ORIENTATION TO THE LANGUAGES OF THE MOMENT: OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEARNING TWO TARGET LANGUAGES IN A MULTILINGUAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

SACHIKO OKAMOTO

University of Hawaiʻi at Manoa

ABSTRACT

This study investigates one EFL classroom in which occasional multilingualism is observed. Foreign language classroom population is increasingly becoming multilingual and multicultural, and the present case exemplifies such a trend. While the use of the L1 in foreign language classrooms is quite common, what has not been studied is that this language can also be another target language in addition to institutionally sanctioned target language when the classroom holds a multilingual student population. This study closely looks at contingently emerging opportunities for learning two different languages for one focal participant who is a learner of both the institutional target language and the language of the host community. Utilizing conversation analysis (CA), the study demonstrates how participants' orientations to the languages of the moment dynamically shift through their ongoing institutional activity and what and how learning activities are locally co-constructed and negotiated, intertwined with their agency and each other's situated identities. This microanalysis of multilingual EFL classroom discourse contributes to our understandings of what is really happening or might happen in real-life language learning in such contexts, considering that such classroom environments are expected to increase

INTRODUCTION

In the current globalized world, we see more interactions in multilingual and multicultural situations whether they are ordinary or institutionally oriented conversation. Bi/multilingual conversations in various social settings such as talks between co-workers in multilingual workplaces (Skårup, 2004), service encounters (Torras, 2005), and professional meetings (Mondada, 2004), as well as casual conversation between friends and acquaintances, have been investigated. Kramsch and Whiteside's (2007) example of multilingual talk in which various languages brought in by several participants in a short stretch of conversation illustrates a complex nature of multilingualism.

Globalization has been expanding and educational settings are no exception. Traditionally, it has been common to see that students in foreign language classrooms like those in Japan share the same L1. However, student population is increasingly becoming more multilingual and multicultural even in such contexts. In terms of language learning and teaching in L1 contexts, while it is not uncommon that the target language is taught by means of the students' L1 in foreign language classrooms, in some classes, whether led by target language speaker teachers or competent L2 speaker teachers, the medium of interaction can coincide with the target language most of the time. In other classrooms, the instruction may be conducted in a mix of the L1 and target language. The mixed use of the target language and the students' L1 has been documented in some studies on code-switching in language classrooms (e.g., Polio & Duff, 1994; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005).

While the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms is quite common, what has not been documented is that this language can also be another target language in addition to the officially recognized institutional target language when the classroom holds a multilingual student population. In such situations, although students' orientation and learning opportunities are most of the time related to their institutional target language throughout the class, the students may not always treat the official target language as the sole target language. Rather, they may orient to

and treat the language common to the majority population of the classroom as the target language when opportunities arise. This phenomenon is particularly noteworthy considering that learning other than institutional target language is not part of the institutional agenda. Capturing and documenting such moments is the major interest of this study, and to my knowledge, no studies have reported this aspect of language learning in the classroom.

This study presents a case of one multilingual EFL classroom in a Japanese university in which more than one language (i.e., English and Japanese) is occasionally used by the participants. Orientation to the focal participant's L1 (i.e., Chinese) is also observed, although rarely. The microanalysis of interaction shows that on occasion participants orient to learning opportunities and teaching-learning activities of a non-institutional target language (i.e., Japanese) besides those of the institutional target language (i.e., English). Such opportunities and activities are dynamically co-constructed and negotiated by participants with their shifting orientations and agency in relation to each other's situated identities (Zimmerman, 1998) in ongoing interaction. Their orientation towards contingently emerging target languages, or *the target languages of the moment*, shows the unpredictability in the developing sequence and their interactional activities.

Lexical Learning

Where potential learning activities occur in this data are in repair sequences, and repair targets taken up by the participants are in most cases vocabulary and vocabulary-related items. Such repair activities are in many cases triggered by (a) trouble with the unavailability of a word (develops to word searches) or (b) trouble in understanding a word. Markee (2000) has pointed out that "the incidental acquisition of vocabulary from meaning-focused interaction does, indeed, lend itself well to qualitative research" (p.118) in terms of comprehensible input.

Interactional sequences involving word searches have been often the focus of analysis in conversation analysis (CA) (e.g., Brouwer, 2003; Carroll, 2005; Hosoda, 2006; Mori, 2004). For example, Mori (2004) has investigated how students negotiate between the task at hand and

emerging lexical problems hindering the proceeding of the task. Mori's study has captured learning opportunities in word search activities in the course of the classroom task and has revealed how the participants oriented to the pursuit of finding the right word while negotiating the timing of getting out of such temporary side sequences. Hosoda (2006) has demonstrated how lexical learning behavior was related to participants' orientation to their differential language expertise (Kasper, 2004). Egbert, Niebecker and Rezzara (2004) have analyzed an extended repair sequence triggered by a word search occurred in multi-party talk between participants with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The sequence entailed both a word search element and a problem in understanding a word. In the data, non-targetlike pronunciation of a produced word in the course of a word search hindered mutual understanding and was oriented to by the participants as an object of repair. The authors have looked at how this trouble in understanding was sequentially developed and resolved with participants' various strategies and resources.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Conversation Analysis

In order to capture the participants' shifting orientations and emerging learning opportunities through the sequential development of talk, I draw on conversation analysis (CA) (Sacks, 1995; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007; Ten Have, 2007) as the guiding theoretical and methodological framework of the present study. With its roots in ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967) under the field of sociology, CA was further developed by Harvey Sacks and his associates (Sacks, 1995; Sacks, et al., 1974) into an independent discipline that investigates particularly, as its term represents, naturally occurring conversation with the special interest in the analysis of sequence organization in talk-in-interaction. In the following g, I will briefly explain CA's important concepts: participants' orientation; procedural relevance and consequentiality; and sequential analysis.

Participants' orientation. The important analytical constraint that CA tries to establish in its analysis is to look at interaction from a *participant-relevant* (also called *emic*) perspective, that is, how a particular issue is treated by the participants as relevant at a particular moment in ongoing talk. Therefore, the analysis of interaction does not start from particular social, cultural, or theoretical assumptions made by a researcher. Rather, conversation analysts take an analytical distance called 'unmotivated looking,' a concept similar to the notion of 'ethnomethodological indifference' (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, pp. 345-356) and 'bracketing' in phenomenology, to detach themselves from any such assumptions, presuppositions, ethnographic information, and physical contexts in the very first stage of their analysis. This analytical distance or objectivity prevents researchers from deciding what is analytically important and what is not in the data for their theoretical or ideological claims from a *researcher-relevant* (i.e., *etic*) outsider's view. Put another way, it can help analysts look at what social actions are going on in the local interactional context, what issues are made relevant by participants themselves at particular moments, and how they deal with such issues in and through interaction. Therefore, CA's analytical and interpretive grounds are strictly maintained by examining participants' demonstrably recognizable here-and-now orientations through their interactional conduct.

Procedural relevance and consequentiality. In CA it is "what" and "how" that are pursued rather than "why". With the same interest held in ethnomethodology, CA also looks at what social actions are done in what way in interaction in order to reveal interactants' practical reasonings or normative orientation based on their implicit commonsense understanding. When "why" matters in CA, the why is meant to explain procedural accountability in interaction. Put it another way, why the participants acted the way they did in a certain interactional context is explained based *not* on *speculating* about the actors' psychological states, preconceived social identities or backgrounds, but on the analysis of observable *interactional evidence* of how a particular interactional procedure is relevant right there and then, how a particular form or style is selected and responded to, and how they are consequential for the participants as well as the subsequent sequence. Therefore, conversation analysts closely investigate participants'

interactional conduct through turn-taking, repair, preference organization and turn/recipient design in order to account for why it is organized as it is, or to answer to the question of "why that, in that way, right now" based on these problems of procedural relevance and consequentiality.

Sequential analysis. Another important point is how sequential analysis is related to procedural relevance and consequentiality. Since conversation is viewed as an act of building intersubjectivity based on interactants' understanding of the previous action (i.e., turn), how social actors act in each turn is seen to be sequentially motivated and related. Therefore, the development of sequence and interactional activities are contingent upon how the previous turn at talk was understood and treated by the next speaker, which is why sequential analysis on a turn-by-turn basis is important in investigating spoken interaction.

As it might be expected from the discussion above, CA engages in a detailed level of analysis of talk-in-interaction, disallowing impressionistic observation of talk. In order to grasp and account for people's social actions from a participant-relevant perspective, it examines talk which is shaping, and also being shaped in, local interactional contexts and sequences.

THE STUDY

The Data and Classroom Environment

The data analyzed here were collected from an undergraduate upper-level English writing and discussion course for English majors at a Japanese university. One class session was ninety minutes, and they met once a week. The class was divided into two groups of four and five students for the sake of an appropriate and effective environment for a discussion activity. I observed and audio-recorded these discussion activities for four class periods with the permission of all participants and their teacher. Since there were two groups in the class, the recording created an approximately twelve-hour data corpus in total (1.5 hrs x 4 times x 2 groups). I will refer to these groups as Group A (with four students) and Group B (with five

students). However, I should mention that although each group's members were basically fixed, there was one time that one student from Group B joined Group A due to class management reasons. Also, the number of the members in the groups sometimes varied due to absence or lateness.

Group discussions were structured so that there was a discussion leader for each session, and every student was required to take that role twice during the semester. The teacher did not assign the order of who would take this role first or second, etc., nor did he give or restrict topics for discussion. Such agendas were discussed and decided among the students themselves. Discussion leaders had the right to decide what topic their group would be discussing according to his/her own interest, and s/he notified the other members of the topic prior to the discussion date so the others can prepare for the topic beforehand.

As I mentioned, this class also had the focus on writing; therefore, the students were required to investigate and write a short report on each topic they discuss. They brought their own reports to the class (the papers were submitted after each session) and sometimes utilized them as references or information sources during the discussion. While the activity of researching and writing on a specific topic in English is the pedagogical aim in academic writing, it also facilitates students' fluency and active participation in discussion in that the process makes them familiarize themselves with the topic.

The whole class period was devoted to a student-centered discussion activity based on their research topic, and the teacher participated in one group during the first half of the class hour and in the other group during the latter half. As a participant observer, I was sitting beside the group members. Although most of the time I was listening to the groups' discussions, I sometimes joined (or was invited to join) their talk. I also engaged in some small talk with them before and after class or before the class task officially began, and through this I was able to build good rapport with the participants. I observed their discussions in three different ways: (1) I moved from one group to the other together with the teacher; (2) I joined a group different from the one that the teacher joined for the first half period, and joined the group that the teacher had just left

for the second half period; and (3) I stayed in one group throughout the whole class period. In this case, this means that I was present in the group both while the teacher was joining and while he was not.

Participants

There were nine students in the class, and they were all first language speakers of Japanese except one student from China, Ling. Ling was a one-year exchange student, attending this English course with other regular English major students in the host university. The English level of Japanese students can be estimated as relatively advanced. Several of them had experiences of staying in English speaking countries such as the U.S., U.K., and Australia. The teacher was a male, first language speaker of American English, who had taught at the university for more than 30 years at the time of the data collection. In the analysis, all students' names are pseudonyms. As for the teacher, I will not assign a particular pseudonym, but instead index him with a general term of his role, 'Teacher'. Likewise, I will refer to myself as 'Researcher' ('Res' in the transcripts).

Recording Environment

A small digital recorder was placed in the center of the participants' group. The visible recorder may have affected the participants to some extent at the beginning of the sessions, but they soon became used to it. I believe that it did not cause any serious distortion to the basic nature of interaction such as the organization of turn-taking.

ANALYSIS

The main part of the analysis is from the discussion sessions conducted by Group A which includes Ling. Where Japanese words and sentences appear in the data, the transcription is presented with two or three lines. Where only words are code-switched, an English gloss is put

under the original Japanese word (see Extract 1 for an example). When code-switching occurs at the phrase- or sentence-level, an English gloss including linguistic functions appears in the second line and an English translation close to the original meaning is placed in the third line. In such cases, Japanese utterances are indicated in italicized forms in the translation (see Extract 2, line 11 for an example). As all detailed information on interactional features including prosodic, verbal, non-verbal features as well as the transcriber's comments are attached to the original utterances, readers are always advised to also look at the original in Japanese even though rough translations in English are provided.

English Word Searches Using Japanese

When they could not retrieve a certain word in English in real time, the participants occasionally code-switched from English (on-task language) to Japanese (off-task language) and the switched word was used as a temporary placeholder for the unavailable English word. The problem was sometimes solved in the form of (self-initiated) self-repair in that a speaker of a trouble source turn (who initiated a word search) found the word in search by him/herself. However, at other times a student invited help from the other co-participants and someone other than him/her provided the solution as an expert party (i.e., self-initiated other-repair). Some of the word searches using Japanese provide opportunities for lexical learning, but first I will present an example of a typical English word search activity utilizing Japanese. Extract 1 shows how Ling utilizes the co-participants' English expertise as a resource of completing her turn in the institutionally appropriate way, that is, in English, by which she makes her less expert identity relevant.

Extract 1

```
    1   Ling:     but the fish (.7) which is
    2             brought out in the river and the lake
    3   Kazuto:   nhm?
    4   Tomoko:   hn.
 →  5             (1.1)
 →  6   Ling:     maybe have uh: (1.0) n(h)- (.8) another
 →  7             kind of (.8) aji  aji    ((shyly))
                              taste  taste
    8             (.4)
 →  9   Kazuto:   taste=
 → 10   Tomoko:   =taste.
 → 11   Ling:     taste.
   12   Tomoko:   a[h ah ah.
   13   Kazuto:    [ah::.
```

In lines 5-7, Ling produces a series of trouble indications, starting from a noticeable pause of 1.1 seconds in line 5, which is attributable to Ling because her turn has not finished yet. In line 6, she produces more trouble indicators: a speech perturbation (uh:), another pause of one second, a troubled exhalation (n(h)-), followed by another 0.8-second pause. In line 7, after another noticeable pause, she switches to Japanese ("*aji aji*") in search of the English equivalent word 'taste' in a shy tone of voice. The way this code-switched word is delivered (i.e., in a shy manner) might be the indication of her institutional orientation and related to the accountability of her act of code-switching. Doing code-switching to a currently non-relevant language is not considered to be an institutionally relevant action and therefore that act is something that should be accounted for. Her code-switching here is accounted for by the unavailability of a certain word in English. These signals of trouble including code-switching contextualize the upcoming activity frame in some way different from the previous (institutionally relevant) activity frame, which turns out to be a temporary word search as a side sequence. Also, she invokes her less expert identity with these cues in order to get help from co-participants to whom she orients to as more expert.

Upon receiving these *contextualization cues* (Gumperz, 1982), Kazuto and Tomoko align with their expected/assumed role as 'experts' by providing the English word for Ling. This

temporal side sequence ends in line 11 with Ling repeating the word ("taste.") by which she successfully completes her turn in English with the two members' help. Now that the two members understand what Ling was trying to say, they return to the suspended point in the topic by reacting to Ling's first turn (lines 12-13). This type of activity and sequence is frequently observed and has an established interactional pattern between the participants. Noticeably, this pattern occurs far more frequently with Ling than with the other members of the group. By developing this recurrent pattern, Ling makes her situated identity (Zimmerman, 1998) as a less expert English speaker more explicit to the others throughout the institutional activity.

Orientation to English Lexical Learning

Since the institutional goal is English learning, it is natural to see that the students orient to English as the official target language. In meaning- and task-oriented interaction, linguistic details were not so frequently taken up by the participants; however, they did occasionally orient to such details, and those were in many cases vocabulary-related. In such cases, some of the learning opportunities and learning activities were developed through word searches. In the following I will present the cases in which the participants actually oriented to learning a specific English lexical item (Extracts 2 and 3). Let us first look at a word search sequence which provides the opportunity for Ling to learn a certain vocabulary word.

Extract 2

```
    1    Ling:      but fish is very good for body.
    2    Kazuto:    h[n
    3    Ling:       [so [the japanese s-
    4    Tomoko:        [n::
→   5    Ling:      people's the japanese (1.5)
→   6               ↑ju↓myoo?    ↑ju↓myoo?   ((shyly; not targetlike pronunciation))
                    life expectancy    life expectancy
    7    Kazuto:    ↑ju↓myoo          ((same pronunciation as Ling))
                    life expectancy
    8               (.3)
    9    Tomoko:    (.) aa[(h):=
   10    Kazuto:         [aa:
   11    Tomoko:    =°nan dakk[e°
                     what   COP-Q
                    "What is it?"
   12    Kazuto:                 [jumyoo       >what was that<
                                  life expectancy
   13    Res:                    [life expectan[cy
   14    Tomoko:                               [↑ah::
   15               life ex[(.) pectancy
   16    Kazuto:          [ah ah ah ah
   17    Res:       h.h.h   ((giggling))
   18    Tomoko:    n:
→  19    Ling:      life?
→  20    Res:       ex[pectancy
→  21    Tomoko:      [expectancy
   22    Ling:      uh huh (    )
→  23               expect- t[cy?
→  24    Res:                [°cy yeah°
→  25    Tomoko:    un.
                    yeah
   26               (1.3)
   27    Ling:      is the (    )
   28               is the [longest in the world?
```

In line 5 Ling starts indicating a trouble with a noticeable pause of 1.5 seconds. It is followed by code-switching to Japanese and she utters the word twice ("↑*ju*↓*myoo*? ↑*ju*↓*myoo*?") in line 6. While temporarily supplementing the gap with the Japanese word, she tries to elicit the English word for it. Kazuto repeats Ling's utterance exactly the same way as she pronounced, although her pronunciation is not actually targetlike in terms of the place where the pitch accent falls. Here, the pronunciation of the Japanese word was not treated as a problem by either Tomoko or Kazuto, but rather their orientation is directed to a challenging problem-solving activity, i.e., an English

word search for '*jumyoo*', and which is observable from their reaction in lines 9-12. Upon uttering a receipt token in lines 9 and 10, they quickly adjust themselves to a new activity mode of a word search, ready for the challenge and solving the problem. In line 11, Tomoko immediately starts a word search by asking herself. Kazuto has also been engaged in a word search activity by uttering the word again and posing the question to himself. What should be noticed is that their questions here are not directed to someone for help, but to themselves. By which act they are displaying that they are 'doing thinking'.

In line 13, Researcher (that is I) provides a candidate vocabulary item, 'life expectancy'. Here, the situation is that another person who was made relevant to be an expert by providing the word in search joined the activity. This is immediately followed by Tomoko's change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) "[↑ah::" with an emphatic tone, and it also partly overlaps with my turn even before it has completed. While Tomoko is repeating the word in the next line, Kazuto also joined the moment of understanding by showing excitement with repeated tokens of a change-of-state ("[ah ah ah ah").

However, this word was revealed to be a gap in Ling's English mental lexicon. In line 19, Ling initiates repair by uttering "life?" with a rising intonation, which invites someone to provide the latter part of the word again, and that indicates where the trouble source is (i.e., the latter part of the compound noun, 'expectancy'). Here, a sort of short teaching-learning session begins. Researcher and Tomoko give the word 'expectancy' to Ling almost at the same time (lines 20-21). In line 23, Ling tries to pronounce the word but shows some difficulty. Researcher supports her utterance and also provides acknowledgment token ("yeah") upon completion of her utterance. Also, another acknowledgment token ("*un*") was provided in the next turn by Tomoko. By ratifying Ling's production, they do being 'expert' displaying their access to or authority of knowledge (Kurhila, 2001, 2005).

This side sequence of a word search and learning activity was brought to an end with a pause of 1.3 seconds. Ling comes back on track and continues her unfinished turn from after the word 'life expectancy' that she has just obtained in the previous activity sequence, and then completes

the rest of her turn (lines 27-28).

Although the practice of English word searches using Japanese with the form of self-initiated other-repair is far more frequent in the case of Ling than in the case of the other Japanese members in the data, it is not restricted to her. The Japanese members also occasionally find English lexical learning opportunities in the same way as Ling does.

Extract 3

```
   1    Ayumi:           [↑i mean-
   2                 (.6)
   3    Teacher:    ((clears throat))
   4                 (.4)
→  5    Ayumi:     depends on thee: the: (.5)
→  6               antena     ((in Japanese pronunciation with flat intonation))
                   antenna
   7                 (1.7)
   8    Teacher:    yeah.
   9                 (.7)
→ 10    Ayumi:     °ante[na°    ((in Japanese pronunciation with flat intonation))
                         antenna
  11    Tomoko:         [h:n
→ 12    Ayumi:     o- ha- how do you call it¿
  13    Teacher:    antenna.
  14    Ayumi:     °ante[nna°  hehhhhh
  15    Tomoko:         [an(h)te(h)nna(h)
  16    Teacher:        [i guess if it's antenna¿
  17    Res:       hhh
  18    Teacher:    what do you [call antenna¿
  19    Ayumi:                  [call(ed) (.) antenna?
  20    Teacher:    let's call it [u[h::      ((jokingly))
  21    Ayumi:                      [hhh
  22    Res:                        [a:hh
  23    Teacher:    a[ntenna.
  24    Res:        [antenna(h).
→ 25    Ayumi:     how do you pronounce
  26    ?          hh
→ 27    Ayumi:     ant[enna      ((smilingly))
  28    Teacher:       [↑oh, antenna.
  29    Tomoko:    huhh
  30    Res:       hh
  31    Teacher:    how do you pronounce it. hh
  32    Ayumi:     ante(hh)na hh   ((in Japanese pronunciation))
  33    Teacher:    £a(h)nt(h)enahhhh ((in Japanese pronunciation)) .hhh okay,
  34                £a(h)n(h)yway the antenna.
```

They are talking about the upcoming change of the current broadcasting system (i.e., from analog to digital). In line 5, Ayumi signals a problem of delivering a word in her ongoing turn with sound stretches and a pause. Following the trouble indication, she switches to Japanese in line 6 (evidenced in her pronunciation). Here, how this turn of Ayumi's was treated is revealed in the subsequent sequence. Teacher does not orient to Ayumi's turn as a trouble finding a word (i.e., as a word search), rather he treats it as a contribution to the ongoing topic. He waits for more continuing contribution or elaboration of explanation to come from Ayumi evidenced by his not taking a turn. However, Ayumi, too, waits for some kind of response from Teacher, also evidenced by not continuing her turn. This orientation mismatch by Ayumi and Teacher creates a fairly long pause of 1.7 seconds (line 7). This silence exerts the power of turn-taking mechanism on the interactants to take some action to break the silence. Teacher self-selects as the most relevant next speaker (because Ayumi is talking to him). However, his turn is minimal ("yeah."), and this acknowledgment token seems to be functioning as a 'continuer' to prompt Ayumi to go on. This brings another 0.7-second pause (line 9). So, Teacher still does not orient to Ayumi's code-switching of this word as a problem.

However, rather than continuing the talk, Ayumi orients to her uncertainty about the word by bringing up the trouble source again ("°*ante*[*na*°") by which she sticks to the word search activity. This orientation to the word search by the 'isolation of the repairable' (Brouwer, 2004, p. 99) is made more explicit in the following utterance ("o- ha- how do you call it¿"). By these eliciting acts, her orientation to Teacher's language expertise and to her less competent speaker identity is also made visible and observable. Teacher immediately provides the word in English, taking on the expected expert identity.

The interesting thing is that this word ('*antena*') is settled in the Japanese lexicon as a loanword in katakana[1], and therefore the pronunciation is similar to that in English (as you can

---

[1] Katakana is one of the two writing types to represent the same Japanese kana syllabary (the other type is hiragana). Katakana is usually used to transliterate foreign words and names, and so forth.

see in Ayumi's utterance in code-switching). So, what Ayumi is saying as a Japanese word is actually close to the English word for which she is searching. As a result, this word search activity is framed with a teasing activity by Teacher. In the course of repair sequence with Teacher's teasing (sometimes in tandem with Researcher: lines 20 and 22-24), Ayumi confirms what '*antena*' is called in English and then how it is pronounced whereby she does orient to her language novice identity relative to Teacher's language expert identity. Also importantly, such acts as repeating and confirming the word and questioning about its pronunciation (lines 14, 19, 25, and 27) display her orientation to learning.

Orientation to Japanese Lexical Learning: Through Word Searches

For the L1 Japanese members, when they are doing English word searches using Japanese words, their target is only English even if those Japanese words are sometimes try-marked (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) with a rising intonation, which displays some uncertainty, because it is fundamentally unnecessary for them to confirm their L1 vocabulary. The Japanese words they use in word searches, at least in the current data, are not unordinary or highly technical terms that some of them might not know even in Japanese; therefore, their try-marking is doing something different from checking the correctness of the Japanese vocabulary itself. However, in contrast to the L1 members, Japanese is not L1 for Ling, but another L2. This situation sometimes directs her to orient to both target languages. For example, the word search activity sequence in Extract 2 reveals Ling's dual orientation. While she orients to the other members' English expertise to elicit a certain English word, she also orients to their Japanese expertise as native speakers. We can observe her subtle attempt of Japanese learning hidden in English word searches in the sequence, although in many cases such attempts are unnoticed or not taken up.

Extract 2 is similar to Extract 1 in terms of inviting a word search with orientation to their relative linguistic expertise. However, there is a subtle difference in how the trouble source turn is delivered and treated. Let us pull out the relevant parts from each extract, labeled as 1a and 2a.

Extract 1a

```
   6   Ling:      maybe have uh: (1.0) n(h)- (.8) another
→  7              kind of (.8) aji  aji   ((shyly))
                              taste  taste
   8              (.4)
   9   Kazuto:    taste=
  10   Tomoko:    =taste.
  11   Ling:      taste.
```

Extract 2a

```
   5   Ling:      people's the japanese (1.5)
→  6              ↑ju↓myoo?     ↑ju↓myoo?    ((shyly; not targetlike pronunciation))
                   life expectancy     life expectancy
   7   Kazuto:    ↑ju↓myoo         ((same pronunciation as Ling))
                   life expectancy
   8              (.3)
   9   Tomoko:    (.) aa[(h):=
  10   Kazuto:    [aa:
  11   Tomoko:    =°nan dakk[e°
                    what   COP-Q
                   "What is it?"
```

An important factor here is the intonation when she elicits the word. In Extract 1a, Ling shows her confidence about the word she is using by not try-marking it ("*aji aji*") when she invites the others to a word search. Therefore, her goal is obviously to obtain the English equivalent word for '*aji*', and nothing else. In other words, the aimed activity is only a word search. In terms of the delivery of the word in a shy manner might be, as analyzed above, interpreted as an account for her act of code-switching as a kind of temporal violation against the institutionally expected language use (i.e., using English).

On the other hand, in Extract 2a, the try-marked intonation works as an invitation to a word search, but it also indicates some uncertainty about the appropriateness of the Japanese word itself, i.e., '*jumyoo*'. Whether the nature of uncertainty is about its pronunciation or the appropriateness of the word choice for the English equivalent she is looking for, she is signaling her uncertain attitude towards her knowledge about this Japanese word with this intonation, otherwise it is not necessary to try-mark it as in the case of Extract 1a. In the same vein, the

delivery of the turn in a shy manner in this case works as an additional cue of her uncertainty of the word. Therefore, she is engaging in two activities here. One is an English word search, and the other thing she is tacitly doing is inviting an assessment on her Japanese use from the most appropriate and reliable judges, i.e., the expert speakers of Japanese, although the latter is not always provided by them in favor of a more immediate activity (i.e., word search) as well as with institutional orientation. This tendency is evident in this case in that her incorrect pronunciation was not oriented to as a repair object over an English word search. In this regard, Kazuto's treatment of her turn in his next turn is very intriguing. As I mentioned above, we cannot say whether Ling's uncertainty is about a word choice or pronunciation here, but Kazuto disregards her non-targetlike pronunciation. His non-orientation to Ling's non-targetlike pronunciation as a possible repairable object is revealed by his exact repetition of Ling's inappropriate pronunciation, rather than presenting an appropriate pronunciation by means of embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987) in his repetition turn. This might also be the evidence that in meaning-oriented or goal-oriented interaction, non-targetlike linguistic forms are in many cases not oriented to unless mutual understanding is jeopardized. By going straight into the word search activity by discarding the opportunity of correcting Ling's pronunciation, he ratifies her utterance as an understandable Japanese word enough for him to get started to an English word search, rather than taking it up as a problem.

We have seen a relatively short word search sequences above, however, the following extract is a case which produces an extended and complex repair sequence which first begins with an English word search and then eventually turns out to be a complete Japanese lexical teaching-learning activity. Since this sequence is quite long, I divide it into two parts (Extracts 4a and 4b).

Extract 4a

```
    1    Ling:              [but as you know,
    2                if you use (.5) air conditioner,
    3                it is (.7) it will- (1.8) it will-
    4                it also kind of way to: (.6) .hh
    5                proceed the- (.7)
    6                [global warming
    7    Tomoko:     [h:n. hn.
    8    Ayumi:      hn.
    9    Tomoko:     hn.
   10                (1.3)
   11    Ayumi:      it is.
   12                (.4)
   13    Tomoko:     u:n.
   14                (.3)
   15    Tomoko:     it is.
   16    Ling:       but (.5) the developing country people
   17    Tomoko:     u:n.
   18    Ling:       a(h) .h they don't have the:
   19                ability to use .h the air conditioner¿
   20    Tomoko:     u[:n.
   21    Ayumi:       [>they can[not ha-< afford
   22    Ling:                  [and soo soo soo
                             right right right
   23                so they don't have the money to buy
   24                the air conditioner.
   25    Ayumi?:     °n:°
→  26    Ling:       >and maybe< they're: the (3.3)
→  27                higaisha no  hantaigo¿
                     victim    LK  antonym
                     "The antonym of victim."
   28                (2.5)
   29    Tomoko:     <↑higaisha wa> (.) [higaisha desho?  ((in a puzzled manner))
                       victim    TP          victim    COP
                     "Victim is victim , right?"
   30    Ayumi:                          [°(    sha)°?
→  31    Ling:       >higaisha no  hantaigo.<=
                      victim    LK  antonym
                     "The antonym of victim."
   32    Tomoko:     =↑hantai?
                       opposite
   33                (.5)
   34    Tomoko:     offender?
   35    Ayumi:      offender?
   36                (.6)
   37    Tomoko:     o↑ffen↓der? attac(.)ker? nan   daro.
                                              what   COP
                     "Offender? Attacker? What is it, I wonder."
   38                (5.5)
   39    Tomoko:     hm:::::
   40                (7.0)
   41    Ling:       th- the vict- vi_ctim.
```

```
42              (.9)
43  Tomoko:     victim?
44  Ling:       soo [soo
                right  right

45  Tomoko:          [un.
                      yeah
46              (.4)
47  Tomoko:     ↑they ↓are the victim. °n° i [think.
48  Ayumi:                                   [hn.
```

They are talking about excessive use of air conditioning, and Ling connects this to the issue of global warming and the suffering of people in developing countries. Although she first described people in developing countries as those who "don't have the: ability to use .h the air conditioner¿", she reformulates the description of them as people who "don't have the money to buy the air conditioner" upon listening to Ayumi's overlapping turn which pointed out that those people 'cannot afford' an air conditioner (rather than not having the ability to use it).

After this negotiation is completed, Ling continues in line 26. However, she encounters a problem here. Having said, "they're: the", she indicates a trouble with a significantly long pause of 3.3 seconds, and she code-switches in the next line and thereby invokes a word search. Here, the way Ling invites the other members' participation of a word search is intriguing. The Japanese word '*higaisha*' is not an equivalent of the English word she is looking for. Instead, she presents a second possible information '*higaisha no hantaigo*', i.e., *the antonym of* '*higaisha*', for this word search. A noticeable thing is that by the way she formulates this word search she indicates the unavailability of not only the word in English, but also its equivalent term in Japanese.

This turn by Ling, however, causes some problems to the recipients in terms of how to interpret her meaning under construction and how to respond to her turn. Starting from the problem of interpreting, considering the development of the talk with some commonsense reasoning, the people Ling is talking about (i.e., people in developing countries) are more likely to be '*higaisha*', i.e., victims, of global warming caused by too much use of air conditioners in developed countries, rather than the opposite population of '*higaisha*'. However, the word Ling

is searching is *the antonym of* '*higaisha*', which would be 'assailant' or some similar term. This is contradictory to the commonsense expectation or to the topic they have developed so far. This is displayed by the absence of response realized by a meaningful pause of 2.5 seconds in line 28. It is followed by Tomoko's expression of confusion towards Ling's logic (line 29). How Tomoko formulates her turn "<↑*higaisha wa*> (.) [*higaisha desho?*" ("*Victim is victim, right?*") is a bit awkward as a response turn to a word search. So, her utterance might be interpreted as a sort of confirmation like, "What you are saying (*higaisha*) is the right word to say (*higaisha*) here, isn't it?" if we make sense of it with some supplemental reading like this. In this way, the word search is temporarily put on hold by this clarification about what logic Ling is trying to construct by this word search. However, having received this response by Tomoko, which still has not provided her with the term she is looking for, Ling further pursues the word opposite to 'victim' (">*higaisha no hantaigo.*<") in line 31. Tomoko again shows a confused attitude in her confirmation with a higher pitch ("↑*hantai?*") in line 32. Thus, what we can observe from this part of the sequence (lines 27-32) is, while Ling is keeping her orientation to the word search, Tomoko is treating Ling's turn as problematic and prioritizing the need for repair over the word search.

Another interesting point about this word search is the ambiguous nature of Ling's formulation of word elicitation, which leads to the issue of how to respond to her turn. In contrast to the other cases in which only a Japanese equivalent word is provided, the form '*higaisha no hantaigo*' in this elicitation strategy makes possible to elicit two different language forms (i.e., English and Japanese) with the same meaning (i.e., the antonym of 'victim'), namely, the English word 'assailant' on the one hand, and the Japanese word '*kagaisha*', which is the antonym of '*higaisha*', on the other. Therefore, the question is how this word search should be responded to at this particular moment: as an English word search or a Japanese word search? If the recipients hear or treat Ling's turn literally in Japanese, the answer would naturally be the

Japanese word '*kagaisha*' ('assailant')[2]. However, Tomoko and Ayumi treat this word search as an English word search as seen in the next sequence (lines 34-40), which proves that they are maintaining their orientation to the institutional activity at this moment.

In line 34, although puzzled by the word Ling used, Tomoko finally goes into a word search activity and provides a candidate English word 'offender' with a try-marked intonation showing uncertainty. Ayumi also follows this and gives the same word (line 35). After another 0.6-second pause, Tomoko again repeats the same candidate item (line 37); however, this self repetition with a question intonation works as a repair initiator for herself. By asking herself, she shows that she is 'doing thinking' if it is the right word. Then, she comes up with another candidate 'attacker', but again shows uncertainty with a micropause of hesitation in the middle of the word and a rising intonation at the end of the word. The uncertainty of both words are explicitly stated in the following self-talk ("*nan daro.*"), expressing that she wonders what the right word is. In short, she is in the middle of a self-repair for the problem that she initiated.

The sequence of a significantly long pause of 5.5 seconds, followed by Tomoko's "hm:::::", which displays her action of still 'doing thinking', and then followed by another significantly long 7.0-second pause entails two (intertwined) interactionally important structures. One is that the pauses of 5.5 and 7.0 seconds may be showing the participants' orientation to the preference for self-repair (Schegloff, et al., 1977). As Tomoko displayed that she was 'doing thinking' (not inviting help) in the previous turn, it is possible that nobody takes the floor, allowing Tomoko more time to self-repair. But at the same time, these pauses can be interpreted as an absence of

---

[2] Although it was hard to catch the exact word Ayumi said with a rising intonation in line 30, if she is possibly saying '*kagaisha*' here, it is likely that she is reacting to Ling's previous turn as a Japanese word search. If she is saying '*higaisha*', it might be the clarification of Ling's logic or the word choice similar to Tomoko's turn in line 29, i.e., repair.

response or reaction from Ling, which can be interpreted as a structurally dispreferred action[3] (Pomerantz, 1984). Despite the two candidate items Tomoko has provided, Ling does not immediately accept either of them, nor does she give any comments on them, which suggests that the two words provided are insufficient in some way for Ling. This absence of reaction by Ling puts Tomoko in the situation in which she needs to work more to come up with other candidates, and the understanding of this is projected in Tomoko's "hm:::::" as 'doing more thinking' in the turn after the 5.5-second silence. Then, another 7.0-second silence follows this. The duration of these pauses gives time to think not only for Tomoko (and Ayumi), but also for Ling, which led her to participate in the word search herself. That Ling was now an active participant in a word search in the face of the other members' struggle with coming up with the word for her is reveled by the evidence that she was the one who broke the silence and came up with the word by herself (line 41).

Now, Ling has found the word by herself, and the word was 'victim'. However, this is followed by an absence of immediate response. A noticeable 0.9-second pause (line 42) infers a certain problem. Here, the problem of logical interpretation mentioned earlier comes up again. Whereas the hearers' expectation about the word which appropriately describes the situation has been all along 'victim', what Ling claims to have found as a result of the word search is the word 'victim' despite the fact that she has been soliciting the word *opposite to* 'victim' for the whole time. Tomoko displays confusion in her confirmation turn ("victim?"). But Ling's answer is affirmative ("*soo* [*soo*."). Tomoko acknowledges it ("[*un*"), opting for the logical sense-making, or in other words, she aligned with Ling's turn because now the word and the logical sense have

---

[3] The terms of preferred/dispreferred actions here should not be confused with personal preferences. These terms indicate structurally alternative actions in turn organization. What is expected in the next turn is realized as a 'preferred' turn shape and the other alternative is realized as a 'dispreferred' turn shape. For example, an invitation turn projects an acceptance as a preferred action in the next turn, and its turn shape is usually realized as short and direct with no accounts, while rejection is treated as dispreferred action and its turn is shaped as delayed, indirect, and long, showing willingness to accept, but incapable to do so, accompanied with its reasons or explanations. The concept of structural preference rather than that of personal preference is clearer in the example such as in a political debate, in which arguing back is projected as a 'preferred' action, rather than just accepting the other party's argument.

met despite the illogical path that had been taken so far. She does not pursue Ling's contradictory use of the term, but rather affirms with "↑they ↓are the victim.", adding some pitch emphasis.

   In the continuing sequence, it is revealed that Ling has misunderstood the Japanese word '*higaisha*' of which meaning is 'victim' as the opposite meaning, i.e., 'assailant'.

Extract 4b

```
   47   Tomoko:   ↑they ↓are the victim. °n° i [think.
   48   Ayumi:                                [hn.
   49             (2.6)
→  50   Ling:     e::¿ victim nihongo de  nan  to  iu¿=
                                Japanese prt  what QT  say
                        "Eh::? How do you say victim in Japanese?"
   51   Ayumi:    =hi[gaisha.
                     victim
   52   Tomoko:      [victim wa: higaisha.
                             TP   victim
                        "Victim is victim."
   53             (1.4)
   54   Ling:     aa: >°soo soo soo [soo soo soo°<
                       right right right right right right
   55   Tomoko:                     [un.
                                      yeah
   56   Ling:     .hh e:[:
   57   Ayumi:          [kooburu.
                          suffer
   58   Ling:     .h a↑a:
   59   Tomoko?:  >un< .h
                   yeah
   60             (.7)
   61   Ling:     (>°demo-°<) higaisha no  hantai[go wa?
                       but         victim  Lk  antonym    TP
                        "(But-) what is the antonym of victim?"
   62   Ayumi:                                   [kagai[sha.=
                                                   assailant
   63   Tomoko:                                        [kagaisha.
                                                         assailant
   64   Ayumi:    =k[uwaeru.
                    add
   65   Ling:       [a↑a::
   66   Tomoko:   un.
                  yeah
   67             (.6)
   68   Ling:     £a↑a::: ((much higher tone)) haha gomen gomen
                                                    sorry   sorry
   69             (.8)
   70   ?         (h:n)
   71             (1.0)
   72   Tomoko:   hu[:n.
   73   Ling:       [£i made a mistake.
   74   Tomoko:   un.
                  yeah
   75             (1.6)
   76   Tomoko:   n::::
   77             (2.6)
   78   Ayumi:    difficult.
```

In line 49, the 2.6-second pause implicates a sequential and activity boundary. However, Ling notices something being not right. This is shown by the interactional awkwardness in the way in which the previous word search ended. The first sign that suggests that something strange is going on is observable when Ling found the word 'victim' (back in line 41). There was an absence of reaction for 0.9 second, followed by Tomoko's confirmation ("victim?"). Another odd moment comes from Tomoko's alignment again back in line 45 ("*un.*") and a summative and affirmative comment in line 47 ("↑they ↓are the victim.") as if it was an already known fact even before Ling found the word. So, what was missing here in this word search is an 'ah' kind of discovery moment or some kind of display of a change of cognitive state.

In line 50, sensing the awkwardness of this interactional organization and that therefore the word she used was something wrong, Ling checks with the co-members how the word 'victim' is said in Japanese. As if having waited to correct the misunderstanding, Ayumi provides the answer, '*higaisha*', immediately after Ling completes the question turn. Furthermore, overlapping with Ayumi's turn, Tomoko also provides the answer with a more elaborate form, "victim *wa: higaisha*." The answers from Ayumi and Tomoko serve as corrective feedback that requires Ling to reconstruct the information that has been mistakenly stored in her mental lexicon. She then needs to reflect on the word search she had been pursuing. After a 1.4-second silence, she displays that she has gone through a certain epistemic change ("*aa:*"), but immediately after this she produces a flurry of acknowledgment tokens in a hasty manner (" >°*soo soo soo* [*soo soo soo*°<"), implying that it was a temporary mistake, not a lack of knowledge.

In line 57, however, Ayumi adds more explanation of the word. The word '*higaisha*' is a kanji compound noun which consists of three components, '*hi-gai-sha*'. *Hi* means 'to suffer', *gai* means 'harm', and *sha* means 'person'; therefore, this compound means a person who suffers from harm (caused by someone or something), i.e., 'victim.' Ayumi emphasizes the meaning of the first element (*hi*) of this word by rephrasing it with another word '*kooburu*' (line 57). '*Kooburu*' is a word of Japanese origin which has the equivalent meaning of the kanji *hi* used in '*higaisha*'. So, by paraphrasing the kanji *hi* with a more explanatory word '*kooburu*', Ayumi tries

to make the meaning of '*higaisha*' clearer for Ling. Paraphrasing a kanji into an indigenous Japanese word as Ayumi does is sometimes helpful in indicating which homophonic kanji is being referred to when it is confusing (there are many homophones in kanji) or what meaning the kanji word has in a more comprehensible way. We do not know if this way of presentation is helpful for Ling whose L1 is Chinese (if she was presented the kanji word visibly, it might be more helpful for her to grasp the meaning than being presented a paraphrased word), nor do we know if she knew the paraphrased word '*kooburu*', which seems to be a relatively advanced word for a learner. However, at least, Ling claims her understanding ("*a↑a:*") of this scaffolding word provided by Ayumi.

Ling now understands the equivalency relationship between '*higaisha*' in Japanese and 'victim' in English. However, she does not miss the opportunity to pursue more. She asks the co-participants what the antonym of '*higaisha*' in Japanese is, too, which is the one she asked in the first place anyway (line 61). Here, it is apparent that the participants are no longer orienting to English; they are now orienting to a Japanese teaching-learning activity. Ayumi provides the word '*kagaisha*' as the antonym of '*higaisha*', and this time her response turn even overlaps with Ling's turn as soon as she understands Ling's question. Tomoko provides the same answer, too. Ayumi again structures her turn in the same way as the previous one, that is, paraphrasing the first element of the kanji compound (*ka*) with '*kuwaeru*', 'to add', a word of Japanese origin. As we can see, the only difference between '*higaisha*' and '*kagaisha*' is the first element of each compound, i.e., *hi* ('to suffer') and *ka* ('to add'), and then the paraphrased words are '*kooburu*' and '*kuwaeru*', respectively. So, by structuring the explanation in this way, Ayumi makes a contrast between the two words and emphasizes the key part to discern the difference between the two. Ling again displays understanding in line 65, followed by Tomoko's affirmation. In line 68, Ling wraps up with her final display of understanding with a more emphatic tone and smiley voice ("£*a↑a:::*"), followed by an apology for making them confused. In line 74, she further gives an account for the confusion that she has caused ("[£i made a mistake."). Ayumi concludes this teaching-learning sequence by providing an assessment comment ("difficult.") from Ling's

point of view (because it is not difficult for Ayumi). By this she accepts Ling's account (i.e., made a mistake) as justifiable because it is "difficult." At the same time, this evaluative comment on the difficulty of particular linguistic items for a novice Japanese speaker again reveals that she takes on the identity of an expert speaker of Japanese in this activity context.

Orientation to Japanese Lexical Learning: Through Trouble in Understanding

Japanese learning opportunities are sometimes promoted by repairs of trouble in understanding certain Japanese words used in talk. Ling sometimes uses Japanese spontaneously, in other words, not for eliciting help in finding an English word. That is to say, she is just using Japanese as a mode of communication at the moment and not orienting to learning nor language expertise. However, a certain Japanese word produced by her sometimes becomes an object of repair and this leads to a potential learning opportunity of Japanese lexical items. In the following case, her pronunciation of a Japanese word '*rikakee*', 'science major', was somewhat non-targetlike and could not be understood by the L1 Japanese members whereby a repair negotiation begins.

This conversation takes place before the participants officially start a discussion activity. Previous to this segment, Ling started the talk by asking the other members about tips for obtaining a high score on the TOEIC test. She was using Japanese as a communication mode first, but after the co-participants' responses in English, her mode of communication changed to English. After a 1.7-second pause just prior to this segment, which can be treated as a sequential boundary, Ling reverts to Japanese. She is now talking about her friend who scored nine hundred on the TOEIC test.

Extract 5

```
    1    Ling:     ri(.)kake  da  yo  ka- rikake  ((non-targetlike pronunciation))
                   science major   COP IP        science major
                   "(He is a) science major, science major."
    2    Kazuto:   mi[kake   it [looks good
                   appearance
    3    Tomoko:      [u:n
    4    Ling:                      [rikake    ((non-targetlike pronunciation))
                                      science major
    5              rikake    ((non-targetlike pronunciation))
                   science major
→   6    Kazuto:   rika-(.)¿   ((surprisedly or confusedly))
                   science major
→   7    Res:      rikake?
                   science major
    8    Ling:     rikake:   [uh:: ((heard as slightly approximating to the target form))
                   science major
    9    Kazuto:                [rikakee
                                   science
   10    Res:      °rika-°
                     science major
   11    Kazuto:   studying [science?
   12    Res:               [science¿
   13    Ling:     soo soo [soo.
                   right right  right
   14    Tomoko:           [↑ah:: >aa aa<
   15    Kazuto:   °a[a:°
```

In line 1, she says that the person she was talking about is a science major ("*ri(.)kake da yo ka- rikake*"). By this she emphasizes the unexpectedness of this person's high score on English test in spite of the fact that he is a science major, not someone in a language related major or non-science major in a more general sense. However, Kazuto misheard this Japanese word as '*mikake*', 'appearance'. One possibility of this mishearing might have been caused by Kazuto's association of a 'high score' with 'looks good'. However, this mishearing is also suspected to have been promoted by Ling's non-targetlike pronunciation. Although the consonant part in the first version is somewhat unclear whether it is pronounced with an unnecessary long consonant (*rikkake* [ɾik:ake]) or the sound which is heard as a long consonant is actually due to an insertion of a micropause within the word (*ri(.)kake*), in my hearing, the odds are slightly high that the latter is the case. At any rate, the final vowel in both production (*ri(.)kake* and *rikake*) is not long

enough for the target form. As a result of this shortfall of the final vowel length, the produced word is heard somewhat similar to the word '*mikake*', of which the only difference is the first consonant. Right after Kazuto says '*mikake*', Ling insistently repeats the same pronunciation she had produced before (lines 4-5). This repetition in lines 4 and 5 is Ling's attempt to make Kazuto notice that the word he has produced is not what she said. Having heard this repetition, Kazuto produces a confirmation check turn by repeating what she pronounced but seems hearable as cut off in the middle of the word with a tone of confusion ("*rika-* (.)¿"). Researcher also does a confirmation check by repeating Ling's utterance ("*rikake?*"). Both confirmation checks work as an initiation of repair. Ling tries again in line 8, which is followed by a problem marker "uh::". Although it is very difficult to detect a difference in her utterance in line 8 compared to the previous production, and an accidental factor might be also involved, the final vowel is heard to be slightly longer than her previous pronunciation. This can be partly grounded by Kazuto's next turn. Upon hearing this production, Kazuto changes the final vowel length in his self-talk (line 9) by which a correct form was reconstructed, and this brings him a new understanding. In line 11, he tries a paraphrase of the meaning of the word to make sure that his new understanding of what Ling means is correct ("studying [science?"). Researcher also reaches the same understanding as Kazuto, which is revealed in the overlapped turns in lines 11-12 in which the same word was synchronously produced ("[science¿"). This is confirmed by Ling ("*soo soo* [*soo*").

In this extract, it is observed that Ling's spontaneous use of Japanese without orienting to language expertise has incidentally led her to a learning opportunity through repair negotiation for achieving intersubjectivity. If we reflect on Extract 2, her non-targetlike pronunciation of a Japanese word was not oriented to by the co-participants because it was an understandable form. However, in this case, her non-targetlike pronunciation caused a problem in mutual understanding. The length of vowels and consonants is a phonologically crucial factor in

discriminating one word (i.e., meaning) from another in Japanese.[4] Also, inappropriate

vowel/consonant length often generates nonexisting words (the example in this extract is such a

case). However, this aspect is also difficult for learners to acquire because the length difference

is very subtle especially in native speakers' natural talk, and learners might experience difficulty

distinguishing the slight difference. On the other hand, the difference may prove challenging in

terms of their production: how much length is appropriate to differentiate one word from another

or to generate target forms. In this sequence, although Ling knew the word itself, she was not

aware of the problem in her pronunciation. In this regard, this repair sequence has given her an

opportunity to notice the gap between the target form and her own production. This repair

negotiation has also provided her with some space to test out her pronunciation in the process of

making herself understood.

   Ling's learning opportunities come not only from her spontaneous use of Japanese as we

have just seen. The use of Japanese words by the L1 Japanese members and Ling's

non-understanding of such words often transform the local interactional context into some sort of

teaching-learning context. Extract 6 shows that Ling picks up the opportunity for learning an

unknown Japanese cultural item.

---

[4] For instance, Mori's (2004) data from a JFL classroom has a good example of this phonological consequentiality. In the pursuit of the appropriate word (i.e., '*sekai*', 'world'), the students in pair work negotiated between two different forms: '*seekai*' ('correct answer') and '*sekai*' ('world'). As you can see in these words, the vowel length discriminates meanings.

Extract 6

```
    1   Ayumi:   i ↑never s- i never seen i've never seen
    2            the people
    3   Tomoko:  hhh usi[ng
    4   Ayumi:        [using furo[shiki?
                           wrapping cloth
    5   Tomoko:                   [furoshiki?
                                   wrapping cloth
→   6   Ling:    furoshiki?
                 wrapping cloth
    7   Tomoko:  un.
                 yeah
    8   Ayumi:   [you know? furoshiki?
                           wrapping cloth
    9   Ling:    [(    )
   10   Tomoko:  [big [handkerchief
   11   Ayumi:        [big
   12            (1.0)
   13   Ayumi:   and then (.)
   14   Ling:    what is used for?
   15   Ayumi:   wrap things? and carry?
   16   Ling:    [ah::
   17   Tomoko:  [un.
                  yeah
   18   Ayumi:   as a bag¿
   19   Ling:    ah: .h
   20   Tomoko:  people used to [£use it but [(    )
   21   Ling:                   [a(h)h
   22   Ayumi:                               [(well)
   23            ↑people use on the formal occasion
   24            li[ke
   25   Tomoko:    [aa:::
   26   Ayumi:   funera:l,
   27   Tomoko:  un
                 yeah
   28   Ayumi:   and then wedding,
   29   Ling:    ↑ah:
   30   Ayumi:   very formal occasi[on but
   31   Tomoko:                    [un un
                                    yeah yeah
   32   Ayumi:   not (.)
   33   Tomoko:  not
   34   Ayumi:   daily life¿
   35   Tomoko:  n: [like supe(hh)rma(h)rket
   36   Ayumi:      [i gave- heh heh
   37   Ling:    ahahah
```

In line 4, Ayumi brings up a Japanese culturally specific item '*furoshiki*', a traditional

Japanese wrapping cloth used as a carrying bag in the old days. '*Furoshiki*' was taken up as an

example of environment-friendly items (they were also talking about a recent trend of carrying 'my bags' for shopping at the supermarket) in relation to their discussion topic of the spirits of reduce, reuse, and recycle. Lines 1-5, Ayumi and Tomoko collaboratively construct Ayumi's turn. In line 3, Tomoko predicts what Ayumi would say next and continues Ayumi's turn ("usi[ng"). Ayumi ratifies this contribution by recycling the word and continues. Ayumi's try-marked "*furo*[*shiki*?" in line 4 is inviting understanding from the listeners which somewhat functions as 'y'know?'. In the next line Tomoko utters the final word with a rising intonation ("[*furoshiki*?") in overlap with Ayumi. This try-marked intonation is doing a different thing from Ayumi's previous turn. By this intonation she confirms whether her prediction is right.

Although both Ayumi and Tomoko orient to their mutual understanding about this item through their joint interactional activity, it is revealed that Ling does not share the knowledge of this cultural item. In line 6, she initiates repair by repeating the word ("*furoshiki?*"). The next actions by Tomoko and Ayumi turn out to be different. In line 7, Tomoko acknowledges Ling's turn, treating it as a confirmation check. In contrast, Ayumi orients to Ling's turn as an indication of an understanding problem and checks if Ling knows about this item. This action displays Ayumi's orientation to Ling's identity as a not-fully-competent speaker of Japanese or a novice cultural member and also redirects Tomoko's orientation. Tomoko's orientation shift is proved in her next action in line 10. She starts explaining what '*furoshiki*' is in the form of a more or less translation equivalent term ("[big [handkerchief,") in English. After abandoning her turn in line 11 followed by a one-second pause, Ayumi restarts her turn ("and then (.)"). It is difficult to know if she treated the previous turn by Tomoko as a completion of repair with sufficient information and tried to move on or if she was going to provide more explanation about '*furoshiki*' in this turn. However, before Ayumi's transition relevant place (TRP) comes, Ling requires further explanation about what it is used for. Her learning object has now moved from the initial 'what it is' or 'what it means' level (lexical) to the level of the actual use of the object (cultural). This extended pursuit about this item reveals that Ling's orientation is now clearly directed to vocabulary learning and vocabulary-related cultural learning. Also, this

learning behavior proves that Ling's initial problem was actually an understanding problem as Ayumi rightly treated. In response to this, Ayumi gives more explanation ("wrap things? and carry?", "as a bag¿" in lines 15 and 18) and Tomoko aligns (line 17). To this explanation Ling shows understanding (lines 16 and 19). Tomoko provides further information, explaining that '*furoshiki*' used to be used, by which she implies that it is not a common practice any more. In response to this turn, however, Ayumi gives a partial counterargument by raising the case in which '*furoshiki*' is still used, that is, in formal occasions like funeral and wedding. Tomoko is reminded of such cases and admits that it is true ("[*aa:::*" in line 25 and "*un*" in line 27). Ling again displays understanding of this added information (line 29). The definition of '*furoshiki*' is constructed turn by turn, describing it as something that is used even now but its use is limited to very formal occasions and that it is not used in daily life such as in supermarket shopping. Also, the act of using it in the supermarket is treated and implied as something laughable in the current Japanese society (line 35). Ling then displays understanding of it too with aligning laughter (line 37). This extract has shown the L1 members' orientation to Ling's identity as a cultural novice and that the identity has also been made relevant by Ling's own actions with agency towards learning about this unknown cultural item. This orientation and agency have transformed the current institutional activity into a temporary Japanese language and cultural teaching-learning activity.

Interestingly, sometimes the teacher also incorporates a Japanese word. The following example works similar to the case seen above with cultural learning. Again, I divide the sequence into two parts (Extracts 7a and 7b).

Extract 7a

```
 1   Teacher:   in any rate,
 2   Tomoko:    n:
 3   Teacher:   uh:: why they are doing that i don't know
 4              but they are building some .h tens of
 5              thousands of tsubo area,
             ((Tsubo is a unit of measurement for land area. One tsubo is about 3.306
             square meters.))
 6   Kazuto:    h:::n
 7   Tomoko:    [h:::n
 8   Teacher:   [supposedly, for agri[culture
 9   Tomoko:                         [so: is [that
10   Kazuto:                                 [n::
11   Tomoko:    not (.) for hobby?
12              (.5)
13   Tomoko:    is that [busi- for business?
14   Teacher:           [nn: i don't think uh:
15   Kazuto:    (   )
16   Teacher:   tens of thousands of tsubo
17              can be [uh: (hobby)
18   Tomoko:           [£tsubohhhh .hh
19   Kazuto:    hhhhh
20   Teacher:   so,
21   Tomoko:    £aa:
```

Here, they are talking about agriculture in Japan. Prior to this sequence, Ling has given an opinion that land in the mountains cannot be used for farming. Teacher disagrees with this by providing a counterexample in the form of a story-telling. The story is about a new agricultural zone relatively close to their university and also located in a rather mountainous area. After a side sequence, he comes back on track and continues the story. In the course of describing the size of the agricultural zone, he brings up a Japanese term '*tsubo*' which refers to a traditional Japanese unit of measurement of land area. What is important is that the use of this Japanese term is, as a result of Teacher's word choice, in connection to the content of the story. Put another way, the formulation of this turn is recipient-designed. There might have been at least three possible ways to deliver the explanation of the land size, which are with: (a) the acreage, e.g., feet; (b) the metric system, e.g., meter; and (c) Japanese traditional measurement system, e.g., '*tsubo*'. He could use the acreage which is commonly used in U.S. culture. However, there is almost no point of using it in order to describe the land area about which they are talking

because this system is not used in Japan. Moreover, they are talking about the land located in Japanese context. Therefore, the use of the term in the description is treated as possibly being confusing and irrelevant for the students. So, the choice might be either the metric system or the traditional and cultural specific Japanese measurement system. While the metric system is widely used in various domains as the current official measurement system in Japan, old measurement units like '*tsubo*' are still used, but have more particular domains of usage, for instance, in describing the size of housing area (but not limited to only such) in present-day Japan. Teacher chooses the term '*tsubo*' here, although the metric system is also utilized later for a different purpose (i.e., for explaining what '*tsubo*' is).

Teacher's culturally accommodative action by choosing this word as commonly shared cultural knowledge and an object to which legitimate cultural members have access without a question (including himself as a member who is actually using it as such) reveals his orientation to the students' cultural knowledge and identity as Japanese, and this word has been selected for this particular population (i.e., L1 Japanese students).

The students are first orienting to the content and not orienting to Teacher's use of this Japanese word. However, his second use of this term (line 16) has caught attention and is treated as something funny by Tomoko who repeats the word and laughs (line 18). This is also followed by a laughter by Kazuto (line 19). The laughable factor might have come from the incorporation of a quite culturally specific word like '*tsubo*' into an English turn.

Extract 7b

```
   21  Tomoko:    £aa:
→  22  Ling:      °tsubo°
   23  Kazuto:    ↑tsubo. is kinda:
   24  Teacher:   three point three. heehoo
                                     square
   25  Ling:      [↑aa:::
   26  Teacher:   [three point three. meters.
   27  Ling?:     hn[::
   28  Teacher:      [square.
   29  Tomoko:    u[:n
   30  Teacher:    [no. square meters.
   31  Ayumi?:    hh
   32  Tomoko:    [£s(h)q(h)uare meters
→  33  Ling:      [square meters=
   34  Teacher:   meter s[quare is a different thi]ng.
→  35  Ling:            =[is    one    tsubo?      ]
   36  Teacher:   yes=
   37  Ayumi:     u[:[n.
   38  Ling:       [a[↑a::
   39  Teacher:     =[is one tsubo.=
```

However, it is revealed that Ling does not share the knowledge of this culturally specific lexical item. In line 22, instead of laughing, she murmurs the word with a small voice ("°*tsubo*°"). This utterance is immediately taken up as a repair initiator by Kazuto in the next turn. And this orientation shift brings a change of the current activity. Kazuto starts providing the explanation of its meaning, taking the cultural expert role. However, soon he encounters a trouble providing or formulating the explanation (lines 23), from which point Teacher takes over Kazuto's turn. With this switching of the role, Kazuto's identity is repositioned from an 'expert' to 'novice' by which Teacher's 'expert' identity is made relevant instead. We could also say that Teacher's role and identity as a teacher is officially made relevant here at this moment, so to speak, by his actions such as giving explanations and helping or guiding students when they are in trouble. In line 24, Teacher provides the information about the size of one *tsubo*, including another Japanese word '*heehoo*', 'square'. Although we have no way of knowing if Ling knows this word or not, her action in the response turn simply tells us what she chose to display about her understanding. She lets it pass, by which she indicates the nonnecessity of clarifying the meaning of '*heehoo*'.

Instead, she produces a change-of-state token ("[↑*aa:::*"), displaying her understanding of Teacher's turn. Teacher continues the explanation, while converting the word '*heehoo*' back into English together with the metric system. Tomoko repeats Teacher's self-repaired utterance ("[£s(h)q(h)uare meters") in line 32, and this overlaps with Ling's repetition of the same utterance in line 33 ("[square meters="). On the one hand, Tomoko's repetition is in a way an act of 'doing teasing' about Teacher's mistake as evident in her smiley voice (indicated with the £ symbol) and laughter (h) within her utterance; on the other hand, Ling's repetition partially constitutes her confirmation check turn. The rest of her turn is completed in the form of a question in line 35 ("=[is one *tsubo*?]"). In response to this, Teacher confirms this as so, and this is followed by another token of displaying understanding ("[*a*[↑*a::*") by Ling (line 38).

    Extracts 6 and 7 above have shown that the occasional incorporation of Japanese cultural knowledge and objects (including vocabulary itself) into talk provides opportunities for cultural learning as well as vocabulary learning for Ling.

Orientation to Ling's L1

    The final extract I will analyze below is another word search activity, but seemingly a Japanese word search. This is not an activity that leads to a certain learning opportunity; however, it is an interesting case in that Ling orients to her L1 (through the electronic dictionary) and consequently the co-participants orient to this language as well. Therefore, this case is worth mentioning and analyzing in terms of another contingently emerging language of the moment.

    Under the restriction of linguistic context in which all of the other group members are L1 Japanese speakers, it is difficult for Ling to rely on her L1 (Chinese) as a resource in the same way as the other co-members rely on their L1. What is observed is that she frequently draws on Japanese in the institutional activity. However, a few cases in which she oriented to her L1 were observed, particularly when she orients to the participants' partially shared knowledge about Chinese characters, though there are some usage differences between the two languages. The participants often rely on their electronic dictionaries as a useful tool for learning and checking

vocabulary in their discussion activity. The use of the electronic dictionary is a very common practice in Japan, and it is often a necessity of language learning for students in the classroom or even outside of the classroom. As such, many students rely on this tool, and the same holds for Ling. Although it is hard to grasp every detail of the participants' actions due to the unavailability of visual data, I will reconstruct what might be happening through the activity of using the electronic dictionary as much as possible relying on the sound and utterances I can recognize in the audio data.

Extract 8

```
     1    Ling:     and maybe you will- (.8)
     2              chuusha?
                    injection
     3              (.7)
     4    Kazuto:   chuusha? aa[:
                    injection
     5    Ling:                [uh:
     6    Kazuto:   in- [inject
     7    Ling:         [(° °)
→ 8    Ling:     inject some kind ovu: (.5)
     9    Kazuto:   (°        °)?
→ 10   Ling:     ee::::::tto.  ((Ling is typing into the electronic dictionary))
                    well
    11              (1.9)
→ 12   Ling:     kore?=    ((shows the Chinese word to someone; recipient unclear))
                    this
    13    Kazuto:   =°medicine°.
    14              (1.7)
    15    Kazuto:   ((clears throat))
    16              (1.0)
→ 17   Ling:     °wakaru   ka na:°
                     understand   Q   IP
                    "I wonder if you can figure it out."
→ 18            kore chuugokugo hhhhh
                    this     Chinese
                    "This is Chinese."
    19    Kazuto:   hehehe[HHHHH
    20    Ayumi:          [m(hhh)m[mm::::[:::::::::::    ((till line 24))
    21    Tomoko:               [↑hn::?
    22    Kazuto:                        [£n: i think
    23              we cannot get it (  [     )
    24    Ayumi:    ::::::::::hhhh
    25    Ling:                           [£wakan nai¿ hh
                                     understand-Neg
                    "You don't understand it? hh."
    26    Tomoko:   u:n. but i ca[n guess like
                    yeah
    27    Kazuto:                 [medicine.
    28    Tomoko:   £something [poison ↑ye(h)sHHHHHH
    29    Kazuto:              [>something ↑something<
    30              poison hehehhhh
    31    Ayumi:    something poi[son
    32    Tomoko:                [something poison=
    33    Ayumi:    somethi[ng bad heheheh
    34    Tomoko:          [n [something bad.
    35    Kazuto:             [(°    yeah°)
    36    Tomoko:   u:n.
    37              (1.3)
    38    Kazuto:   u:::n.    ((Ling is typing))
    39              (2.7)    ((typing sound continues))
→ 40   Ling:     ah ↑ho↓rumon ka.
```

```
                        hormone    prt
                   "Ah, that's hormone."
41  Kazuto:  ↑aa[:[:
42  Ayumi:     [ºaa:º
43  Tomoko:    [a↑a::[:
44  Ayumi:          [a↑a[::
45  Ling:               [inject some
46         horumon and made the chicken
           hormone
47         become bigger [and bigger
```

In the above extract, Ling is continuing a topic about chickens crammed and fed in small spaces. After Ling's English word search for 'injection' using a Japanese equivalent word '*chuusha*' (though it was provided as and also used as a verb form because the sentence under construction requires that form) is accomplished as in the typical pattern between the participants (lines 1-7), Ling incorporates this word and continues her turn (line 8). However, as soon as she has started her continuing turn, she again encounters a trouble and it is indicated by the elongation of a word with a vowel marking ("ovu:", i.e., 'of') (Carroll, 2005) and 0.5-second silence. After the signal of trouble, however, neither a possible candidate English word nor a Japanese equivalent for the searched English word nor any alternative clue is produced here. Instead, while producing an elongated delay marker ("*ee:::::tto.*") followed by a 1.9-second pause, she checks her electronic dictionary. Having found a word, she shows it to the other member(s) (the recipient is unclear due to the unavailability of visual data), saying "*kore?=*" ('this') (line 12). It is unclear whether Kazuto's next utterance ("=ºmedicine.º") latched to this Ling's turn is a result of guessing from the previous content or a result of having looked at the Chinese word in Ling's dictionary because the latched utterance with no gap leaves some doubt whether he actually saw the word. Considering that Ling is trying to tell the co-members something about injection, it might still be possible that he has associated the searched word with some kind of medicine even before looking at the Chinese word. If this is the case, another possibility is that Ling is first showing the word to Tomoko sitting next to her during Kazuto's utterance above. In any case, this is followed by an extended gap of silence (lines 14 and 16). Orienting to this as a sign of trouble, Ling expresses her concern whether they can figure out the

meaning of what she has shown to them. Predicting a negative answer from the previous problem sign, she preemptively provides an account, in place of them, for why they cannot understand the word: because it is Chinese ("*kore chuugokugo* hhhhh").

So, what is probably happening here is that what Ling has looked up is a Chinese word and that she is showing it to the other members. It is possible that she is using some sort of L1 (Chinese-Chinese) dictionary here because if she found the English word in her Chinese-English dictionary, the word search would presumably end here. Or, if she found the Japanese word in her Chinese-Japanese dictionary, she would be able to provide the others with the Japanese word as a hint for the English word search. But neither case occurs here. It seems inefficient to not look up the word in question directly using a bilingual dictionary, but at any rate, she is using L1 dictionary at this moment.

As Ling predicted, Kazuto provides a negative answer ("[£n: i think we cannot get it"), and Ayumi also implies the impossibility of figuring it out with an elongated voice and laughter. As soon as she recognizes Kazuto's comment, Ling reconfirms that they do not understand it, followed by a little laughter ("[£*wakan nai*¿ hh"). While acknowledging the difficulty, however, Tomoko does not give up entirely. She says, "but i ca[n guess like £something [poison ↑ye(h)sHHHHHH"), implying that it is still possible to guess the meaning of the word partially even though she does not know the exact meaning, with an agreement-seeking manner. Overlapping with her turn, Kazuto rejoins the problem-solving activity by providing the word 'medicine' again which he has previously mentioned, and once hearing Tomoko's expression 'something poison', he enthusiastically aligns to it (lines 29-30). Thereafter, the Japanese members agree on their understanding of the meaning of it as 'something poison' and 'something bad' (lines 31-35).

However, the problem is not fully solved yet. Even though the other members vaguely understand the word Ling has shown to them, Ling is still in the process of a word search for the exact word she is trying to convey to them. During a kind of blank time between activity boundaries, Ling again checks her dictionary. During Kazuto's utterance ("*u:::n.*") of seemingly

filling the silence (line 38) and the following 2.7-second pause (line 39), Ling types into her dictionary and finds the word '*horumon*' (line 40). Upon hearing this, the other members show understanding one after another whereby all the participants share the moment of discovery and intersubjectivity.

One interesting thing in this word search is that what she was engaged in is actually a Japanese word search. Considering her pronunciation (*horumon*) embedded in the Japanese sentence turn (line 40), more likely the word has been retrieved as a Japanese lexical item (consequently, it is assumed that she has used the Chinese-Japanese dictionary this time). She then incorporates the result of her Japanese word search in her continuing turn as it is[5] (line 45 and after). Since it is not rare to see that the participants incorporate Japanese words into their English utterances, this case can be seen to be working in the same way. Once the intersubjectivity necessary for moving the topic forward has been established among all the participants with the word '*horumon*', they go back on track without further prolonging the side sequence.

In this example, Ling did not have the exact word nor other alternatives in Japanese to provide for the other members for an English word search. Under this situation, in order to convey what she wants to say in the talk, she lets herself attempt a kind of 'give-it-a-try' way by showing a Chinese word to the co-participants as another alternative which might possibly be shared in part between her and the Japanese participants. The significant aspect, therefore, is that Ling actually used (or attempted to use, at least) Chinese to the other Japanese members as a resource and the participants oriented to this language whereby her L1 goes beyond a personal level and gains a public role, which means her L1 has become *the language of the moment*.

---

[5] There is a possibility that she incorporated the word as an English word in her continuing turn because the pronunciation of 'hormone' in English and '*horumon*' in katakana is somewhat alike. However, in my view, it is quite likely that she has treated the retrieved word as Japanese, as mentioned in the main analysis, considering her pronunciation.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As I have demonstrated in this study, microanalysis of the moments of learning in detailed sequential contexts can be a valuable way to observe what learning activities are happening and how they are happening in actual interaction. I have shown how the participants co-construct their classroom activity, orienting to and bringing up available language resources, especially focusing on one participant's orientation towards learning *the target languages of the moment*. While in the big picture English is the target language and relevant throughout all of the classroom activities, Ling's orientation to her two target languages creates dynamism and contingency in the local level learning activities, intertwined with all the participants' orientations to the multilingual nature of the classroom, to each other's identities, and their agency.

Pedagogical Implications

A few examples in this study may shed light on language teaching in multilingual foreign language classrooms. In vocabulary teaching, it might be important to consider how to explain culturally specific items to students who do not have the requisite cultural knowledge. In the example of teaching and learning sequence of a culturally specific item '*furoshiki*' (Extract 6), Ling pursued learning about it from the vocabulary level up to the cultural level, and the cultural expert members elaborated the explanation to a more culturally oriented way through their definition activity. This suggests the importance of providing not only a sort of translation equivalent, but also a culturally informative way of explaining about such objects for meaningful learning. This issue might also have an implication for promoting intercultural learning in multilingual foreign language classrooms.

In another example about the Japanese traditional unit of measurement '*tsubo*' (Extracts 7a and 7b), the teacher's explanation of the word has another pedagogical implication. It is about how to extend a cultural learning opportunity that is initially targeted to a specific person (i.e., a

cultural novice; in this case Ling) to other students who have the basic cultural knowledge as members of that culture. An explanation like, "*Tsubo* is a unit of the Japanese traditional measurement system.", could be informative for Ling to get general cultural knowledge (but may not necessarily be sufficient). However, it is unnecessary information for the Japanese students who have this general knowledge. The teacher's more specific and practical level explanation of its actual size (approximately 3.3 square meters) provides potential opportunities for learning for both parties. Even though the Japanese students know this term and what it is as a common vocabulary and cultural item, it is very likely that they do not know exactly how large one *tsubo* is, unless these young students are familiar with and have knowledge about this old measurement system in some way. Actually, in the continuing sequence of this episode, one student's misunderstanding of the size created another repair sequence that involved all of the participants. In that sense, the teacher has succeeded in extending cultural learning opportunity from one person to the whole group.

Another issue is about the use of the electronic dictionary. I have presented one instance in which Ling relied on her L1 as a resource for communication with the Japanese members, expecting their partially shared writing system, although it is a rare case under the restriction of the students' different L1s. However, this phenomenon suggests a potential of the electronic dictionary as a resource for intersubjectivity between L1 Japanese and L1 Chinese users in addition to its use as a self-learning tool. Since kanji is ideogramic, intersubjectivity is much more likely to be made through looking at characters than through hearing. The participants orient to this resource as such, and thus the Chinese word was *shown* to the Japanese members *visually* through her electronic dictionary, not through pronouncing it.

The electronic dictionary is very useful as a self-learning tool; however, it also has a potential of promoting communication and collaborative learning especially when utilized in group work. Vocabulary learning behaviors with the electronic dictionary often bring learning opportunities to not only the person who originally started the activity, but also the other members in the group. Although it is beyond the scope of this study, several intriguing activity sequences with the

electronic dictionary use have been actually observed in this data corpus.

The limitation of this study, however, is a lack of visual data which have become a more essential data source along with audio-recorded data in recent CA and observational research. The present analyses, especially on the example of the electronic dictionary use, might have gained more validity if visual data had been available. As visual data allow a more detailed description of physical and non-verbal behavior, it is expected that the trend of including video-recorded data for analyses of interaction will further extend in future research.

Future Call for Microanalysis of Multilingual and Multicultural Classroom Discourse

Considering the current global flow of students and diversity of learning contexts, it is quite possible that even foreign language classrooms such as the one we have seen in this study might include one or more students with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds coming to a given country to study the language and culture of that society or to study their specialty in a second language context. By the same token, it is also possible that many such students have knowledge of or are learning more than one non-native language, as in Ling's case.

In the case of Japan, a growing number of international students have been studying in institutions of higher education. According to the Japan Student Services Organization (2009), as of May 2008, the number of international students in Japan is 123,829, and this figure is the highest ever. In particular, students from Asian countries share more than 90 % of the total number, and students from China comprise more than half of the international students (58.8 %). Considering that many of these international students attend universities, it is highly expected that many of them will also have opportunities to learn a language other than Japanese through the required course work. In such cases, learning opportunities and behaviors similar to those observed in this study might also be expected in other foreign language classrooms. That is to say, while learning another language other than Japanese in a foreign language classroom, there might also be Japanese learning opportunities there. For Ling's case, even in an English classroom, she is surrounded by linguistic and cultural experts from whom she can learn about

her another target language, i.e., Japanese, and its culture, and she tries to seize contingently emerging opportunities for learning them as much as possible.

I believe that the observed situation is not limited to this study, and therefore this study will not simply end as an individual case. Since international students are expected to spend much time studying in the universities they attend, more studies utilizing microanalysis of multilingual and multicultural foreign language classrooms in higher education settings will contribute to our understandings of what is really going on in real-life learning situations there.

REFERENCES

Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal, 87,* 534-545.

Brouwer, C. E. (2004). Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 93-113). London: Continuum.

Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL conversation. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 214-234). Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Egbert, M., Niebecker, L., & Rezzara, S. (2004). Inside first and second language speakers' trouble in understanding. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 178-200). London: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology: perspectives and developments* (pp. 338-366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Have, P. ten. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Heritage, J. (1984). 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.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27,* 25-50.

Japan Student Services Organization. (2008, December 25). International students in Japan 2008. Retrieved February 6, 2009, from

http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/data08_e.html

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 88,* 551-567.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in second language acquisition and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *The Modern Language Journal, 91,* 907-922.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 1083-1110.

Kurhila, S. (2005). Different orientations to grammatical correctness. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 143-158). Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Mondada, L. (2004). Ways of 'doing being plurilingual' in international work meetings. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 18-39). London: Continuum.

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88,* 536-550.

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 313-326.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation*. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons

in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in*

ethnomethodology (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of

turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

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.

Skårup, T. (2004). Brokering and membership in a multilingual community of practice. In R.

Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 40-57). London:

Continuum.

Torras, M. C. (2005). Social identity and language choice in bilingual service talk. In K. Richards

& P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 107-123). Houndsmill,

Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and

pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*, 302-325.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe

(Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87-106). London: Sage.

APPENDIX

Interlinear gloss

COP	Copula (various forms of copula)
TP	Topic Marker
LK	Linking
Q	Question Marker
QT	Quotation Marker
Neg	Negative inflection
IP	Interactional Particle
prt	Particles

Transcription conventions

(0.0)	Time gap in tenths of a second
(.)	Brief time gap
=	Latched utterance
-	Cut-off
[	The point of overlap onset
]	The point at which an overlap ends
:	Lengthened sound (extra colons indicate more lengthening)
.	Falling tone
,	Continuing intonation
?	Rising intonation
¿	Rising intonation, but not too high
↑	Marked rise of immediately following segment
↓	Marked fall of immediately following segment
hhh	Outbreath including laughter
.h	Inbreath (extra hs indicate more aspiration)
(h)	Aspiration inside the boundaries of a word including laughter
£	Smiley voice
word	Stressed utterance
CAPS	Markedly louder sounds relative to the surrounding talk
°	Softer sounds
> <	Faster speech
< >	Slower speech
( )	Utterance unable to transcribe
(words)	Especially dubious hearings or speaker-identifications.
(( ))	Transcriber's descriptions