and then codeswitches to disclose more than L2 resources.[6]

Extract 1

```
52  T:            how much is your <monthly rent> for a month?
53                (.)
54                tell ↑me.
55                (0.8)
56  MASA:         okay er
57                (1.0)
58       ->       my rent is ah:: about seventy thousands=
59       ->       =[nana-ma ]n roku-sen    yen
                     seventy-six thousand
60  T:            =[seve(n)-]
61                (0.3)
62                oh good.
63                (.)
64                seventy-six thousand=
65                =h[mm
66  MASA:           [yes yes yes
67                (0.7)
68  T:            reas(h)onable I guess.
69                (0.2)
70  MASA:         hh huh huh
```

Masa's responsive turn is normatively designed as a preferred action to satisfy the teacher's question, but he codeswitches into L1 when the turn reaches its possible completion point in L2, which is evident in the teacher's turn-taking in line 60. His L1 is produced without any prosodic break after completing the L2 turn and is thus syntactically dislocated (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, 2007), which discloses more precise information at that moment in connection to the particular item "seventy thousand" in the previous L2 turn[7].

The appropriateness of Masa's response with his codeswitched unit is a final product of reciprocal negotiation between the student and the teacher in sequence. In line 62, the teacher first displays a change of epistemic state from unknowing to knowing in his production of "oh"[8], next opens his positive evaluation, and then provides a follow-up commentary that incorporates L2 and L1 resources into a more accurate format in line 64. At that moment, no pedagogical orientation is made to either L1 as a

breaching of normative medium of the interaction or to induce reworking from Masa. That is, the teacher confirms Masa's attempt as something preferable, mutually understandable, and institutionally acceptable as in its format of L2 first and L1 next. From these points of observation, Masa's specific design of post-completion codeswitching can be a pedagogically-oriented device to accomplish his alignment with the activity by foregrounding a normative medium of the interaction (L2) in a vital action completion and underemphasising the provision of L1 as elaborative aside the accomplishment of the required action.

What Extract 1 sheds light on is the normative orderliness of the interactional medium, not just a language code. Namely, L2 is treated as a normative choice to complete a responsive action in its preferred format, and L1 is understood as an additional resource. In this sense, provision of L1 *before* possible completion of a required action is treatable as a blockage in the activity in all-in-L2, indexing an unreasonable alteration of an agreed, already contextualised medium. With regard to this implication, I now turn to the deviant case of codeswitching in Extract 2, where L1 is placed as a necessary component in turn construction and treated as dispreferred in receipt of the teacher's pedagogical interference of overtly requesting a realignment. As background, this extract represents part of the follow-up interaction after finishing a group-speaking task based on the activities in the textbook. Before line 26, the teacher noticed that the student Kai did not actively participate in his group work, which was, as the teacher mentions in line 26, not usual.

Extract 2

```
26  T:           wh:y you don' talk much today.
27              (0.6)
28  KAI:  ->    because I °er:::° ne-    busoku ?
                                  sleep  lack of
            JP:          I was not getting enough sleep
29              (0.4)
30  T:     X    in english p↑lease?
31              (0.3)
32  KAI:        so(h)rry
33              (0.3)
34              ah:: I er not sleeping well
35              °yester[day°
36  T:                 [but wh:y you didn't?
37              (0.5)
38  KAI:        why (0.3) er:m
```

The extract starts in line 26 when the teacher takes a turn to ask Kai the reason for remaining silent in the previous group work. Kai replies with no delay in his type-conforming response (Raymond, 2003), starting with "because" to the teacher's "why"-question, which displays a strong preference in L2, but then codeswitches into L1 to complete his preferred responsive action. The teacher treats this codeswitching as an unnormative switch of the agreed medium, not just a language code, leading to her projection of warning in line 30 to re-establish the trajectory in L2. This pedagogically-oriented interference, or policing (Amir & Musk, 2013), is not practiced with an overtly negative evaluation by denying the response itself. Rather, this is a negotiation with the recipient Kai, the L1 producer, who is given a choice to resolve the identified problem in the next line or to refuse it. In lines 32–35, Kai accepts the proposed all-in-L2 trajectory by first acknowledging his previous misalignment in a format of apology and then recompleting his response in L2. Once action completion is accomplished in L2, there is a readiness to move on. In line 36, after the student's reworking, the teacher reorients to the previous "why" question that is still left unsolved and needs further clarification from Kai.

The previous examples have revealed that the production of L1 is not a direct cause of stigmatisation as blockage to accomplish pedagogical

agendas. There are interactional reasons for the participants to accept or deny codeswitching, which is not simply based on predetermined language policies in the classroom but instead arises in their practice with particular intersubjective need to do so. Extract 1, for example, showed the teacher's treatment of acceptably incorporating the emergence of L1 as an elaborative item to the previously completable L2 action, which foregrounds the achievement in L2 over the deployment of codeswitching, not treating L1 as an independent problematic resource to block the activity. This is an occasion where the appropriateness of codeswitching is mutually shaped as not an alteration of a contextually-normative medium. When the production of L1 ends in blocking the activity, the teacher's follow-up evaluation is suspended until a required action is complete in alignment with an institutional medium, as in Extract 2.

As one more addition to the analysis, I illustrate a special case where post-completion codeswitching in L1 renewably brings an alternative interpretation to the previously completed units in L2. Let me first describe the background of Extract 3 below. Before line 83, the teacher had initiated a round informing task whereby each student in turn describes a line of the story in the textbook that they had read as homework before the class started. Although students were not strictly instructed regarding which information should be first and next, they eventually disclose the information one by one in the same order seen in the original story.

Extract 3[9]

```
83   RENA:        she is not happy about her travel=
84   T:           =okay she:
85                (2.3)
86                <i::s>?
87                (0.3)
88   RENA:        was was
89                (0.5)
90   T:           good bec*au::se?
           t:         *his hand moves and points to JUN -->
91                (0.8)
           t:    ----->
92   JUN:         she * (.) mi- missed her ((ah:)) flight.
```

```
          t:    ----*he hands down
93              (0.3)
94  T:          mm=
95  JUN:  ->    =chien
96               delayed
97              (0.9)
98  T:          wait (0.2) what?
99              (1.1)
100 JUN:        she missed ah:
101             (0.3)
102 T:          you mean
103             (0.4)
104             she missed [it.
105                        [+(0.9)  + (0.3)
106      jun:             +nodding+
107             not the flight was
108             (0.2)
109             ah no=>you're right<
110             (.)
111             uh she missed her flight because
112             (0.5)
113             °yes that's right°
114             (.)
115             her train was delayed so:
116             (0.3)
117             she was
118             (.)
119             late.
```

As the starter, Rena takes a turn in line 83 to introduce baseline information about the person's unsmooth travel. The teacher responds in line 84 with his form-focused orientation in a format of a designedly incomplete turn to identify which part of the previous turn is repairable in the next turn slot (Koshik, 2002). In line 85, the recipient, Rena, does not show an aligning response to fulfil the teacher's request, meaning that an essential component to complete the sequence is noticeably absent (Schegloff et al., 1977). The teacher then reworks in line 86 by repeating the erroneous part in Rena's previous utterance, more explicitly identifying a trouble source in a non-evaluative format. Theoretically, there is an option left at that moment for the teacher to insert more direct mitigation as completing repair by the teacher himself. As evident in the extract, this direct option is not taken. Instead of correcting it with a substitutional item, the second teacher-initiated repair finally induces

Rena's conduct of a self-repair with a more acceptable item which aligns with the teacher's focus.

On completion of the first sequence with Rena, the teacher moves on to the next with another student, directing Jun to provide a reason to the first information from Rena. In line 92, Jun normatively displays her alignment with the suggested trajectory of the activity by providing another line of information in a preferred action format as syntactically well-connected to the previous teacher's turn. This provision by Jun seems to be successfully done and receives minimal acknowledgement from the teacher. Jun then jumps in and codeswitches into L1 in line 95 to elaborate the previously complete item in L2.

Analogous to what was observed in Extract 1, Jun's codeswitching is designed as minimally intervening by being deployed *after* a base action is possibly complete all in L2. Nevertheless, this elaboration in codeswitching eventually allows an alternative interpretation, whereby the teacher may need to check for the accomplishment of mutual understanding and cease the sequence to request clarification regarding Jun's elaboration in L1. It is in one sense true that the emergence of L1 triggers the teacher's temporal halting of the sequence, but on the other hand, it does not receive an orientation to the presence itself as dispreferred and repairable, which is transparent in the shift of teacher's treatment to what is repairable. In line 98, the teacher decides to insert a negotiation course of actions based on the pedagogical need to confirm whether Jun correctly understands the story through the appropriate grasp of the meaning of the target verb: "miss". He first produces a "what"-question to request confirmation from Jun without directly locating what exactly is troublesome, but indexing the entire previous action of Jun as repairable (Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman, 2010).[10] In the next line, Jun preferably responds by partly repeating the same action with a basic component. Although her repair is partial, it reaches its subsequently completion point for the teacher, who thus starts another action of more strongly locating the trouble source for confirmation check (Sidnell, 2010); displaying what the

teacher needs to clarify is Jun's treatment of a particular lexical item "missed" that was originally produced but can be substituted with the later L1 item. We can conclude that the teacher's orientation is one of incorporating the L1 resource to retrospectively understand the previous L2 turn units; that is, the codeswitched unit is treated as dependent, not standing alone in being addressed. In other words, a specific focus of the teacher is displayed as monitoring Jun's comprehension rather than her language choice, and is mutually shaped as a product of negotiation with the student's orientation.

Concluding remarks

This article has demonstrated that intersubjectivity is crucial between the teacher and students to accomplish their goal-oriented learning tasks, based on an exploration of the specific deployment of students' codeswitching. It is key for any action to be designed not to intervene or block the pedagogical foci of the activities. As in previous research in classroom L2 interaction (e.g. Amir & Musk, 2013; Sert, 2015; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005), language choice is institutionally embedded in the normativity of learning activities. Once a particular language is shaped as a mutually agreed, contextualised language medium, it is normative for students to align with it for successful completion of their activities. It is true that there are cases where codeswitching is treated as significant misalignment with the activity and thus dealt with by the teacher. However, this normativity should not be interpreted as predetermined or universal. Regarding this, although it is reasonably assumable that there is a necessity to use L1 to accomplish language learning (Duff & Polio, 1990; Macaro, 1997), acceptability of codeswitching is contextually situated and accountable in their practices even when students are overtly instructed to use L2 only, as demonstrated in the cited extracts. If codeswitching is truly and entirely a deviant practice, it is unexplainable why some of them are allowed. Rather, all depends on their mutual understanding in alignment with what they are doing at the moment, what is focused on in each action, what is then requested to be done, what should come next, and in which medium they are

expected to select.

The appropriateness of codeswitching is not something predeterminable but emerges as a product of interactional practice with reciprocity of perspectives on a turn-by-turn basis. Their true motivation in codeswitching, e.g. their attempt to cover up the limited access to L2 at a particular moment, is not transparent and therefore not accountably arguable in this article. It is instead accountable through their observable behaviours that codeswitching is systematically managed not to treat it as misalignment with the mutually shaped context of the ongoing activity. When students complete a requested action in L2, the following L1 production is alluded as an elaboration to something once possibly complete as fulfilment of local pedagogical agendas in that sequence. If the L1 is emergent as part of the vital resources in the speaker's action, it is possibly treated as unnecessary alteration of an agreed medium, not just a language code (Auer, 1998, p. 16). A comparison between these different treatments of codeswitching highlights underlining preferences in that accomplishment in a normative medium is foregrounded over the actual provision of codeswitching, depending on whether requirement at that time is accomplished. Here, the issues of the psychological background or motives in L1 production, such as whether the student has limited access to accurate L2 equivalent and thus covers his deficiency in provision of L1, are beside the point.

Notes

1 Discourse analysts call this interactional cycle at three levels an *initiation–response–feedback* (IRF) structure (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Note that IRF is a functional labelling without taking into account the underpinned actions in each level. The teacher's *initiation*, for example, is interpretable differently depending on what is on the purpose of the action of questioning, as in requesting accurate productions or inducing participation for fluid interactional purposes (Seedhouse, 2004).

2 The term *(classroom) codeswitching* generally refers to the alteration of language choices as a management to accomplish social tasks (see Lin, 2013).

3   There has been a continuous debate in SLA field regarding the particular status of a language, such as a native, foreign, second, or additional language. This article avoids touching on the classification of the status of their instructed language, English, since there is no evidence of how these language statuses are relevant or treated in their organisation of talk.

4   This commentary is not derived from a sort of *student-as-deficient* mentality. From an emic perspective, students' limited accessibility is not discursively accountable but emergent in the sequential environment of their activities and observable to the analysts (see Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee & Kasper, 2014).

5   Koshik (2002) originally illustrates a phenomenon of *designedly incomplete utterances* (DIU) as a teacher's resource to induce students' production of what is missing but required, but it is of course utilisable by students to elicit assisting actions from the teachers (Sert, 2015).

6   The original response of MASA in line 58 includes a grammatical error ("thousand" must be singular here), to which the teacher does not orient in his response by bringing attention to this erroneous part; note that his own production in line 64 is in a singular form. A possible interpretation is that the question is driven by his focus on the content rather than its perfectly accurate form. Regardless of whether the teacher actually realises the presented error or misses it, it is an observable fact that the teacher does not bring it up in class at that moment.

7   This turn composition fits in a typology of turn expansion and classified as 'non-add-on'. See Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007) for detailed descriptions of the phenomenon in different languages.

8   Traditionally, a token "oh" has been claimed in form-function categorisation to be a signal of the speaker's unexpectedness or surprise (Aijmer, 1987, p. 80; Bolinger, 1989, p. 266), or under the functional label of *discourse marker* (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 74; Schourup, 1985, p. 21). Taking an emic stance on the token, it is important to unveil *why* the speaker *chooses* to place a *particular* interactional device *at that moment*. In this respect, "oh" does not just indicate the degree of expectation or surprise for the speaker but intersubjectively exhibits that the speaker undergoes a shift in his/her knowledgeability (Heritage, 1984). See also Schegloff (1993) for a critique of the

discursiveness of the category of *backchannels*.

9 In this excerpt, lines 90 and 105 require understanding of the speakers' bodily-conveyed actions. The second tier indicates their nonverbal behaviour and its timing. The same symbols delimit the bodily actions of distinctive speakers: * for the teacher, + for Jun. For a detailed description of the systematic multimodal transcription convention, see Mondada (2018).

10 Linguistic resources (e.g. "sorry", "pardon", and "what") for this type of repair initiation are called *open-class repair initiators* (Drew, 1997).

Transcription Convention

[ ]	overlap onset and offset
(.)	micro-pause (< 0.2 seconds)
(0.X)	length of pause/gap in seconds
=	latching
exa-	truncation
> <	accelerated part of talk
< >	slowed part of talk
( )	approximation of what is heard
(( ))	transcriber's comment
.	falling pitch contour
,	slightly rising pitch contour
?	rising pitch contour
ex<u>am</u>ple	word stress
↑ ↓	sharp rise or fall in pitch
:	sound stretch (multiple symbols indicate a length)
° example°	lower volume than surrounding talk
EXAMPLE	increased volume compared to surrounding talk

Acknowledgement

References

Aijmer, K. (1987). "Oh" and "Ah" in English conversation. In W. Meijs (Ed.), *Corpus linguistics and beyond* (pp. 61–86). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: Micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151–167.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (2013). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Bolinger, D. (1989). *Intonation and its uses: Melody and grammar in discourse*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Ono, T. (2007). 'Incrementing' in conversation: A comparison of practices in English, German and Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 17(4), 513–552.

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(1), 69–101.

Drew, P. (2013). Turn design. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 131–149). Oxford: Blackwell.

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154–166.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a

redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 6(1), 1–22.

Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In R. Sanders, & K. Fitch (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103–146). Mawah: Erlbaum.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.

Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 35(3), 277–309.

Lin, A. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review,* 4(1), 195–218.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Macbeth, D. (2000). Classrooms as installations: Direct instruction in the early grades. In S. Hester, & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order* (pp. 21–71). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal,* 88(4), 491–500.

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.

Oloff, F. (2013). Embodied withdrawal after overlap resolution. *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 46(1), 139–156.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organisation: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939–967.

Robinson, J. D., & Kevoe-Feldman, H. (2010). Using full repeats to initiate repair on others' questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, (43)(3), 232–259.

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In D. Hymes, & J. J. Gumperz (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325–345). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1075–1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(1), 99–128.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(1), 1–63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: 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, 361–382.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. C. (1985). *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. New York: Garland.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.) (2013). *Handbook of conversation analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*: *The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302–325.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.