

INTERACTION IN A CHINESE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS APPROACH

JOHN RYLANDER

University of Hawai‘i

ABSTRACT

The following research involves the use of Conversation Analysis (CA) in the analysis of classroom discourse within a year-long university level Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) course. The goals of the research were: (a) to look at how a specific, two-part activity within a CFL classroom is bounded by a pre-allocated instructor turn, (b) how the turn-taking structure of the activity is organized in terms of question/answer adjacency pairs, (c) how repair occurs within the data and whether, as well as in what form, uptake exists, and (d) how students orient to the on-going speech in general by incorporating the lexical and grammatical elements of the conversation within their turn-taking strategy. Findings show that though the instructor provided little repair, learners were generally receptive to it and produced uptake, and that the on-going classroom interaction provided linguistic input rich enough that participants were able to incorporate lexical items from it for use in their own talk.

INTRODUCTION

Markee (2000) argues that Conversation Analysis (CA) be incorporated into Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research methodologies. In his book “Conversation Analysis,” he attempts to refute claims that because the focus of CA is on language *use* and that it is fundamentally a behavioral discipline stemming from research as a sub-discipline of sociology dating back to the late 1960s, it is methodologically incongruent with SLA research, whose research purpose is the understanding of the cognitive processes involved in SLA. Markee shows that through the analysis of fine-grained transcriptions (in his case, second language classroom discourse) insights can be gained into the manner in which talk is used to achieve comprehensible input, a focus of much mainstream SLA research.

The present research is concerned with whether, as Markee puts it, “fine-grained transcriptions [analyzed using CA methodology] would enable SLA researchers

interested in understanding the effects on language learning of (a) conversational repairs and (b) conversational input in general to investigate whether the moment-by-moment sequential organization of such talk has any direct and observable acquisitional consequences” (p. 42). At present, research of this type is rare, especially in terms of classroom discourse, and having it could “potentially demonstrate whether and how members [i.e., classroom language learners] exploit repair on a moment-by-moment basis as a resource for learning new language” (p. 99). With this as a general research framework, the analysis presented in this research will look at (a) how a specific, two-part activity (student presentation followed by question/answer session) within a Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) classroom is bounded by a pre-allocated instructor turn, (b) how the turn-taking structure of the activity is organized in terms of question/answer adjacency pairs, (c) how repair occurs within the data and whether, as well as in what form, uptake exists, and (d) how students orient to the on-going speech in general by incorporating the lexical and grammatical elements of the conversation within their turn-taking strategy. Points (a) and (b) will detail the structures of interaction with the classroom environment under research, while points (c) and (d), both more in line with Markee’s (2000) research, will address issues of interaction and language learning in such an environment.

The research foundation for the present research does not, however, stem from CA research within the field of SLA, which is at present relatively sparse. It stems from the experimental and quasi-experimental studies into interactional modification, or negotiation of meaning, that occurred throughout the mid-1980s on to the present. This research has provided rich findings into the nature of learner language input, comprehension, and output. However, it must be said that much of the basis for this experimental research was begun in the decade prior, in the 1970s, through various combinations of discourse analysis in the form of linguistic and sociolinguistic research methodologies, e.g., systemic functional linguistic analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, classroom ethnography (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Hatch, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In the field of SLA in the two decades since, due to the popularity of quantitative studies centered on the benchmark of statistical significance, little research using methods of discourse analysis, specifically using CA, has been done.

CA's research foundation in the 1960s and 1970s focused on the structure of everyday conversations and how competent interlocutors used language for communication. Markee (2000) defines CA as the study of "the sequential structure of talk-in-interaction in terms of interlocutors' real-time orientations to the preferential practices that underlie, for participants and consequently also for analysts, the conversational behaviors of turn-taking and repair in different speech exchange systems" (p. 25). At the heart of CA is an emic perspective that focuses on what speakers themselves orient to within conversation. No subjective opinions about meaning are expressed by the researcher when discussing data; instead, the context of the conversation provides all necessary meaning from the turn-taking structure and the issues to which participants orient. The motivation of the analysts, then, is to root out the mechanisms of conversations, the rules by which participants abide and through which conversation is structured. This line of research is based on the assumption that conversation alone provides all necessary information. Issues of economic status, gender, and other forms of social categorization are not considered *a priori* to analysis of the data; nothing but what the conversation provides is salient to understanding the co-construction of meaning between the participants, what Markee (2000) calls the "underlying preferential structure of conversation" (p. 28). From an SLA perspective, CA methodology provides a record of input to which participants orient during conversation. This input can then be analyzed for message comprehension, output, and feedback, the means by which this comprehension comes about and evidence of how non-native speaking (NNS) participants incorporate input, either localized or general, into their output.

Outline of Research

The present research will start with a review of the literature concerning Interaction research in SLA. Following this will be a review of relevant methodological underpinnings of CA and the rationale for its use in this research. Then, a detailed description of the classroom context and the specific activity selected for analysis will be provided. Finally, conversation data will be analyzed and a discussion of findings will follow.

Interaction in SLA

Hatch (1978) proposed that the field of SLA adopt a research technique common in the field of first language acquisition, that of discourse analysis. She claimed that, by focusing on frequency and morpheme studies, first language learning research to date had ignored the question of *how* a language learner actively participates in the language learning process. First language researchers, in her view, had relied upon the mistaken assumption that language learning was simply a process of receiving language bit by bit, followed by a mental construction process whereby the learner would automatically fit the language together *before* using it. This computational idea, of course, reflected others of the time—notably Krashen’s Input Hypothesis relying upon “the silent period” and Chomsky’s Language Acquisition Device. Hatch, instead, claimed that, “language learning evolves *out* of learning how to carry on conversations” (p. 404, stress in original). Topic-nomination, attention-drawing markers, attending to meaning and scaffolded interaction found within the data, to Hatch, “suggest[ed] that...discourse structure is at the heart of sentence structure from the beginning of its development” (p. 407, stress removed). Discourse analysis of this sort is found in earlier work done by Hymes (1972) in regards to an understanding of ‘communicative competence’ and, though different in design, Selinker (1972) in terms of interlanguage (IL) performance data.

SLA researchers in the 1980s, turned their attention to the effects of negotiation in interaction, focusing on how learners become more communicatively competent and display greater control of sociolinguistically appropriate, native-like language output, i.e., how negotiation develops learners’ IL toward the target language (TL) in ways other than syntactic development. Instrumental in this research was earlier work by Long (1981b, 1983a, 1983b, 1996), whose Interaction Hypothesis states that “environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner’s developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during *negotiation for meaning*” (Long, 1996, p. 414; stress in original). Early on, Long (1980) found negotiation for meaning useful in that it allowed learners to engage in the type of language modifications, not just input simplification, necessary for improved language comprehension. Long’s (1980) study

was the first to show the merit of Krashen's (1977) view that comprehensible input is *necessary* for SLA, but also that it is *not* sufficient (as Krashen had earlier claimed). As well, the nature of Long's research—the quantification of conversations, e.g., the amount of confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, and question types—set a standard by which much of the research on interaction was to follow (see, Gass & Varonis, 1985, 1989; Long, 1981b, 1983a; Pica, 1983, 1987, 1988; Pica & Doughty, 1985; Pica, Doughty, & Young, 1986; Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987; Varonis & Gass, 1985).

The concern of this research tradition has been to understand the cognitive aspect of learning—language development and failure—rather than simply how languages are used, for negotiation or otherwise. As Doughty and Long (2003) state, “[p]erformance data are inevitably the researchers’ mainstay, but understanding underlying competence, not the external verbal behavior that depends on that competence, is the ultimate goal” (p. 4). Early on, Interaction research was grounded in Long's (1983b) claim that there is a *causal* relationship between learner interactional modification and cognitive aspects of SLA in that (a) *assuming that* comprehensible input leads to SLA, (b) *if* interactional modification of meaning leads to comprehensible input, (c) then interactional modification for meaning is facilitative of SLA. What was left unanswered were questions of how, at what rate, and to what extent interaction allowed learners to achieve progress in SLA.

Interaction studies have shown the following: a positive effect on comprehension of modified input (for review see Parker and Chaudron, 1987), interactionally modified input leads to increases in learner production (for review see Yano, Long, & Ross, 1994), conversational modifications aid lexical development via clarification requests and learner reformulation (Sato, 1986), the frequency and type of NS questions within NS/NNS interaction (Varonis & Gass, 1985), the manner and amount of NS/NNS conversational modifications (Pica, 1992a, 1992b; Pica, Holliday, & Lewis, 1990), the manner and amount of modification in NNS/NNS interaction compared to NS/NNS (Varonis & Gass, 1985), experimental “task-type effect” (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987; Varonis & Gass, 1985), differences in conversational modifications made inside and outside the classroom setting (Pica & Long, 1986), the

role and importance of opportunities for learner output (Swain, 1985, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1995, 1998), and the role of attention and noticing within interaction (Doughty, 2001; Schmidt, 1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1994). (For further reviews, consult Doughty and Long, 2003; Gass, 1997, 2003; Long, 1996; and Pica, 1994). Summarizing the emphasis interaction plays on this tradition of SLA research, Gass (1997) states, “[w]ithin the current orthodoxy, conversation is not only a medium of practice; it is also the means by which learning takes place. In other words, conversational interaction in a second language forms the basis for the development of syntax; it is not merely a forum for practice of grammatical structures” (p. 104).

Interaction in CA

According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989), it is not easy to apply to classroom learning (the main SLA context) the controls necessary for good experimental research. A methodological gap, therefore, exists when attempting to understand classroom discourse using experimental methods. The Interaction work presented above and CA methodology differ in this regard in that the former, more theory-driven laboratory research, has focused primarily on the quantification of data—the products of speech, categorized in great detail, from controlled settings—whereas the later, heuristic-inductive approach focuses on language *in situ*, where the interlocutors orient themselves to the relevance of the conversation itself on a moment-by-moment basis, placing more emphasis on the form taken by interaction, rather than the content in itself.

CA has its roots in Ethnomethodology and was developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), who focused their studies on the organizational details of ordinary communication through telephone conversations. They found that there is an orderliness to the manner in which conversations occurred moment by moment—the way in which they unfolded and were co-created by participants—and this revealed how cognition is socially distributed. Supporting this assumption are findings on how parties produce orderliness within conversation *in situ* (Psathas, 1995). For example, one notion of CA is *recipient design*, which holds that any turn at any moment is being created specifically for a co-participant or participants. This, then, is what CA focuses on: the unfolding

temporal organization of talk co-created through interaction; namely, what participants themselves orient to during ordinary talk (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997).

CA methodology seeks to understand how conversations are organized, the rules by which they are governed, and in this light it is understood that conversation works around a “local management system” where meaning is exchanged and mutual comprehension accomplished. Human conduct is not defined theoretically but is understood in the analysis of “situationally invoked” instances (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). Theory is not created *a priori* but is approached as contextually derived social actions that are organized locally. This, of course, means researchers using CA to analyze data do so without initial research questions; instead findings are arrived at through analysis of the data themselves (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). Heritage (1988) explains that conversation has structure, that meaning within conversation is derived from participant turn-taking—within the pre- and post-utterance comments, that it is anything but accidental, and that detailed transcription of naturally occurring data, i.e., data of ordinary conversation, is necessary for analysis.

For researchers whose primary source is conversational data, fine-grained analysis of transcribed audio- or video-taped recordings is necessary. Given that no preconceived theory or specific research questions drive the analysis, findings are based on the ‘method of instances’ (Psathas, 1995) rather than on statistical relevance. Using the method of instances, of researching the rule-based sequential turn-taking mechanism of conversations, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1977) arrived at a conversational category called *adjacency pairs*. *Adjacency pairs* are groupings of turns that, for lack of a better phrase, “go together,” e.g., question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance, request-acceptance, complaint-excuse. Various rules for the occurrence of pairs are that they must (a) be adjacent to each other, (b) be produced by different speakers, (c) be ordered as first and second parts with a first requiring a second (not another first) and placing certain expectations that must be attended to in a second in order for it to fit with the first, and (d) achieve conversational functions such as starting and closing conversations, conversational moves, speaker selection, remedial exchanges, or building extended, sometimes divergent speech streams such as through insertion sequences (Boden, 1994). Additional research into adjacency pairs has pointed out that a second pair must follow a first, and in cases where this fails to occur provides counter-

evidence—in that what a first pair part does is to make a second pair part conditionally relevant, so that if the second pair part is missing, it is noticeably absent. Researchers then found that there exist preferred and dis-preferred seconds (Schegloff, 1988; Pomerantz, 1984a); for example, a preferred second for an offer is an acceptance, a dis-preferred second is a refusal (see, though, Bilmes, 1988 for criticism of the concept of preference).

Adjacency pairs are constructed through turn-taking behavior. An understanding of turn organization in ordinary conversation can be seen in Sacks et al.'s (1974) 14-point constitutive model of turn-taking (see Appendix A). Markee (2000) states, “[a] *turn* is defined as a spate of talk that is collaboratively constructed by speakers out of one or more TCUs [turn constructional units], whose projectability allows possible next and current speakers to identify when current speaker’s turn might hearably be coming to an end” (p. 84). According to Markee, TCUs themselves consist of a variety of components that may be sentential, clausal, phrasal, lexical or even smaller, non-lexical elements such as *uh*, *um* or *hmm* or change-of-state tokens like *oh* or *okay*, used to indicate comprehension. (For a more detailed review of CA methodology, see Markee, 2000; Psathas, 1995; ten Have, 1999; Sacks, 1992a, 1992b.)

The issue then is how CA, as a data-driven, emic research methodology, can benefit the field of SLA, whose research tradition overall—and more specifically in terms of Interaction studies—has been dominated by experimental, etic-based research. The present research proposes to show that within the context of SLA, CA is an effective instrument for gaining an understanding of language *use* within the language learning context, specifically in an intermediate CFL classroom. It is important to note that CA is not a methodology attempting to explain or describe the cognitive processes of second language acquisition. According to Negretti (1999), “CA approach does not lead to a generalization about language learning, but rather to the discovery of how non-native speakers produce L2 in this environment: which L2 structures, rules, and practices they adopt or sometimes create in order to effectively communicate in a context that forces them to rearrange their linguistic knowledge” (p. 77).

The view taken in the present research then is that CA methodology allows for an *in situ* analysis of participant conversational modifications and, in general, a description of

what participants in conversation orient to—corrective feedback and previously uttered linguistic elements—as potential resources for language learning. In contrast, mainstream SLA does not look at how participants orient to what is happening in interaction, including how students and teachers orient to what is happening at the moment in the classroom. As well, mainstream SLA quantifies elements of interaction, but does not look at how they are organized sequentially or the interactional work that is done with particular turns in particular contexts.

Data Collection

Two semesters of an intermediate CFL classroom were chosen for research (CHN 301 and 302). Each semester, written permission by all students and the instructor was granted to audio record classes, which met daily Monday-Friday for 50 minutes. At various unobtrusive locations around the classroom, a single tape-recorder was placed to pick up as many people speaking as possible. Though the researcher was primarily a class-participant during the data collection period, all information relevant to this research comes directly from the transcriptions of the audiotapes and one questionnaire administered during semester (see Appendix B for data summary); no notes were taken during classroom activities regarding the research. The classroom itself was relatively small and no extraneous sounds other than those produced in a normal classroom setting disturbed the recording process. Due to the fact that the recorder was in class and recording occurred each day, it is the researcher's opinion that the data collection process on the whole caused as little disturbance as such an instrument could under these classroom conditions.

Two different SONY dictaphone recorders were used over the course of data collection, a SONY M-717V and a SONY M-100MC. For the fall, the M717V was used in conjunction with a SONY flat-mic. Upon listening to the tapes near the end of the fall semester, it was found the flat-mic was shorting out during recording, resulting in long periods of silence. Without the flat-mic, the M-717V, due to its smaller internal microphone, failed to record the classroom setting with the necessary clarity for

transcription purposes. Recordings were discontinued temporarily, until the SONY M-100MC was purchased.

Rough transcriptions were made from the tapes only after the completion of the two semesters. In total, 34 hours of class were recorded over the course of the two semesters, 19 hours from fall 1999 and 15 from spring 2000. From this database, three classes were chosen at random for transcription and rough analysis, each of which occurred during the spring semester.

Having the rough transcriptions provided a macro perspective of class activities, showing the variety of *classroom speech events*, each of which being bounded, present from class to class, and the types of instructor-student and student-student interaction. Mitchell, Parkinson, and Johnstone (1981) describe a *classroom speech event* as “a stretch of lesson discourse, having a particular topic, and involving the participants...in a distinctive configuration of roles, linguistic and organizational” (p. 12). Each class began with either (a) a written quiz on textbook vocabulary items in which the instructor would speak individual words and students would write characters and corresponding *pinyin* with tone marks or (b) a student presentation. Following this, the class generally covered homework material either as a whole-class or in small groups, with any homework being collected following this. For the remainder of class-time, the instructor would introduce grammatical points or cultural facets noted in the text and students would form small groups or pairs to work on an assigned task stemming from that day’s lesson. At the end of the class, time permitting, students made impromptu, whole-class summations of their pair-/group-work.

After an initial data analysis, a particular, routine speech event was singled out for fine-grained transcription: the student presentation at the start of class, which included a whole-class question/answer discussion session. (However, for reasons explained later, only the Q/A sessions were rendered into fine-grain transcription.) One important, more technical and research-oriented, reason why this speech event was selected was because it was clearly recorded in terms of sound-quality. At the same time, the speech event provided a fair amount of peer-to-peer speaking instances compared to when lessons were more instructor-fronted. Resulting transcription notes were slightly modified from Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) (see Appendix C). This process required the data

first be written in *pinyin* and then translated separately into English. Following this, two NS Mandarin editors reviewed all written transcripts with the aid of the original audiotapes.

Classroom Setting

The data were collected from a class taught by a female NS originally from Taiwan who had taught courses at various university levels for approximately six years leading up to the time of data collection. The stated objectives of this class, CHN 302, were to improve the overall Mandarin language ability of students in the four basic skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Grades were based on the following: being prepared with class homework, near-daily vocabulary quiz scores, essays, informal presentations, chapter tests, and mid-term and final exams, both of which contained a written and an oral component, i.e., partner role-play.

In the Spring semester (from which all discussed data stems), sixteen students attended class; these students could be considered anything but homogenous. Since the Chinese language department at the site university did not, at the time of the data collection, administer placement exams for classes beyond the first two levels—100 and 200, which satisfy the university language requirement—students entered 302 with varying Mandarin skills, the basic premise being that a passing grade from previous classes was evidence enough of readiness. However, students could circumvent the lower levels (100 and 200, or even 300) by appealing to the director of the Chinese language department; and for numerous students in 302; this was certainly the case—those with in-country experience, previously advanced level high-school Mandarin classes, Defense Language Institute or other language school experience, and certain Heritage students. No issue, it seemed, was taken with the sometimes dramatically divergent student language skills, i.e., Heritage students with advanced listening and speaking abilities—occasionally in dialects other than “standard” Mandarin—but with limited literacy skills studying together with students more highly skilled in literacy—having come from grammar/textbook-based CFL classes—but not in oral communication.

There were nine Caucasian students (English L1), six Heritage students (English L1) with various amounts of Mandarin exposure from family members, and one Japanese L1

student employed by the university as a Japanese language instructor (see Appendix B for student descriptions). Nearly half (seven) of the students had some kind of in-country language exposure in Taiwan, the People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, or Macao. There were three females (all Heritage students) and thirteen males.

For this heterogeneous group, the instructor used a uniform teaching approach, with students receiving identical input at the same level and pace, both orally and textually. Since CHN 302 was a continuation of CHN 301, the same book was used, *Taiwan today: An intermediate course* (Teng & Perry, 1996), with the first six chapters having been covered in 301 and the last six in 302. *Taiwan today* is a structurally based textbook divided into topic categories such as "Exercise in the Park," "Strong Women," and "Separated by the Strait." Each chapter begins with a short text (written in both complex characters - *fantizi*, and simplified - *jiantizi*) followed by various subsections: vocabulary, grammar, and exercise—which are further divided into vocabulary drills, fill in the blanks, speak and act role-play, and composition. Of these sections, only the text, the vocabulary, and the grammar were covered in class on a regular basis.

The Speech Event: Student presentation and Q/A session

At the beginning of the semester, students were assigned days when they would stand and give a five-to-ten minute presentation relating in some way to that week's textbook topic. Some students chose their topics, others were given topics on which to present. Once set as to who would be first, second, third...etc, this order was then repeated, with the last person followed by the first. In this way, students were assigned either three or four presentations per semester. None of these were formally graded, however they were, to a certain extent, expected by the instructor to be prepared for and carried out in a set, but largely unstated, fashion. Things such as props could be used, e.g., photos, objects, diagrams, power-point presentations, video-clips, magazine articles, a script could be at hand but not specifically read from unless absolutely necessary, and each person was to be prepared for at least a five minute monologue before a Q/A session began. No mention was made of the type of language required for the presentations—the lexical items, the syntactic structures, or the pragmatics of interacting in Chinese—and students were left to their own designs as to how they would prepare. The blackboard could be used and

there was a certain freedom to move about the room; however, presenters were required to stand before the class, and normally this resulted in students appropriating the space where the instructor normally stood, behind the instructor's desk and before the blackboard. Although the presentation topics revolved around those covered in the textbook, nothing was said of using material specifically found within the book. What makes this important for the present research is that the linguistic resources from which participants drew during student presentations were limited to being oral, with occasional characters or *pinyin* written on the board. The resulting group discussion was constructed largely as a Q/A session rather than a textbook lesson. That is, the audience did not have before them handouts of the presentation providing them with the lexical or grammatical elements used in the presentation. Participants relied almost solely on oral input and their oral communicative skills.

The Three Presenters

Three audiotapes were chosen at random and the data transcribed. On the three tapes were *Mao*, *Qing*, and *Wu*¹, three male students. *Qing* and *Wu*, both Caucasians, were enrolled at the graduate level in Asian Studies; *Mao*, a Heritage student, was enrolled as an undeclared first-year undergraduate. Of the three, only *Qing*, who had less than a year's worth of in-country experience, had taken CHN 301. *Mao* had no extensive in-country experience but had taken Mandarin classes in high school and was permitted to skip levels 100, 200 and 301. *Wu* had just returned from living for two years in Taiwan and had likewise skipped the lower levels.

The topics for the three presenters were as follows: *Mao* explained the situation regarding one of his relative's Chinese restaurant; *Qing* described a nudist dormitory at the undergraduate college he attended; and *Wu* told how his mother graduated from university to go on for an advanced degree in Marine Biology. Only interactions from just before the onset of student or instructor questions on until the end of the Q/A session were transcribed, since this was the time when the majority of NS/NNS and NNS/NNS interaction took place.

¹ All names are pseudonyms.

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AS A BOUNDED SPEECH EVENT

The student presentation is a two-part activity—an individual student monologue and a whole-class Q/A session—performed routinely near the start of each class and set off respectively by an instructor utterance: *ni zhunbei hao le ma?* and a variation of *nimen you wenti wen ta*. In the excerpt below, the instructor, *Laoshi*², is either seated among the students or in the process of moving from the desk at the head of the class to a seat among the students. She uses this utterance to initiate the start of the monologue section.

Excerpt 1 (Mao Data)

Chinese³ (lines 01 to 04)

→01 Laoshi: *xia yige (2.0) ni* are you ready? (.) *ni zhunbei hao le ma?*

02 Mao: *yeah*

03 Laoshi: *ni (**)* *na yige menu ni meiyou gei wo (ji le yizhang)* you should make a copy

04 (.) *gei wo*

English (lines 01 to 04)

→01 Laoshi: next person (2.0) you *are you ready?* (.) have you prepared?

02 Mao: *yeah*

03 Laoshi: you (**) that *menu* you didn't give me (make a copy) *you should make a copy*

04 (.) give me

In line 01 the instructor asks, *ni zhunbei hao le ma?* (lit., have you prepared well? or col., are you ready?), which is a routine conventionalized to mark the first part of the speech event, the monologue, and is used to indicate to that day's speaker that s/he should move to the head of the class and begin her/his prepared speech. This question is not an open

² *Laoshi* translates as 'instructor' and throughout the data analysis section these two terms are used interchangeably.

³ In order to more clearly differentiate code-switching within the data presented, the font appearances italics and standard have been used. Within the Chinese excerpts, italic signifies Chinese written out in *pinyin* and standard font signifies code-switches into English. In contrast, within the English translations, standard indicates translated Chinese and italics signifies code-switches into English.

invitation to negotiate whether the speaker will or will not give a speech due to her/his preparedness.

Once the speaker has finished the monologue section, s/he remains at the head of the class, the instructor in her seat among the students. The transition between these two sections occurs through the use of the second phrase. The following three excerpts show what in speech act theory is defined as the illocutionary force of this phrase.

Excerpt 2 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 64 to 79)

64 Laoshi: *hu hum*

65 Wu: *so xianzai ta bu zai yaoshi (.5) ta yao (.5) ta ta yao yanjiu*

66 Laoshi: *zuo yanjiu*

67 Wu: *ta xihuan [zuo yanjiu keshi xianzai ta dang: (.5) yijiaogaode (.5) eh=*

68 Laoshi: *[zuo yanjiu*

69 Wu: *=zhiwei (.5) souyi bu neng yanjiu (.) ta zhi (.5) zhi eh: guangli guan*

70 *bangongshi (1.5)*

→71 Laoshi: *um (1.5) hao. nimen you wenti wen ta?*

72 *(3.0)*

73 Laoshi: *mei you?*

74 Liu: *wo you*

75 Laoshi: *mei you.*

76 Liu: *you (1.0) wo ting bu dong (2.5) ni muqin (.5) di: yici shang eh daxue (.) eh ta*

77 *biye (.5) ma?*

78 Wu: *(**) ta biye*

79 Liu: *biye (1.0) oh*

English (lines 64 to 79)

64 Laoshi: *uh hum*

65 Wu: *so now she isn't at if (.5) she wants (.5) she she wants research*

66 Laoshi: *do research*

67 Wu: *she likes [doing research but now she will become: (.5) transfer (.5) eh=*

- 68 Laoshi: [doing research
69 Wu: =positions (1.5) so she cannot do research (.) she only (.5) only eh: mana-
70 manage the office (1.5)
→71 Laoshi: uhm (1.5) good. if you have any questions ask him
72 (3.0)
73 Laoshi: no questions?
74 Liu: I have
75 Laoshi: no questions.
76 Liu: I have (1.5) I didn't understand (2.0) your mother (.5) the: first time she went to
77 eh college (.) eh did she (.5) graduate?
78 Wu: (**) she graduated
79 Liu: graduated (1.0) oh

In line 70, *Wu* finishes a co-constructed description of his mother's job situation that he has been having with the instructor. After a 1.5 second pause within *Wu*'s turn at line 70, the instructor makes the assessment that his speech was *hao* (good). As has been shown by CA research, assessments are implicative of closing down a line of talk or an activity (Goodwin, 1986), as this assessment seems to be functioning here. Following this, in line 71, *Laoshi* opens the floor to audience participation by asking, *nimen you wenti wen ta* (do you have any questions ask him). After a 3.0 second pause in which no one responds, the instructor asks, *mei you?* (no questions?)—a truncated repetition of her initial question—to which *Liu* responds in line 74 with, *wo you* (I have). In line 75 the instructor, apparently not having heard *Liu*, repeats, *mei you.*; this time with falling intonation, signaling that the Q/A session is finished since no one has offered a question. However, *Liu*, in line 76, repeats his claim to the floor with *you* (have). This is followed first by a brief pause of 1.5 seconds—potentially a hesitation for *Liu* to confirm his right to the floor—followed by his question. Of note here is an issue to be dealt with in more detail later: that of participant orientation to the activity. Notice how the students are responsible for entering into the Q/A session by making claims to the floor—specifically, by asking questions of the presenter. It is clear here that whether a Q/A session will or

will not occur is something in which the students must participate; without student questions, *Laoshi* declares an end to the speech event and the class moves on.

In excerpt 3 below, during *Qing*'s presentation, a slightly different take on this illocutionary phrase occurs. *Qing* has finished a brief conversation with the instructor, where she confirms that both males and females of a certain nudist dormitory at *Qing*'s undergraduate university did not, in fact, wear clothes.

Excerpt 3 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 22 to 33)

22 Laoshi: *hen hao wan (1.5) ni qu (**) shenma dou meiyou?*

23 Qing: *meiyou.*

24 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

25 Qing: *hao wan*

26 Laoshi: *hen hao wan*

→27 Qing: *Macalester daxue (2.5) you wenti ma?*

28 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

29 Laoshi: *you wenti ma?*

30 ((?)): *uh::m*

31 *(2.5)*

32 Laoshi: *mei you wenti (1.5) uh*

33 Wen: *uh:: (1.0) was it Minzhou? was that*

English (lines 22 to 33)

22 Laoshi: very fun (1.5) when you went (**) you didn't wear anything?

23 Qing: nothing.

24 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

25 Qing: fun

26 Laoshi: very fun

→27 Qing: *Macalester university (2.5) do you have questions?*

28 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

29 Laoshi: do you have questions?

- 30 ((?)) uh::m
31 (2.5)
32 Laoshi: no questions. (1.5) uh
33 Wen: uh:: (1.0) *was it North Dakota? was that*

Here in line 27, after repeating the topic of his presentation—“Macalester *daxue*” (Macalester university), *Qing* ends the monologue section of his speech by asking, *you wenti ma?* (do you have questions?), a slightly rephrased version of the instructor’s shown in excerpt 2 above. The class responds in line 28 with laughter but no immediate claims to the floor. The instructor then offers the question, *you wenti ma?* An unidentified speaker begins but does not complete his or her utterance in line 30. As was seen in excerpt 2, because no one immediately raises a question, the instructor then states, *mei you wenti.* (no questions.) with falling intonation. Again, as in excerpt 2, a student uses the turn following this potential end to the Q/A session to claim the floor and ask a question.

Looking at excerpts 2 and 3, it may seem that the student speaker as presenter also has rights to this pre-allocated turn and that he⁴ can signal to the audience the end of his monologue section and their chance to then ask questions. However, excerpt 4 below shows that only the instructor can actually decide when the speech event transitions from the monologue section to the Q/A session.

Excerpt 4 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 30 to 43)

- 30 Mao: *u:hm, (2.0) (**) (1.5) eh zui huadide fan shi yi bu (.5) seafood (.5) lobster (2.0)*
31 *uhm (1.5) dish (2.0) wo bu xihuan huafei no! wo bu xihuan (1.5) uhm seafood*
32 *yinwei (.5) bu hao chi*
33 Laoshi: *seafood zenma shuo?*
34 Mao: *oh (1.0) <haishan shipian>*
35 Laoshi: *haixian*

⁴ In the random selection of tapes to be transcribed, three male presenters were chosen. For this reason, any pronominal reference made to the three speakers as a whole will reflect this.

- 36 Mao: *uh:m (3.5) ni you wenti ma?*
37 Laoshi: *jiu zhei yang?*
38 Mao: *uh? (2.0) what can I say?*
39 Laoshi: *xianzai shi shei zai kai zheige canguar? (.) you duo shao ren qu? (2.5) yiban*
40 *shi shenma ren qu neige can neige fanguar?*
41 *(1.5)*
42 Mao: *uh?*
43 *(1.5)*

English (lines 30 to 42)

- 30 Mao: *u:hm, (2.0) (**) (1.5) eh the most expensive food is (.5) seafood (.5) lobster*
31 *(2.0) uhm (1.5) dish (2.0) I don't like to pay no! I don't like (1.5) uhm*
32 *seafood because (.5) it doesn't taste good*
33 Laoshi: *how do you say seafood?*
34 Mao: *oh (1.0) <seafood>*
35 Laoshi: *seafood*
→36 Mao: *uh:m (3.5) do you have any questions?*
37 Laoshi: *that's it?*
38 Mao: *uh? (2.0) what can I say?*
39 Laoshi: *now who runs this restaurant? (.) how many people go? (2.5) normally what*
40 *kind of people go to that restaurant?*
41 *(1.5)*
42 Mao: *huh?*
43 *(1.5)*

As in excerpts 2 and 3, the instructor takes an active role in the presentation leading up to the point of transition into the Q/A session. Here, *Mao* attempts to begin the Q/A session of the speech event by using a slightly rephrased version of the question we have been focusing on. In line 36, he asks, *ni you wenti ma?*⁵. However, *Laoshi*, in line 37, refuses

⁵ The issue of correctly formed grammatical utterances is beyond the scope of this paper. Here *Mao* formulates the question, *ni you wenti ma?* (do you have questions?), using the singular *ni* (you) in place of

to accept *Mao*'s suggestion that he has finished his presentation by stating, *jiu zhei yang?* (is that it?). Here we see that although *Qing*, in excerpt 3, uses this transition phrase to end the monologue section of his presentation, it is *Laoshi* who claims the right to actually open the floor for student questions. Only when she considers the presentation content and length adequate—*hao* (good)—does she allow for the transition to occur. Instead of this, in excerpt 4, she responds in line 39 with explicit instructions to *Mao* on how to continue his presentation, offering him a list of questions to answer. The following excerpt is a continuation of excerpt 4. Here we see how much more *Laoshi* expects of *Mao*.

Excerpt 5 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 36 to 60)

36 Mao: *uh:m* (3.5) *ni you wenti ma?*

37 Laoshi: *jiu zhei yang?*

38 Mao: *uh?* (2.0) what can I say?

→39 Laoshi: *xianzai shi shei zai kai zheige canguar? (.) you duo shao ren qu?* (2.5) *yiban*

→40 *shi shenma ren qu neige can neige fanguar?*

41 *(1.5)*

42 Mao: *uh?*

43 *(1.5)*

44 Laoshi: *you (**)* *hen duo ren qu neige fanguar ma?*

45 Mao: *uhm* (.5) *wo xiang* (1.5) *bu shi hen duo* (1.0) *only jiu* (1.0) *uh:m* (3.0) *ji jire* (.)

46 *you ren*

47 Laoshi: *jieri* (.5) *oh pingchang meiyou ren na?*

48 Mao: *eh* (1.5) *keyi keshi wo* (1.5) *bu shi* (1.0) *hen* (.5) *happening*

49 Laoshi: *suoyi bu zhuan qian?*

50 Mao: *yeah*

51 Laoshi: *guan men eh?*

52 Mao: *eh?*

the more appropriate plural *nimen*. The instructor does not orient to this phrase as an error but instead responds to the illocutionary force of it.

→53 Laoshi: going to be closed down yeah, *guan men*. ((audible laughter by members of

→54 class)) *you wenti wen ta*

55 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

56 Laoshi: *you mei you wenti wen ta*

57 (1.0)

58 Qing: *yige (1.0) yige (1.0) panzi*

59 Laoshi: *eh?*

60 Qing: *duo shao qian?*

English (lines 36 to 60)

36 Mao: uh:m (3.5) do you have any questions?

37 Laoshi: that's it?

38 Mao: uh? (2.0) *what can I say?*

→39 Laoshi: now who runs this restaurant? (.) how many people go? (2.5) normally what

→40 kind of people go to that restaurant?

41 (1.5)

42 Mao: huh?

43 (1.5)

44 Laoshi: have (**) do many people go to that restaurant?

45 Mao: uhm (.5) I think (1.5) not very many (1.0) *only* only (1) uh:m (3.0) on holidays

46 (.) they have people

47 Laoshi: holidays (.5) so normally there aren't any people?

48 Mao: eh (1.5) because because I (1.5) it's not (1.0) very (.5) *happening*

49 Laoshi: so it doesn't make money?

50 Mao: *yeah*

51 Laoshi: it's going to close eh?

52 Mao: *eh?*

→53 Laoshi: *going to be closed down yeah*, closed doors. ((audible laughter by members of

→54 class)) if you have questions ask him

55 Class ((audible laughter by members of class))

56 Laoshi: if you have questions ask him

- 57 (1.0)
58 Qing: one (1.0) one (1.0) dish
59 Laoshi: eh?
60 Qing: how much does it cost?

Laoshi does not actually require much more linguistic production from *Mao* in the turns following her three suggested topic questions in lines 39 and 40: “who runs this restaurant?”, “how many people go!?”, and “normally what kind of people go to that restaurant?” Following this list, *Mao* seems confused as to how he should continue his presentation, saying *huh?* as a clarification request in line 42. The instructor then responds by modifying the second of her three questions into a yes/no question, changing “how many people go?” to “do many people go to that restaurant?” Here the instructor not only nominates the topic but also begins a series of adjacency pairs in the form of question/answer turns over the course of eight lines, from line 44 to 52, which results in a scaffolded interaction controlled by the instructor. Then in line 53, after an assessment of the content from the eight-line Q/A segment, the instructor says, *you wenti wen ta*, repeating the phrase once more in that line and then again in line 56, just as the data in the previous excerpts show.

These repeated phrases in excerpts 3, 4, and 5 indicate the instrumental, illocutionary role this phrase plays within structuring the student presentation speech event. However, during the Q/A session of *Qing*'s presentation there occurs a separate incident where the instructor uses *nimen you wenti wen ta*, fifty-four lines after the Q/A began in line 33 (see excerpt 3 above). Here, shown in excerpt 6, this phrase cannot be categorized as procedurally consequential in terms of a “transitional” phrase.

Excerpt 6 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 83 to 91)

- 83 Laoshi: *ruguo (.) ruguo (.) wo keyi shuo, (.) wo bu xiang qu nege sushe zhu ma?*
84 Qing: *uhm?*
85 Laoshi: *ke bu keyi?*
86 Qing: *ah (.5) keyi.*

- 87 Laoshi: *keyi. (.) hao. (3.0) nimen you wenti wen ta*
88 Ming: *ah (.5) qingwen (.5) nege sushede: <dizi> shi shenma?*
89 Laoshi: *dizhi*
90 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
91 Qing: *dizi?*

English (lines 83 to 91)

- 83 Laoshi: if (.) if (.) can I say, (.) I don't want to live in that dorm?
84 Qing: *uhm?*
85 Laoshi: can I?
86 Qing: *ah (.5) you can.*
→87 Laoshi: I can. (.) okay. (3.0) if you have questions ask him
88 Ming: *ah (.5) excuse me (.5) that dorm's: <address> is what?*
89 Laoshi: address
90 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
91 Qing: *address?*

Leading up to line 87, where the instructor repeats the phrase *nimen you wenti wen ta*, *Laoshi* and *Qing* have been working at completing the question *Laoshi* asks partly in both lines 83 and 85, i.e., can people choose not to live in the nudist dorm. In line 86, *Qing* answers *Laoshi's* question, saying *ah (.5) keyi*, or “ah (.5) you can,” and then at the beginning of line 87 *Laoshi* confirms through a repetition, followed by the phrase in question. This instance requires a re-examination of the role of this phrase within the activity.

According to Geis (1995) the truth value, i.e., the underlying semantics of an utterance, is *indexical*; it is “assigned dynamically with respect to the context” in which it occurs (p. 37). In reviewing the four instances where variations of the phrase occur, it becomes apparent that *nimen you wenti wen ta* is used not only as a transitional phrase separating the speech event into its parts, it is also a pre-allocated next-turn signal used by the instructor to prompt audience participation by defining the student-as-audience member role as active member responsible not only for listening to the speech but also

interacting with the speaker about its topic. More precisely, *Laoshi* uses this phrase to redefine the student role from one of silent listener to active contributor, a phrase to which the students orient by posing questions.

As was pointed out in the description of these excerpts initially, *Laoshi* repeated the phrase when no one immediately claimed the floor by asking a question.

Excerpt 7 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 71 to 77)

71 *Laoshi*: *uhm (1.5) hao. nimen you wenti wen ta?*

72 (3.0)

73 *Laoshi*: *mei you?*

74 *Liu*: *wo you*

75 *Laoshi*: *mei you.*

76 *Liu*: *you (1.0) wo ting bu dong (2.5) ni muqin (.5) di: yici shang eh daxue (.) eh ta*

77 *biye (.5) ma?*

English (lines 71 to 77)

71 *Laoshi*: *uhm (1.5) good. if you have any questions ask him*

72 (3.0)

73 *Laoshi*: *no questions?*

74 *Liu*: *I have*

75 *Laoshi*: *no questions.*

76 *Liu*: *I have (1.5) I didn't understand (2.5) your mother (.5) the: first time she went to*

77 *eh college (.) eh did she (.5) graduate?*

In line 71, *Laoshi* asks if students have questions and then allows a wait time of 3.0 in which no one claims a turn. In line 73, she repeats a negative, truncated version of the question with rising intonation: *mei you?* (no questions?). She then repeats *meiyou* a third time, line 75, this time with falling intonation, indicating an end to the Q/A session. However, *Liu*, after an unsuccessful attempt in line 74, claims the floor in line 76 with

you (I have). He then pauses for 1.5 seconds before asking his question. The *Qing* data also reveal this type of organization.

Excerpt 8 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 29 to 33)

29 Laoshi: *you wenti ma?*

30 ((?)): *uh::m*

31 (2.5)

32 Laoshi: *mei you wenti (1.5) uh*

33 Wen: *uh:: (1.0) was it Minzhou? was that[(**)*

English (lines 29-33)

29 Laoshi: do you have questions?

30 ((?)) *uh::m*

31 (2.5)

32 Laoshi: no questions. (1.5) uh

33 Wen: *uh:: (1.0) was it North Dakota? was that [(**)*

Here, after asking the class in line 29 whether they have questions or not, *Laoshi* waits momentarily, this time for 2.5 seconds (after one unknown individual's failed attempt at claiming the floor in line 31), before issuing another next-speaker turn option in line 32. Markee (in press) defines this type of wait time as a "zone of interactional transition," whereby within an institutional setting such as a classroom *Laoshi* is indexing her role as "instructor." Again, the *Mao* data show this similar turn-taking structure.

Excerpt 9 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 53 to 58)

53 Laoshi: going to be closed down yeah, *guan men*. ((audible laughter by members of

54 class)) *you wenti wen ta*

55 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

56 Laoshi: *you mei you wenti wen ta*

57 (1.0)

58 Qing: *yige (1.0) yige (1.0) panzi*

English (lines 53 to 58)

53 Laoshi: *going to be closed down yeah*, closed doors. ((audible laughter by members of

54 class)) if you have questions ask him

55 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

56 Laoshi: if you have questions ask him

57 (1.0)

58 Qing: one (1.0) one (1.0) dish

Excerpt 9, line 53, the class responds to *Laoshi* with laughter, causing the instructor to repeat a variation of the phrase in line 54 and then again in line 56. Both the instructor and students orient to only *Laoshi* as having the right to initiate the transition with “*nimen you wenti wen ta*” or some variant. Evidence of this is revealed in excerpt 4, where *Laoshi* refuses to allow Mao to initiate the transition.

Viewing the repeated occurrence of instances in the data such as this allows for a deeper analysis of the manner in which this classroom speech event was organized and of the roles participants played in comprehending adjacency pair turns and the pre-allocation turns taken by the instructor. *Nimen you wenti wen ta*, therefore, served a dual role for the instructor by both indicating a transition between segments in the activity and acting as a prompt for students to participate in their role as active members of the second part of the two-part speech event. The Q/A session only occurs if students take an active role and ask questions, but it is also a bounded event with the instructor taking responsibility for initiating and terminating it. Particularly with regard to the transition from the monologue to the Q/A, the deviant cases in excerpts 3 and 4 show that both the instructor and students orient to the instructor as sole possessor of the right to initiate the transition, through the students’ laughter and *Laoshi*’s repetition of the phrase in excerpt 3, and *Laoshi*’s refusal to allow a student-initiated transition in excerpt 4. Potentially deviant cases such as these highlight an integral aspect of CA methodology; in that by working from a method of instances that views all occurrences as structurally significant,

fine-grained analysis such as that provided above reveals the organization of the manner in which participants orient to turn-taking.

TURN-BY-TURN SPEECH EVENT ORGANIZATION - QUESTION/ANSWER ADJACENCY PAIRS

Classroom research has shown that formal classroom conversations are generally constrained by pre-allocated turns, where instructor-dominated question-answer routines drive classroom activities (see Chaudron, 1988; Fanslow, 1977; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, 1992). Research into classroom instructor-question behavior (see Brock 1986; Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1981a; Long & Sato, 1983) has looked into question types, i.e., open vs. closed, display vs. referential, and frequencies used by instructors in language classrooms.

Much has been said about question/answer sequences in terms of which question types prompt what kind of student production. In this relatively controlled interactional sequence, where both topic and next-turn speaker are generally understood, research has found that students are likely to produce more lengthy and syntactically complex responses following certain types of questions (Brock, 1986; Pica and Long, 1986). For example, opinion questions have been found to allow for a relatively open, next-speaker turn that may extend on and include not only the speaker's opinion but also potentially an account or reason for having it. In contrast, certain question types are believed to restrict next-speaker turns; examples of these closed questions would be 'yes/no' questions and 'or' questions, or questions asking for short, specific answers, e.g., what time is it? and how many bagels are in a baker's dozen? However, research into Oral Proficiency Interviews has shed light on the fact that in certain contexts yes/no questions are designed to elicit elaborated answers (He, 1998; Ross, 1998).

Another aspect of question type is whether they are asked as display questions or referential questions. Display type questions are questions where the question's answer is known to the person asking it, e.g., an instructor asks, "Who was the first president of the United States?" not because she doesn't know but because she is checking to see if her students know. On the other hand, referential type questions are questions whose answers

are unknown by the person asking them. Research has shown that open-ended, referential questions promote more learner output, but that instructors are more prone to asking display questions within the FL classroom context (Brock, 1986).

As previously stated, CA methodology views question/answer turns as adjacency pairs, with a first pair/second pair obligation. According to Heritage (1984), “questioners attend to the fact that their questions are framed within normative expectations which have *sequential implications* in obliging selected next speakers to perform a restricted form of action in next turn, namely, at least to respond to the question with some form of answer” (p. 249).

Returning to the CFL data, due to the fact that all interaction occurs within the Q/A session of the presentation, it would be expected that the data be almost exclusively organized around this Q/A structure. As well, one distinguishing characteristic of the present classroom speech event is that all audience participants, including the instructor as audience-member, formulate questions based upon previously unknown information, in other words, as referential questions. In the excerpts to follow, this type of Q/A organization will be analyzed. Below, *Laoshi* and *Mao* are talking about the *dimsum* schedule at *Mao's* family's restaurant.

Excerpt 10 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 99 to 112)

99 Laoshi: *wo wen ni (**) dianxin dianxin eh, dimsum eh*

100 Mao: *yeah?*

→101 Laoshi: *zhiyou zhongwu you ma? (.) ji dian dao ji dian? (.) ji dian you dianxin?*

102 Mao: *what's that?*

103 Laoshi: *shenma shihou wo keyi qu?*

104 *(1.0)*

105 Mao: *uh (1.5) shidianban uh: (2.0) <erdian>-*

106 Laoshi: *-liang dian*

107 Mao: *liang dian*

→108 Laoshi: *(Mao) (.) yi ke (.) yi fen (.) yi ke yi fen duo shao qian?*

109 Mao: *wo [wo bu pay money (.5) wo (eat for free)*

110 Laoshi: [ni zhidao?

111 Peng: weishenma ni bu pang?

112 Laoshi: weishenma ni bu pang? ((instructor laughter))

English (lines 99 to 112)

99 Laoshi: I have a question (**) dimsum dimsum eh, *dimsum* eh

100 Mao: *yeah*

→101 Laoshi: it's only mornings? (.) from what time to what time? (.) when is dimsum?

102 Mao: *what's that?*

103 Laoshi: when can I go?

104 (1.0)

105 Mao: uh (1.5) ten-thirty uh: (2.0) <two o'clock>-

106 Laoshi: -two o'clock

107 Mao: two o'clock

→108 Laoshi: (*Mao*) (.) one dish (.) one dish (.) one dish one dish is how much?

109 Mao: I [I don't *pay money* (.5) I (*eat for free*)

110 Laoshi: [do you know?

111 Peng: why aren't you fat?

112 Laoshi: why aren't you fat? ((instructor laughter))

Excerpt 10 offers two question segments, each unique in their own development, organization, and completion. *Laoshi* asks both questions, the first in line 101: *zhiyou zhongwu you ma? (.) ji dian dao ji dian? (.) ji dian you dianxin?* (it's only in the mornings? (.) from what time to what time? (.) what time is dimsum?); the second question is in line 108: (*Mao*) (.) *yike (.) yifen (.) yike yifen duo shao qian?* ((*Mao*) (.) one dish (.) one dish (.) one dish is how much?). According to how Interaction research has categorized question types, both of *Laoshi's* questions are of the same type: closed, referential questions, asking for specific information unknown to the questioner, i.e., the time and cost of *dimsum*. However, a closer look shows how structurally distinct each of these questions are.

The second question, ‘how much the *dimsum* is’ is shorter, consisting of two turns (one adjacency pair) and occurs over the course of two lines, 108 and 109.

Excerpt 11 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 108 to 110)

→108 Laoshi: (*Mao*) (.) *yi ke* (.) *yi fen* (.) *yi ke yi fen duo shao qian?*

109 Mao: *wo* [*wo bu pay money* (.5) *wo* (*eat for free*)

110 Laoshi: [*ni zhidao?*

111 Peng: *weishenma ni bu pang?*

→112 Laoshi: *weishenma ni bu pang?* ((instructor laughter))

English (lines 108 to 110)

→108 Laoshi: (*Mao*) (.) one dish (.) one dish (.) one dish one dish is how much?

109 Mao: I [I don't *pay money* (.5) I (*eat for free*)

110 Laoshi: [do you know?

111 Peng: why aren't you fat?

→ 112 Laoshi: why aren't you fat? ((instructor laughter))

Two issues in CA connected to question/answer adjacency pairs are *recipient design* and *conditional relevance*. Though it is unclear this in excerpt whether *Laoshi* directly names *Mao* before posing her questions, CA rules of *recipient design* and *context-shaped action* state that questions are asked of individuals who are “likely to be informed” of the answer (Heritage, 1984; p. 250). Here, *Mao* is the most likely to be informed of the answer, which is what *Laoshi* attempts to confirm in line 110 by asking *ni zhidao?* (do you know?). This confirmation overlaps *Mao* as he formulates his answer in line 109. Though there is some issue as to *Mao*'s status as one who is informed, the requirements of a question/answer adjacency pair are fulfilled since offering an account of not knowing information to answer a question, in fact, constitutes an answer.

As for *conditional relevance*, according to Mori (2002), “as a first pair part of an adjacency pair, a delivery of a question sets the frame of reference for how the subsequent turn would unfold or should be understood. That is, the occurrence of an

answer as the corresponding second pair part becomes relevant, and the lack thereof, or a seemingly unfitting utterance, is recognized as a noticeable problem of the normative second, and accounted for with reference to the ‘conditional relevance’” (p. 329). In line 109, in response to *Laoshi*’s question, *Mao* claims ignorance, followed by an account of why he is unable to answer the question, thereby both responding to *Laoshi*’s question and confirming *Laoshi*’s uncertainty about *Mao*’s status as one who is informed. Added to this is *Peng*’s self-selection in line 111, where he initiates a topic switch by posing a new question. Within CA, turn-allocation (Sacks et al., 1974) demands that “[i]f the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a ‘current-speaker-selects-next’ technique, then self-selection for next speakership may...be instituted” (p. 704). *Peng*’s self-selection reveals his orientation to *Laoshi*’s question having been “answered” and therefore his claims to the floor justified. *Laoshi*’s repetition, in line 112, shows she has accepted *Mao*’s answer, or lack thereof, and does not object to moving on to the next topic.

The second question, which is longer and more involved, occurs over the course of seven lines (101-107) and involves *Laoshi* and *Mao* talking about the restaurant’s schedule for when *dimsum* is served.

Excerpt 12 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 99 to 107)

99 *Laoshi*: *wo wen ni (**)* *dianxin dianxin eh, dimsum eh*

100 *Mao*: yeah?

→101 *Laoshi*: *zhiyou zhongwu you ma? (.) ji dian dao ji dian? (.) ji dian you dianxin?*

102 *Mao*: what’s that?

103 *Laoshi*: *shenma shihou wo keyi qu?*

104 (1.0)

105 *Mao*: *uh (1.5) shidianban uh: (2.0) <erdian>-*

106 *Laoshi*: *-liang dian*

107 *Mao*: *liang dian*

English (lines 99 to 107)

99 Laoshi: I have a question (**) *dimsum dimsum eh, dimsum eh*

100 Mao: *yeah*

→101 Laoshi: it's only mornings? (.) from what time to what time? (.) when is dimsum?

102 Mao: *what's that?*

103 Laoshi: when can I go?

104 (1.0)

105 Mao: *uh (1.5) ten-thirty uh: (2.0) <two o'clock>-*

106 Laoshi: *-two o'clock*

107 Mao: *two o'clock*

In line 99, *Laoshi* initiates her question to *Mao* with the “question announcement,” *wo wen ni* (col., I have a question or lit., I ask you), followed only by the topic of her question—*dianxin dianxin eh, dimsum eh*. *Mao* responds with, “yeah,” acknowledging both his status as next-turn speaker and his comprehension of the topic⁶ for the question to come. *Laoshi* continues in line 101 with the question *zhiyou zhongwo you ma?* (it's only in the mornings?), then after a micropause reformulates the question as *ji dian dao ji dian?* (from what time to what time?), only to immediately reformulate the question a second time as *ji dian you dianxin?* (when is dimsum?). With three questions given him in succession, *Mao* requests clarification in line 103, asking “what's that?”, prompting *Laoshi* to simplify her question in a topic-prominent manner by placing the syntactically simplified question words *shenma shihou* (when) at the beginning, followed by *wo keyi qu* (can I go). These turns, lines 102 and 103, constitute a content-related *insertion sequence*, in that the second pair part answer is momentarily postponed due to a repair prompt in the form of a clarification request. However, the overarching machinery of the question/answer adjacency pair, namely the requirements of a second pair part answer, still applies and is satisfied in *Mao*'s turn in line 105 with *uh (1.5) shidianban uh: (2.0) <erdian>* (*uh (1.5) ten-thirty uh: (2.0) <two o'clock>-*).

⁶ According to Li and Thompson (1981), “One of the most striking features of Mandarin sentence structure, and one that sets Mandarin apart from many other languages, is that in addition to the grammatical relations of ‘subject’ and ‘direct object,’ the description of Mandarin must also include the element ‘topic.’ Because of the importance of ‘topic’ in the grammar of Mandarin, it can be termed a *topic-prominent* language” (p. 15).

What fine-grained analysis provides is the moment-by-moment organization of Q/A turn-taking between interlocutors. What we see above is that two identical question types produced different resulting behavior. Excerpts 11 and 12 show that there is more to questions than simply their categorization and the sum of their type frequencies, and that methodologies applying fine-grained analysis, such as CA, are able to fill in the gaps where other, more classification-oriented research are limited. When quantifying data such as this, a student presentation and Q/A session on information previously unknown to an audience that includes the instructor, it would not be surprising to find a majority of questions being referential. In fact, a tally of the instructor's questions posed to students shows that only 1 of the 33 questions was a display type question; 11 others were procedural and the remaining 21 were referential. Though Interaction research shows the types and frequencies of question behavior between instructors and learners in a classroom setting, it fails to look at *how* this Q/A behavior occurs and is incapable of analyzing the precise moment-by-moment actions because (a) micro-level of analysis is ignored and (b) questions and answers are displaced from their sequential environments.

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK, REPAIR, AND UPTAKE

One major issue of classroom discourse is corrective feedback—what prompts it, or *triggers* it in Varonis and Gass's (1985) terms, and the manner and form in which it is given—though, typically, how the prompt is formulated is absent. Schachter (1991) states that the use of corrective feedback, also called negative data or negative evidence, has “to do with externally provided information to the second language (L2) learning student, first language (L1) learning child, or the experimental subject (as the case may be), either (a) that the production or activity of that student, child, or subject was in some way anomalous, unacceptable, or deviant, or (b) that the activity produced had not achieved its goal” (pg. 89). The ultimate purpose of corrective feedback in the SL classroom is two-fold: first to promote learner awareness of non-TL production and second to prompt a learner-generated correction of non-TL forms, called *uptake* (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Since it is implied that within a language classroom it is the instructor's job, in a sense, to fix in some way learner errors and other non-target-like forms, instructor

feedback is a phenomenon somewhat distinct from NS/NNS interactions occurring in more naturalistic settings, where NSs rarely correct NNS's errors and only do so when comprehension is somehow affected. Chaudron (1988) notes that in French language classrooms instructors provided feedback on learner grammatical errors 77% of the time, compared with findings by Chun, Day, Chenoweth, and Luppescu (1982), where, in NS/NNS speaker pairs in casual, more naturalistic conversations, NSs provided feedback only 9.8% of the time.

Connected to the idea of why and how frequent classroom feedback occurs is the form it takes. Researchers have found a dominant classroom interaction pattern described by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) as IRF—*initiation, response, feedback*—which, in more naturalistic, conversational settings, lacks the final step—the *feedback*—or what is sometimes referred to as *evaluation* (Mehan, 1974). In ordinary conversations, third turn responses, e.g., acknowledgements and assessments, are common, though with these there lacks comment on the well-formed nature of interlocutor utterances. Within both L2/FL and content classroom settings, this final evaluative stage has been considered a necessary component to learning, in that it is through this stage that learners become aware of their own performance, specifically whether it is or is not correct in the instructor's eyes. Chaudron (1988) reviews this idea further, grounding evaluation of this nature in a traditional behaviorist view of learning, a view focused on patterns of imitation, feedback and habit formation. However, some researchers (Fanslow, 1977; Chaudron, 1977, 1988; Allen, Frohlich, & Spada, 1984; Lyster & Ranta, 1997) have raised the question of the clarity, in terms of learner understanding, and systematicity of instructor feedback in language classrooms, with Long cautioning language instructors against using what he calls the “shotgun” effect of giving oral and written feedback on a wide variety of errors without first looking at feedback in other settings and conducting a needs analysis of the learners and plotting where their IL is in terms of recognizable developmental sequences (see Meisel, Clahsen, & Pienemann, 1981).

As well, error correction in classroom situations does not often result in immediate learner repair or self-correction (Chaudron, 1988). In fact, the part learner repair and/or uptake plays in learner IL development is yet largely unknown. What is recognized is that the simple presence of learner uptake following correction does not constitute

acquisition; however, uptake is viewed as an important element in learner awareness of non-target-like forms in their developing IL, even, as in the case of group work or whole class when a specific student is not on call, when spoken as private speech (Ohta, 2000). Furthermore, the link between the lack of immediate uptake following error correction and the potential, delayed effects of such negative feedback on acquisition remains even less clear. However, questions such as these have helped shape research and instructional focus on how and when to (as well as when not to) address learner errors in classroom settings. Chaudron (1988, p. 135) reviews Hendrickson's (1978) five instructional questions for possibly dealing with classroom oral error correction:

1. Should learner errors be corrected?
2. If so, when should learner errors be corrected?
3. Which learner errors should be corrected?
4. How should learner errors be corrected?
5. Who should correct learner errors?

Though these questions have yet to be answered, Chaudron concludes that (a) error treatment is at the center of classroom research on student and instructor communication and (b) "communicative interaction in group-work may provide as much, and possibly more, appropriate corrective feedback to learners as instructor-fronted classroom tasks" (p. 152). It is obvious not only from this list of instructional questions but also from the research on error correction in classrooms that the trend has been to define and quantify the types of instructor modification behaviors assumed to be most effective in prompting learner uptake or self-repair. Even larger still is the question of what an error is, besides the more easily identifiable non-TL utterances involving grammar, lexis, pronunciation. Error correction research, for the most part, has failed to address issues of socio-pragmatic errors within discourse.

CA methodology looks at multiple conditions, rather than the types and frequencies, under which repair occurs during interaction on a moment-by-moment basis. Hosoda (2000), citing Wong (2000), states that "the essential difference between negotiation of meaning and the CA notion of repair is that while the former is limited to correction of error or to clarification of communication due to the learner's linguistic errors, the CA notion of a repair sequence deals with any problems in speaking, hearing, or

understanding of the talk, including problems in redundancy, reduction through noise, lack of understanding of idiomatic use of language, and lack of ability to make inferences” (p. 63). As well, CA views repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) as falling under four general classifications, summarized as follows: “Repair may be initiated either by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-initiated repair) or by another speaker (other-initiated repair). The repair may then be carried out by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-repair) or by the other speaker (other-repair)” (Hosoda, 2000, p. 39; parenthesis in original). The main difference between these two methods of repair analysis is that CA views repair as logically occasioned and tied to the turn-taking structure rather than the Interaction view of being isolated to different ways of initiating other-repair. However, analytical units from Interaction discourse analysis such as clarification request, comprehension check, and confirmation check are still relevant as concepts, though far too coarse as analytical units, when analyzing classroom language use under a CA methodology. Incorporation of such concepts, when sequential analysis supports the use of these categories, will aid in combining the pre-existing knowledge based from Interaction studies into CA analysis of learner language use. This issue of how each methodology must, in some manner, make allowances for the other will be addressed further in the discussion section.

Early CA research (Schegloff et. Al, 1977) found that competent native speaking interlocutors show preferences for certain types of repair work within conversations. Native speakers tend to perform self-repair initiations over other-repair initiations and self-repair over other-repair. In this preference structure, it is understood that both speakers play integral parts in how repair sequences occur, with *other* speakers allowing for *self* to initiate and repair before offering aid (see Bilmes, 1998 for criticism of the preference concept). Notice here an example of self-repair performed by *Mao* while within the monologue section of his presentation.

Excerpt 13 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 13 to 15)

13 Mao: eh:: (.5) wo: jia:de (1.5) fanguar shi Jia Jiu Qing (.) Xi (.5) eh (.5) wode
14 gugu: (2.0) eh (3.5) yijiujiu no! yijiuba something nian (.) eh (1.0) make it

15 (2.0) eh: (.) zhei shi (2.0) Jia: eh: (neige) (1.5)

English (lines 13 to 15)

13 Mao: -eh:: (.5) my: family:'s (1.5) restaurant is *Jia Jiu Qing* (.) *Xi* (.5) eh (.5) my
14 uncle: (2.0) eh (3.5) 199 *no!* 198 *something* year(.) eh (1.0) *make it* (2.0) eh:
15 (.) this is (2.0) *Jia*: eh: (this) (1.5)

In line 14, as he is explaining when his family's restaurant was founded, *Mao* mistakenly offers *yijiujiu* (199) but abruptly follows this with "no!" and the correction, *yijiujiuba* something *nian* (198 *something* year).

In research on casual conversations between Japanese NSs and highly proficient NNSs of Japanese, Hosoda (2000) found similar repair patterns in that "the occurrence of other-repair in the Japanese data follow the findings from ordinary conversation in English" (p. 61); namely, that unsolicited other-repair was not present, but, rather, verbal and non-verbal indications of distress or appeals for assistance on the part of NNSs prompted NSs to provide repair when needed. From her findings, Hosoda argues that, "other-repair may have [...] a sequence-initiating action that [makes] the repair recipient's acceptance behavior in the next slot relevant" (p. 61). Within the language classroom context, this view seems to mesh with Interaction research on feedback, in that corrective feedback is implemental in promoting learner repair.

Classroom research on corrective feedback and CA studies on repair lead to an interesting question: if, as the classroom research suggests, instructor feedback is common (other-initiated repair and other repair) and, as the CA research shows, there is a preference in both NS/NS and NNS/NS (albeit advanced NNS) conversations for self-initiation and self-repair, what would classroom repair organization look like within a student-fronted (though instructor controlled) classroom activity involving a Q/A session? With regard to the CFL classroom data analyzed in this paper, the answer is that the repair organization was nearly one-sided, with the instructor providing both unsolicited and solicited other-repair on student errors. However, this instructor repair also appeared to be fairly infrequent. The repairs focused on below will be limited to

those *Laoshi* directed toward learner errors at the lexical level: in student word choice and pronunciation.

Other-Initiated Instructor-Repair

The data show several instances of other-initiated other-repair performed *Laoshi*, where mistaken utterances were replaced with more target-like ones⁷. The following excerpt occurs between *Mao* and *Laoshi* on the subject of what he likes to eat at his family's restaurant.

Excerpt 14 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 27 to 36)

27 *Laoshi*: *xihuan chi* (**) ((audible laughter by members of class))

28 *Mao*: *uhm*: (2.0) *gen* (2.0) *cake* (.) *noodle*

29 *Laoshi*: *oh* ((instructor laughter)) *okay* (.5) *hao* ((instructor laughter))

30 *Mao*: *u:hm*, (2.0) (**) (1.5) *eh zui huadide fan shi yi bu* (.5) *seafood* (.5) *lobster* (2.0)

31 *uhm* (1.5) *dish* (2.0) *wo bu xihuan huafei* no! *wo bu xihuan* (1.5) *uhm* *seafood*

32 *yinwei* (.5) *bu hao chi*

→33 *Laoshi*: *seafood zenma shuo?*

→34 *Mao*: *oh* (1.0) <*haishan shipian*>⁸

→35 *Laoshi*: *haixian*

36 *Mao*: *uh:m* (3.5) *ni you wenti ma?*

English (lines 27 to 36)

27 *Laoshi*: you like to eat (**) ((audible laughter by members of class))

28 *Mao*: *uhm*: (2.0) and (2.0) *cake* (.) *noodle*

29 *Laoshi*: oh ((instructor laughter)) *okay* (.5) *good* ((instructor laughter))

30 *Mao*: *u:hm*, (2.0) (**) (1.5) *eh the most expensive food is* (.5) *seafood* (.5) *lobster*

⁷ Discussion of the grounds for distinguishing mistaken utterances from correct utterances is beyond the scope of this paper. However, as they initiate and complete repair, both the instructor and the students can be heard to orient to particular utterances as mistaken or correct.

⁸ Within transcripts, the symbols <xxx> indicate word(s) to which *Laoshi* orients repair, stemming from either learner mispronunciation or misuse of a lexical item (as is the case in excerpt 13).

31 (2.0) uhm (1.5) *dish* (2.0) I don't like to pay *no!* I don't like (1.5) uhm

32 *seafood* because (.5) it doesn't taste good

→33 Laoshi: how do you say *seafood*?

→34 Mao: *oh* (1.0) <seafood>

→35 Laoshi: *seafood*

36 Mao: uh:m (3.5) do you have any questions?

In line 30, following a .5 pause after the phrase *eh zui huadidefan shi yi bu* (eh the most expensive food is), *Mao* code-switches to English to say the word “seafood.” In the instructor’s next turn, *Laoshi* asks *Mao* how to say the word “seafood” in Chinese, using a phrase normally reserved for conventional displays of difficulty: *X zenma shuo?* (how do you say X?). *Mao* responds with the change-of-state token “oh” (Heritage, 1984) in line 34, followed by a 1.0 second pause and then his production of <*haishang shipin*> (lit. maritime food), an incorrect response though very close to target-like. The instructor then offers an other-repair in line 35, saying *haixian*. *Mao* then acknowledges the repair in line 36 with “uh:m,” though does not produce uptake.

Some research into NNS repair (Klinck, 1984; Hosoda, 2000) report that NNSs, following instances of other-repair, show a preference for repetition of repaired items (though, at this point, this is merely a theory assertion). However, in excerpt 13 this is not the case. Instead, *Mao* responds with an acknowledgement—“uh:m”—in line 35, followed by a lengthy pause of 3.5 seconds, after which he makes an attempt to complete his role as presenter by appropriating *Laoshi*’s phrase *ni you wenti ma?* (do you have any questions?).

This type of repair occurs again in the *Wu* data, involving an unsolicited IRF prompt where miscommunication is not obvious. In a sense, this type of instructor orientation to learner production, as is the case with the *Mao* excerpt above, is ‘instructorly’ rather than for the purpose of repairing communication breakdown. In *Wu*’s presentation he has been speaking about his mother’s job following her graduation from a PhD program in Marine Biology.

Excerpt 15 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 65 to 70)

65 Wu: so *xianzai ta bu zai yaoshi (.5) ta yao (.5) ta ta <yao> yanjiu*

→66 Laoshi: *zuo yanjiu*

67 Wu: *ta xihuan [zuo yanjiu keshi xianzai ta dang: (.5) yijiaogaode (.5) eh=*

68 Laoshi: *[zuo yanjiu*

69 Wu: *=zhiwei (.5) souyi ent a yanjiu (.) ta zhi (.5) zhi eh: guangli guan*

70 *bangongshi (1.5)*

English (lines 65 to 70)

65 Wu: so now she isn't at if (.5) she wants (.5) she she <wants> research

→66 Laoshi: do research

67 Wu: she likes [doing research but now she will become: (.5) transfer (.5) eh=

68 Laoshi: [doing research

69 Wu: =positions (1.5) so she cannot do research (.) she only (.5) only eh: mana-

70 manage the office (1.5)

In this excerpt, line 66, we can see *Laoshi*'s unsolicited repair of *Wu*'s improper use of *yao yanjiu* (wants research), supplying the repair *zuo yanjiu* (do research). Though *Wu* does not offer immediate uptake, *Wu*'s next independent use of the repaired verb phrase (which appears to be a continuation of the larger idea begun in line 65) is incorporated correctly. Notice, as well, how *Laoshi*, in line 68, offers additional support by repeating her original repair at the same time *Wu* encounters a grammatically relevant insertion place for his uptake. This form of up-take is promising, at least in terms of a learning perspective, in that turn-initial repetition (simple repetition following repair) shows little evidence of a learner's ability to integrate other-repair in a meaningful and syntactical manner.

The *Mao* data reveal a similar uptake pattern, in that *Laoshi* repair of a mistaken lexical item was noticed and incorporated grammatically within the following learner turn. Though *Mao* appeared unreceptive to *Laoshi* repair in excerpt 14, choosing not to

produce up-take, in this segment we find him selective in responding to the other-repair given him.

Excerpt 16 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 81 to 88)

81 Mao: yeah so *suoyi wo* (2.5) *eh:* (2.5) < *liangge:: nian* > (.5) (*duo*)

→82 Laoshi: *liang nian qian*

83 Mao: *eh* (.) *wo zai* (1.5) {name of chef's restaurant} <*zhongguo*>

→84 Laoshi: *gongzuo*

85 Mao: *ni* (.5) *wo zai* {name of chef's restaurant—known by its initials} [*gongzuo*

86 Laoshi: [{initials

87 of restaurant} *shi shenma?*

88 Mao: {full name of restaurant}

English (lines 81 to 88)

81 Mao: yeah so so I (2.5) *eh:* (2.5) <two years> (.5) (more)

→82 Laoshi: two years ago

83 Mao: *eh* (.) I (1.5) at {name of chef's restaurant} <China>

→84 Laoshi: worked

85 Mao: you (.5) I at {name of chef's restaurant—known by its initials} [worked

86 Laoshi: [{initials of the

87 chef's restaurant} is what?

88 Mao: {full name of restaurant}

Laoshi offers two instances of repair in the above excerpt, in lines 82 and 84, both in response to ill-formed lexical items. The first, *liang nian qian* (two years ago), she offers following *Mao*'s mistaken *lingge:: nian*, which *Mao* appears to only briefly notice with *eh* at the beginning of line 83. Moving on, *Mao* produces *zhongguo* (China) rather than *gongzuo* (work), a mistake of context it appears, seeing (a) how the topic of his presentation is on Chinese restaurants and (b) how the two lexical items have similar

tones and consonant sounds (though in opposite order). To this second offer of repair, *Mao* orients, producing grammatically correct uptake at the end of line 85.

Instances of this type, where *Laoshi* initiates unsolicited other-repair following incorrect uses of lexical items, occurred infrequently. This shows that she usually did not orient to the activity with an ‘instructorly’ use of repair, but instead allowed for communication to occur relatively free from lexical repairs in instances where learner word-choice was inappropriate. This was also the case when the instructor offered repair initiation (the little that she did) in response to student mispronunciation.

Other-Initiated Pronunciation Repair

Studies such as McGinnis (1996) have attempted to isolate developmental problems for NS English learners regarding their comprehension of Chinese tones, while other studies have focused on learner tonal-production errors and development of tonal control (Hayes, 1988; McGinnis, 1995). Throughout the present research little attention was paid to correct or incorrect pronunciation in basic learner production, i.e., no tonal marks, either correct or incorrect, were incorporated into the transcripts. Being that the students were low to upper intermediate learners, it was understood that pronunciation errors were not only present but common. Given this, after analyzing the data, a few instances existed where student mispronunciation resulted in instructor other-repair; namely, when mispronunciation affected communication. In the following excerpt, *Qing* and *Ming* are attempting to work with the word *dizhi* (n. address), which *Ming* has trouble pronouncing and *Qing* has trouble understanding.

Excerpt 17 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 88 to 105)

→88 Ming: *ah (.5) qingwen (.5) nege sushede: <dizi> shi shenma?*

89 Laoshi: *dizhi*

90 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

91 Qing: *dizi?*

92 Ming: *dizi*

93 Laoshi: *dizhi-*

94 Ming: *-zai zai nar?-*

95 Laoshi: *-zai na[r?*

96 Ming: *[dizhi*

97 Laoshi: *ta xiang qu*

98 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

99 Qing: *uhm::*

100 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

101 Laoshi: *ta xiang qu kan (zheige)*

102 Qing: *dizhi zai uh::m (1.5)*

103 Ming: *kai wanxiao meiguanxi*

104 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

105 Qing: *zai uhm (.5) footba::lls uh (.5) stadium (.5) ah: (1.0) xiamian*

English (lines 88 to 105)

→88 Ming: *ah (.5) excuse me (.5) that dorm's: <address> is what?*

89 Laoshi: *address*

90 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

91 Qing: *address?*

92 Ming: *address*

93 Laoshi: *address-*

94 Ming: *-where is it?-*

95 Laoshi: *-where is[it?*

96 Ming: *[address*

97 Laoshi: *he wants to go*

98 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

99 Qing: *uhm::*

100 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

101 Laoshi: *he wants to go and see (this)*

102 Qing: *the address is uh::m (1.5)*

103 Ming: *just joking forget about it*

104 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

105 Qing: at uhm (.5) the *footba::ll:s* uh (.5) *stadium* (.5) ah: (1.0) below

Ming's question in line 88, *nege sushede: dizi shi shenma?* (that dorm's: address is what?), causes *Laoshi* to initiate an unsolicited other-repair in line 89, where she states *dizhi* (address), correcting *Ming*'s zh [tʂ], which he had mispronounced as z [ts]. *Qing* fails to understand this word, which is clear from his response in line 91, where he repeats of the word using rising intonation. In the turns following this, *Laoshi* and *Ming* do pronunciation work, in which *Ming* attempts to pronounce the word correctly but without success; this repair-work of *dizhi* does little to clear up *Qing*'s misunderstanding, for he chooses not to provide the required second pair answer turn here. Then, in line 94, *Ming* modifies his question by stating *zai zai nar?* (where is it?), a phrase which *Laoshi* then repeats in line 95 not as a repair but as an overlapping confirmation. After instructor comments and general student laughter in lines 97 to 101, *Qing*, topicalizes the noun in question, *dizhi* (address), and then begins to answer. Three lines later, after *Ming* retracts his initial question, stating it was just a joke, *Qing* answers the question of where the dormitory is located.

The above excerpt shows the basic structure implemented by the instructor to offer repairs on mispronounced vocabulary within on-going conversations either between two other participants (as the *Qing* and *Ming* conversation shows) or between herself and a student. The instructor waits until some form of verbal distress occurs following a mispronounced lexical item before providing repair; in the excerpt above, *Laoshi* did not provide repair until after *Qing* repeats the word *dizhi* as a clarification request and *Ming* repeats the word unsuccessfully. This is similar to another excerpt involving *Qing* and *Ming*, where once again *Ming* shows distress in pronouncing a word in Chinese; this time the word *dongtian* (winter).

Excerpt 18 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 47 to 61)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *qingwen* (.) *neige uhm meiyouchuanyifuderen* (.5) *tamen* ((audible

48 laughter by members of class)) *dongtian tamen meiyou chuan yifu?*

49 Qing: *bu shi* (.2) *za::I uh::m* (.5) *susheli*

50 Ming: *oh* (.) *susheli*

51 Qing: *haishi* (1.5) *uh::m* (2.0) *uhm* (.5) *shenma shuo* (1.5) *zai::* *uhm* (2.5) *uhm-*

52 Ming: *-sushe waibian chuan yifu?*

53 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

54 Qing: *shenma shihou* (.5) *keshi zai* (.5) *uhm* (.5) *uhm wanshang youshiyou qu* (1.5)

55 *tamen xihuan* (.) *da* ent a

56 Laoshi: *mei chuan yifu?*

57 Qing: *mei chuan yifu* [*dui*

58 Ming: [*<dongtian dong- dong>-*

→59 Laoshi: *-dongtian*

60 Ming: *dongtian*

61 Qing: *dongtian* (.5) *dui dongtian* *hen* (.5) *hen* *leng*

English (lines 47 to 61)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *excuse me* (.) *those uhm people who don't wear clothes* (.5) *they*

48 ((audible laughter by members of class)) *in the winter* they don't wear clothes?

49 Qing: *not* (.2) *in:* *uh::m* (.5) *the dorm*

50 Ming: *oh* (.) *in the dorm*

51 Qing: *also* (1.5) *uh::m* (2.0) *uhm* (.5) *how do you say* (1.5) *in::* *uhm* (2.5) *uhm-*

52 Ming: *-outside the dorms do they wear clothes?*

53 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

54 Qing: *what time* (.5) *but in* (.5) *uhm* (.5) *uhm evening sometimes they go* (1.5) *they*

55 *like to* (.) *play frizbee*

56 Laoshi: *they don't wear clothes?*

57 Qing: *they don't wear clothes* [correct.

58 Ming: [*<winter wint- wint>-*

→59 Laoshi: *-winter*

60 Ming: *winter*

61 Qing: *winter* (.5) *correct winter* *very* (.5) *very* *cold*

Ming begins his question in line 47 and 48, and *Qing*, in his proceeding turn, begins to answer. *Laoshi*'s repair does not come until line 59, ten lines later. Though *Laoshi* interjects a comment at line 57, it is clear that the co-constructed conversation about where and when the nudist dormers go nude is entirely *Ming* and *Qing*'s creation. Following the question in line 49, *Qing* provides an answer to *Ming*'s question, saying the dormers do not wear clothes inside the dorm. *Ming* then confirms *Qing*'s answer with a repetition in line 50. In line 51, as he attempts to continue his answer, *Qing* uses a conventional display of verbal distress, *shenma shou?* (what to say). *Ming* then redirects *Qing* back to an unanswered element in his initial question with *-sushe waibian chuan yifu?* (outside the dorms do they wear clothes?). *Qing* not only answers the question but also explains what the dormers do while outside in the winter. Here the second part of the question/answer adjacency pair is complete. Following this is an assessment segment, where *Laoshi* first inserts a comment and then, in line 59, *Ming* attempts his own. It is here, following *Ming*'s failed attempt to say the word *dongtian* (winter), where *Laoshi* provides an unsolicited repair of his pronunciation. Instead of completing his assessment or initiating a new question, *Ming* provides uptake of *Laoshi*'s repair.

In the excerpt below, we see a somewhat similar type of repair organization occurring, but here the conversation is between *Laoshi* and *Yang* as they talk about Chinese restaurants and Chinese food.

Excerpt 19 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 142-160)

142 Laoshi: *bu zhidao mei xiguan dui (.5) suoyi ruguo nimen you kong (.) shei quguo? Shei*

143 *quguo?*

144 *(2.0)*

145 Laoshi: *ni quguo? Ni quguo?*

146 *(1.5)*

147 Laoshi: *oh shi ba.*

148 Yang: *uh hum*

149 Laoshi: *zenma yang?*

150 Song: *(ni keyi qing Laoshi) (**)* ((audible laughter by members of class))

151 Laoshi: *ni bu yao zheiyang zi ta (.) bu shi tade dian eh (.) ni qu de {I's*

152 *name} shenma shihou quguo? Chi le shenma? Zenma yang?*

153 Yang: *oh (.5) uhm (1.5) yi nian yiqian wo quguo (.5) wo (.) wo wang le (1.5) keshi*

154 *wo bu xihuan <zhongguo cai>*

→155 Laoshi: *zhongguo cai*

156 Yang: *zhongguo cai*

157 Laoshi: *zhongguo cai (2.5) ent xihuan zhongguo cai? (1.5) bu hao* ((audible laughter

158 *by members of class)) Yang ni yiding xihuan zhongguo cai* ((audible laughter

159 *by members of class)) (2.0) hao (.) Zhou ni weishenma qu {I's*

160 *name}?*

English (lines 142-160)

142 Laoshi: *you don't know you're not used to it right (.5) so if you have time (.) who*

143 *has gone? Who has gone?*

144 *(2.0)*

145 Laoshi: *have you gone? Have you gone?*

146 *(1.5)*

147 Laoshi: *oh you have.*

148 Yang: *uh hum*

149 Laoshi: *how was it?*

- 150 Song: you can treat *Laoshi* (**) ((audible laughter from members of class))
151 *Laoshi*: you won't offend him (.) it's not his place eh (.) when did you go to
152 {restaurant's name}? what did you eat? How was it?
153 Yang: oh (.5) uhm (1.5) over a year ago I went (.5) I (.) I forget (1.5) but I don't like
154 <chinese food>
→155 *Laoshi*: chinese food
156 Yang: chinese food
157 *Laoshi*: chinese food (2.5) you don't like chinese food? (1.5) that's not good ((audible
158 laughter from members of class)) *Yang* you have to like chinese food ((audible
159 laughter from members of class)) (2.0) okay (.) *Zhou* why did you go to
160 {restaurant's name}?

Looking at the data, it seems apparent in line 146, after *Laoshi* asks who has gone to *Mao*'s family's restaurant, that *Yang* makes some kind of non-verbal gesture. What makes this apparent is *Laoshi*'s comment in line 147 *oh shi ba!* (oh you have!), to which *Yang* responds with "uh hum" in the following line. This then establishes the two speakers and the topic to follow, with the instructor taking on a somewhat unusually active role in the presentation activity by asking the audience questions on the presenter's (*Mao*'s) behalf about the topic of his family's restaurant and who in the class had visited there. In the conversation that follows (seven lines later in line 155) *Laoshi* offers an unsolicited other-repair of *Yang*'s pronunciation of *zhongguo cai* (chinese food), in which he had used high level even, i.e., first tone, rather than high rising, i.e., second tone, intonation for *guo*. This is followed first by *Yang*'s uptake and then by *Laoshi*'s repetition. The difference here compared to instructor repair during student/student conversation presented in the excerpt above is that miscommunication does not occur. Nowhere is it clear that *Yang*'s mispronunciation of *zhongguo cai* impedes communication between him and *Laoshi*: there is no pause before production, no false starts or other displays of verbal distress.

Though only one instance of repair such as this, occurring in a conversation between instructor and student, does not define an organizational pattern, it gives an indication of how turn-taking resulted between *Laoshi* and a student concerning learner mispronunciation (though with no apparent miscommunication). However, instructor-initiated other-repair on

pronunciation in conversations between students occurred in a relatively organized manner, in that instructor-repair occurred following miscommunication between students, with the repair being followed by some form of learner uptake. This shows that even though learners were speaking between each other they were still receptive to *Laoshi* error correction and oriented to it within the turn-taking structure of the Q/A session. We see then that within the context of learner-to-learner conversations in the activity there existed the possibility of instructor participation at the lexical level with word-choice and pronunciation corrections, though, again, this did not appear to be very frequent.

Self-Initiated Other-Repair

Only one of the three presenters self-initiated other-repair during both presentation and Q/A sessions, i.e., he overtly requested instructor correction or confirmation on his production in the TL. On multiple occasions, *Wu* asked *Laoshi* for confirmation/correction on both his lexical choice and pronunciation, using his time in the activity as a way to confirm his oral production skills. Faerch and Kasper (1983) define this behavior as an *appealing strategy*. In the excerpt below, *Wu* is speaking about his mother's time at university.

Excerpt 20 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 19 to 33)

- 19 Wu: *Ming de muqin yiyangde (1.0) ta: xi jiali (.5) ta zuofan (.5) ta xi xi yi- (1.0)*
20 *biede (.5) biede (.5) jiashi jiashi (1.0) keshi women zhang zhangda yihou*
21 *women dou (.5) dao (.5) eh xuexiao qu (1.0) wo muqin (1.0) eh (.5) hui shang*
→22 *daxue (1.5) tamen (.5) eh tamen daxue (1.0) eh (**) (1.5) tamen <dang> boshi?*
23 Laoshi: *hum.:?*
→24 Wu: *tamen <dang> boshi?*
25 Laoshi: *(**) ni muqin qu (**) xiu boshi*
26 Wu: *xiu boshi*
27 Laoshi: *hum (1.0) na shihou jihui?*
→28 Wu: *(**) tamen zai shang daxue <dang> boshi?*
29 Laoshi: *xiu boshi*

- 30 Wu: *xiu boshi* (2.0) *eh suoyi* (1.0) *eh ta jiao* (.5) *ta bu neng- ta bu yao eh* (.5)
→31 <*jiaoshou*> (.). *jiaoshu* (*eh*)?
32 Laoshi: *uh hum*
33 Wu: *ta bu yao jiaoshu* (1.0) *ta yao eh: (.5) zai* (1.0) *shiyanshi* (1.0) *gongzuo* (.5)
- English (lines 19 to 33)
- 19 Wu: same as Ming's mother (1.0) she: cleaned house (.5) she cooked (.5) she cleaned
20 cleaned cloth- (1.0) other (.5) other (.5) house things house things (1.0) but after we
21 grew grew up we all (.5) went (.5) eh to school (1.0) my mother (1.0) eh (.5) could go
→22 to university (1.5) they (.5) eh their university (1.0) eh (**) (1.5) they <became> PhD?
23 Laoshi: *hum::?*
→24 Wu: they <became> a PhD?
25 Laoshi: (**) your mother went (**) and got a PhD
26 Wu: got a PhD
27 Laoshi: *hum* (1.0) then she married?
28 Wu: (**) they were at the university <becoming> a PhD?
29 Laoshi: getting a PhD
30 Wu: getting a PhD (2.0) eh so (1.0) eh she taught (1.0) she couldn't- she didn't
→31 want eh (.5) to <teach> (.). to teach (*eh*)?
32 Laoshi: *uh hum*
33 Wu: she didn't want to teach (1.0) she wanted eh: (.5) at (1.0) a laboratory (1.0) job

In the excerpt above, *Wu* three times solicits other-repair from the instructor while still in the presentation section of his speech, once in line 22 and again in line 24, both involving the verb *dang* (to become), a transitive verb used before occupations such as *dang laoshi* (to become a instructor), and a third time in line 31 with the *shu* (book) of *jiaoshu* (lit., teach book(s) or col., to teach⁹). In first solicitation, line 22, *Wu* uses <*dang boshi*> (<become a PhD>) with rising intonation, indicating an interest in receiving some type of instructor

⁹ Chinese lexicon has what is known as 'disyllabic tendencies,' of which *dang laoshi* and *jiaoshu* are examples. The nature of the language finds verb-object pairings of this sort very common, and by comparison *jiaoshu* is viewed as one lexical item, whereas *dang laoshi* is an example of various pairs *dang* may take based on the semantics of its object, e.g., *dang lushi* (become a lawyer) and *dang yisheng* (become a doctor).

confirmation. *Laoshi* responds to this request in line 23 with *hum*::, followed as well with rising intonation, signaling a clarification request from *Wu* as to his question. *Wu* then repeats his troubled phrase of <*dang boshi*>, and *Laoshi* then offers repair in the following line by using *shou boshi* (to get or receive a PhD), which *Wu* then repeats as uptake in his next turn.

Though *Wu* requests confirmation of his use of the verb *dang* with the object *boshi* in lines 22 and 24, his next independent use of the verb-object combination in line 28, just four lines later, finds him repeating his initial incorrect use of *dang*. To this, *Laoshi* responds with a repetition of her initial repair. *Wu* then corrects his mistake a second time in line 30. In this very same turn, *Wu* requests his second confirmation of a problematic verb phrase, line 31. Here the confirmation request is formed as a self-correction followed by rising intonation. With *Wu*'s self-repair correct, *Laoshi* simply confirms with an acknowledgement—*uh hum*—and *Wu* incorporates his self-corrected, other-confirmed verb phrase in the beginning of his next turn.

Within the data it is evident by the way he solicits instructor repair that *Wu* orients to his role as both presenter and as language learner within a classroom context. Though his is actively seeking feedback on lexical items questionable to him, he is selective of responding to *Laoshi*'s offers of repair, just as was the case with *Mao* (see excerpt 16). Here again is a portion from the previous excerpt.

Excerpt 21 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 19 to 28)

- 19 Wu: *Ming de muqin yiyangde (1.0) ta: xi jiali (.5) ta zuofan (.5) ta xi xi yi- (1.0)*
 20 *biede (.5) biede (.5) jiashi jiashi (1.0) keshi women zhang zhangda yihou*
 21 *women dou (.5) dao (.5) eh xuexiao qu (1.0) wo muqin (1.0) eh (.5) hui shang*
 →22 *daxue (1.5) tamen (.5) eh tamen daxue (1.0) eh (**) (1.5) tamen <dang> boshi?*
 23 Laoshi: *hum*::
 24 Wu: *tamen <dang> boshi?*
 25 Laoshi: *(**) ni muqin qu (**) xiu boshi*
 26 Wu: *xiu boshi*
 27 Laoshi: *hum (1.0) na shihou jihui?*

→28 Wu: (**) *tamen zai shang daxue <dang> boshi?*

English (lines 19 to 28)

- 19 Wu: same as Ming's mother (1.0) she: cleaned house (.5) she cooked (.5) she cleaned
20 cleaned cloth- (1.0) other (.5) other (.5) house things house things (1.0) but after we
21 grew grew up we all (.5) went (.5) eh to school (1.0) my mother (1.0) eh (.5) could go
→22 to university (1.5) they (.5) eh their university (1.0) eh (**) (1.5) they <became> PhD?
23 Laoshi: hum::
24 Wu: they <became> a PhD?
→25 Laoshi: (**) your mother went (**) and got a PhD
26 Wu: got a PhD
27 Laoshi: hum (1.0) then she married?
→28 Wu: (**) they were at the university <becoming> a PhD?

In line 22, for some reason, *Wu* begins to refer to his mother in the plural, using *tamen* (they) three times in that line. In line 24, as he initiates other repair, he again uses the plural. *Laoshi* formulates her repair in the following line, topicalizing *Wu*'s mother in the singular, *ni muqin* (your mother). However, *Wu* neither incorporates this (i.e., *wo muqin*—my mother) nor does he provide the correct singular form in line 28. These two instances reveal that students were selective in the other-repair they noticed, even when specifically seeking *Laoshi* repair.

Self-initiated Self-repair

As stated above, research into NS/NS and advanced NNS/NNS conversations has shown a preference for self-initiated self-repair. However, in the present data, only one instance of self-initiated self-repair occurred. Here, *Mao* is speaking about what he does and does not like to eat at his family's restaurant.

Excerpt 22 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 37 to 36)

27 Laoshi: *xihuan chi* (**) ((audible laughter by members of class))

- 28 Mao: *uhm: (2.0) gen (2.0) cake (.) noodle*
- 29 Laoshi: *oh ((instructor laughter)) okay (.5) hao ((instructor laughter))*
- 30 Mao: *u:hm, (2.0) (**) (1.5) eh zui huadide fan shi yi bu (.5) seafood (.5) lobster (2.0)*
- 31 *uhm (1.5) dish (2.0) wo bu xihuan huafei no! wo bu xihuan (1.5) uhm seafood*
- 32 *yinwei (.5) bu hao chi*
- 33 Laoshi: *seafood zenma shuo?*
- 34 Mao: *oh (1.0) <haishan shipian>*
- 35 Laoshi: *haixian*
- 36 Mao: *uh:m (3.5) ni you wenti ma?*

English (lines 27 to 36)

- 27 Laoshi: *you like to eat (**) ((audible laughter by members of class))*
- 28 Mao: *uhm: (2.0) and (2.0) cake (.) noodle*
- 29 Laoshi: *oh ((instructor laughter)) okay (.5) good ((instructor laughter))*
- 30 Mao: *u:hm, (2.0) (**) (1.5) eh the most expensive food is (.5) seafood (.5) lobster*
- 31 *(2.0) uhm (1.5) dish (2.0) I don't like to pay no! I don't like (1.5) uhm*
- 32 *seafood because (.5) it doesn't taste good*
- 33 Laoshi: *how do you say seafood?*
- 34 Mao: *oh (1.0) <seafood>*
- 35 Laoshi: *seafood*
- 36 Mao: *uh:m (3.5) do you have any questions?*

In line 27, *Mao* begins to describe the dishes he dislikes, seafood in general and lobster in particular. Within his account of why this is so, in line 30 he repairs the incorrect lexical item *huafei* (to spend) with *xihuan* (to like). Notice how he signals his repair with the word “no!” *Mao* used this self-repair signal previously (see excerpt 13) while still at the earlier stages of his presentation. Repair of this type was seldom found within the data.

Participant Performance within the Presentation

The manner in which both solicited and unsolicited repair occurs in these data raises the question of participant performance within the activity. In a sense, each of the participants,

by involving or not involving themselves with repair, may reflect their view of what the purpose of the activity is, with each of the participants, both students and instructor, displaying different orientations to their roles in the activity. For instance, as the examples above show, *Wu* uses his role as presenter as a tool for testing vocabulary still unknown to him and possibly taken straight from the dictionary in preparation for his speech. The excerpt below reveals *Wu*'s questionable use of vocabulary specific to his presentation.

Excerpt 23 (Wu Data)

Chinese (lines 33 to 58)

- 33 Wu: *ta bu yao jiaoshu (1.0) ta yao eh: (.5) zai (1.0) shiyanshi (1.0) gongzuo (.5)*
34 *shiyanshi shi laboratory (1.5) ta yao yanjiu yanjiuzhe (1.5) ta yao dang*
35 *yanjiuzhe shi researcher (1.0) suoyi eh (.5) ta kaishi (.5) zai eh Jiazhou (.5) eh*
36 *haibiar (1.0) haibiar chang (.5) eh de ying (.2) shiyanshi (.5) eh kaishi*
37 *gongzuo (2.0) ta xue (.) ta zhuanye xue (.5) ent zhuanye shi (1.0) haigou*
38 *(1.5) [haigoude shenghou*
39 Laoshi: *[haigou?*
40 Laoshi: *shenma shi haigou?*
41 Wu: *haigou (.5) eh seals*
42 Laoshi: *seals shi haigou ma?*
43 Wu: *haigou.*
44 Laoshi: *seals shi haigou eh? Okay. ((instructor laughter))*
45 Wu: *haigou (1.0) seals*
46 Class: *((audible laughter by members of class))*
47 Laoshi: *dui. Wo bu zhidao zenma shuo*
48 Wu: *wo zidian shuo haigou*
49 Laoshi: *zhei shi huahuade*
50 Wu: *bu shi dayade*
51 Laoshi: *bu shi da ya*
52 Wu: *actually (.) shi (.5) wait (**) ((looking word up in dictionary)) (1.5)*
53 Laoshi: *haigou*
54 Wu: *(3.5) hailishi (.5) shizi*

55 Laoshi: *oh haishizi*

56 Wu: *haishizi (.5) haishizi zai Jiazhou Jiazhou you hen duo haishizi*

57 Laoshi: *haigou (.) haigou ni zhidao haigou*

58 Wu: *haigou haigou (.5) sea dog sea dog*

English (lines 33 to 58)

33 Wu: she didn't want to teach (1.0) she wanted eh: (.5) at (1.0) a laboratory (1.0) job

34 (.5) laboratory is *laboratory* (1.5) she wanted to do research researcher (1.5) she

35 wanted to become a researcher is *researcher* (1.0) so eh (.5) she began (.5) on the

36 eh California (.5) eh coast (1.0) ocean coastline (.5) eh of the ocean (.2) laboratory

37 (.5) eh began to work (2.0) she studied (.) her major studied (.5) her her major is

38 (1.0) seals (1.5) [seal's life

39 Laoshi: [seals?

40 Laoshi: what is seals?

41 Wu: seals (.5) eh *seals*

42 Laoshi: *seals* are seals?

43 Wu: seals.

44 Laoshi: *seals* are seals eh? Okay. ((instructor laughter))

45 Wu: seals (1.0) *seals*

46 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))

47 Laoshi: correct. I don't know how to say this

48 Wu: my dictionary says seals

49 Laoshi: this is colloquial

50 Wu: they aren't the ones with big teeth

51 Laoshi: they don't have big teeth

52 Wu: actually (.) are (.5) wait (**) ((looking up the word in his dictionary)) (1.5)

53 Laoshi: seals

54 Wu: (3.5) seals (.5) seals

55 Laoshi: oh seals

56 Wu: seals (.5) seals in California California has lots of seals

57 Laoshi: seals (.5) seals you know seals

58 Wu: seals seals (.5) sea dog sea dog

In line 39, we see *Laoshi* overlap *Wu*, asking for clarification of *Wu*'s use of the word *haigou* (lit., sea dog), by repeating the word with rising intonation. In line 40, she reformulates her request more directly with the phrase, *shenma shi haigou?* (what is seals?). It is obvious in lines 41 to 44 that *Laoshi*'s clarification request of *haigou* is at the semantic level, for we see *Wu*'s response in line 41 is clarification enough of the essential meaning, "*haigou (.5) eh seals.*" In line 44, *Laoshi* then says, "*seals are seals eh? Ok.*" Even though *Laoshi* has accepted *Wu*'s use of *haigou* as 'seals' and the manner in which he uses code-switching to clarify this, *Wu* goes on to look up seal in his dictionary and finds '*hailishi (.5) shizi?*' (line 54), which *Laoshi* immediately recognizes with *oh haishizi*. With both participants finally confirming the correct lexical item, *Wu* immediately incorporates the new item into his next turn as uptake. However, here we see that *Laoshi* defers to *Wu*'s earlier use of *haigou*, saying in line 57, *haigou (.) haigou ni zhidao haigou* (seals (.) seals you know seals).

Wu's lexical work here and the amount of turn-taking dedicated to this single vocabulary word, plus the previous excerpts showing his active role in requesting confirmation of his lexical choices and his active uptake following instructor-repair, reveals his orientation to how he understands his role as presenter. He participates not only in the information-giving aspect of the speech but also utilizes the allotted power as presenter to confirm his lexical choices in the TL. *Wu* strongly orients to being a student who can request, even receive correction from the instructor.

We can contrast *Wu*'s behavior as presenter with *Mao*'s. As we have seen in earlier excerpts, *Mao* not only attempted to end his monologue section prematurely but he also needed guidance from *Laoshi* as to how he should structure his presentation, i.e., what topics to cover. As well, *Mao*'s lexical choices came into question, in that in one instance he choose an English word instead of its Chinese counterpart, and when prompted by *Laoshi* revealed his understanding of that counterpart. In another instance, *Mao* shows his knowledge of a Chinese lexical item but chooses for some reason not to use it. Here, it is a student, rather than the instructor, who offers him feedback. In excerpt 20, *Mao* and *Song* are speaking about whether *Mao* has worked in his family's restaurant.

Excerpt 24 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 71 to 76)

71 Song: *Mao xiansheng-*

72 Laoshi: *-xiansheng* ((audible laughter by members of class))

73 Song: *ni zai neibian gongzuo ma?*

74 Mao: *bu zai (.5) yinwei (.5) eh: tamen shuo (.5) Cantonese*

→75 Song: *Guangdonghua*

76 Mao: *yeah (1.0) Guangdonghua*

English (lines 71 to 76)

71 Song: Mr *Mao-*

72 Laoshi: -Mr, ((audible laughter by members of class))

73 Song: did you work there?

74 Mao: not there (.5) because (.5) eh: they speak (.5) *Cantonese*

→75 Song: *Cantonese*

76 Mao: *yeah (1.0) Cantonese*

Notice how, in line 75, *Song* offers *Mao* the Chinese for “Cantonese,” and by replacing it with *Guangdonghua* keeps *Mao* ‘on task’ speaking the TL. *Mao*’s knowledge of this word is claimed by his use of “yeah” as an acceptance of the unsolicited other-repair in line 76. *Song*, whose Chinese level was far in advance of *Mao*’s, aided *Mao* here by giving him relevant input during learner-learner turn-taking that *Mao* then incorporated as uptake in his following turn.

Wu’s and *Mao*’s data raise the issue of ‘voluntary participant performance’ within the speech event. Unlike *Wu*’s continual attempts at correct TL production and appeals for assistance, throughout *Mao*’s presentation he displayed either his inability or unwillingness to stay ‘on task,’ i.e., speak Chinese, during the presentation and Q/A session. His code-switching to English is prevalent throughout, which suggests that *Mao*’s concern as speaker was with the subject-matter content of what he said, regardless, at times, of whether it was

in Chinese or English. Notice the excerpt below, which occurs after *Laoshi* and *Mao* have concluded co-constructing minor additions to the information concerning his presentation.

Excerpt 25 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 56 to 66)

56 Laoshi: *you mei you wenti ent a*

57 (1.0)

58 Qing: *yige (1.0) yige (1.0) panzi*

59 Laoshi: *eh?*

60 Qing: *duo shao qian?*

61 Laoshi: *yike (.) yike fan (.) keren de ke (.) yike (.) fan (.) kefan duo shao qian?*

62 Mao: (1.5) *one what? (**)*

63 Laoshi: *one order*

64 Mao: *of what?*

65 ((?)): *something (**)*

66 ((?)): *(fish)*

English (lines 53 to 70)

56 Laoshi: *if you have questions ask him*

57 (1.0)

58 Qing: *one (1.0) one (1.0) dish*

59 Laoshi: *eh?*

60 Qing: *how much does it cost?*

61 Laoshi: *one (.) a dish (.) ((character parts)) (.) a dish (.) of food (.) how much is a dish?*

62 Mao: (1.5) *one what? (**)*

63 Laoshi: *one order*

64 Mao: *of what?*

65 ((?)): *something (**)*

66 ((?)): *(fish)*

In line 56, *Laoshi* opens the floor for questions. *Qing* then asks about the cost of a dish of food at the restaurant, using a topic-prominent question that begins in line 58 and concludes in line 60, i.e., *yige panzi duo shao qian?* (one dish costs how much money?). *Laoshi*, in line 61, reformulates *Qing*'s question, repairing a problem with *Qing*'s mistaken use of *panzi* (lit., plate for eating on) for *ke* (dish of food). Looking at lines 62 and 64, it is clear by the way *Mao* formulates his clarification request—"one what?"—that he understands two elements of *Laoshi*'s repair: (a) the basic question of *dou shao qian?* (how much money?) and (b) the fact that some "one" thing is the topic. In the turns leading up to *Mao*'s clarification request, both *Qing* and *Laoshi* repeatedly use the classifier phrases (Li and Thompson, 1981) *yige* or *yike*, with *yige* being the general, all-purpose classifier and *yike* specifically relating to dishes of food. *Mao*'s reply of "one what?" indicates that he either failed to comprehend the instructor initiated repair-work and reformulation concerning the lexical items *panzi* and *ke*, or he viewed these Chinese lexis unnecessary for formulating his response in Chinese as *yige shenma?* (one what?) or *shenma ke?* (what dish?), which may arguably be within his linguistic capabilities.

By comparing *Wu*'s and *Mao*'s data in this fashion, at a turn-by-turn level, we can see that though the activity is the same, participants orient to different roles as presenters, with one participant oriented to being a language student, responsible for trying to use the language, but also burdened by limited proficiency, and the other participant oriented to being a source of information, apparently less concerned with trying to use Chinese.

Linguistic Incorporation

On a turn-by-turn level, analyzing how repair and uptake are organized, CA allows, as has Interaction research, for the investigation of instances of corrective feedback within talk. However, seldom researched is how linguistic input in general is a resource at interlocutors' disposal during interaction. Though the focus of CA methodology is on the sequential organization of action in the turn structure, i.e., adjacency pairs, CA allows for a broader perspective of the entire interaction, not only in turn-by-turn units of analysis. The present data revealed where the lexical environment in general provided input rich in not only lexis but also in the morphological construction, specifically that relating to affixes and incorporation, of new, viable lexical clauses. Of particular importance is how learners

incorporate elements from the on-going talk into their limited lexical and grammatical understandings to form comprehensible lexical options in place of actual vocabulary not known, either actively or passively. Below is an example of this type of NS formulation from the instructor's speech during a conversation about a restaurant, where she makes a humorous suggestion on a possible career choice for *Mao*.

Excerpt 26 (Mao Data)

Chinese (lines 77 to 78)

77 Laoshi: *keshi ni keyi dang neige (3.0) dish-washer (.) wash dishes de ren* ((instructor
78 laughter)) *xi wanderen-*

English (lines 77 to 78)

77 Laoshi: *keshi ni keyi dang neige (3.0) dish-washer (.) wash dishes de ren* ((instructor
78 laughter)) *xi wanderen-*

Looking at lines 77 and 78, the instructor provides the same semantic information in three different ways, one right after another and divided by small pauses: first with “dish-washer,” then “wash dishes *deren*” (*de* = of the type or sort; *ren* = person or people) and then finally as “*xiwanderen*” (wash+dish+sort of+person). NS speakers of Chinese nominalize lexical elements, such as the verb phrase *xiwan* (wash dishes), in this manner to clarify the type or kind of head noun within the noun phrase.

In the extended instance that follows, this sort of relativization of a verb phrase (*meiyouyifu* = without clothes) modifying a noun (*ren* = person) through the use of the nominalizer *de* allows for speakers to adapt in the conversation when another lexical choice is absent, either because it is unknown or simply does not exist. So, for instance, if a person did not know the lexical item for ‘poor’ (*pingqiong*), another conversational option would be to create a synonymous attributive adjective or adjectival phrase using known elements such as *meiyouqianderen*, meaning ‘does not possess money type of person.’ If a speaker did not know *tuding* (bald) another choice would be to say *meiyoutoufaderen*, or ‘does not possess hair type of person.’ In making this lexical choice interlocutors are displaying elements of their communicative strategies; namely, their ability to circumnavigate lexical

holes such as the word for ‘bald’ (*meiyoutoufa* or *tuding*) in their working oral vocabulary by using a form of circumnavigation.

In the excerpt below, what is interesting is how two learners create lexical options for *luoti* (naked or nude) by using variations of *meiyouyifudesushe* (does not possess clothes type of dormitory); wherein the negated verb phrase *meiyouyifu* (does not possess clothes) is connected with *de* (of the sort or kind) to form an attributive adjective meaning “of the sort without clothes,” which, in turn, modifies *sushe* (dormitory). Macalester College, specifically, has a nudist dorm, which is the topic of *Qing*’s presentation.

Excerpt 27 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 01 to 49)

- 01 Qing: *zhiyu:: (.5) uhm:: zhiyu eh Macalester da::xue Macalester daxue*
- 02 *xuesheng shi hao (2.0) hmm bu tong::: (1.0) ah (1.0) bu tong: (.5) bu tong::de*
- 03 *xuesheng shi: hao (1.0) ye suoyi bu tongde (2.5) yige (.5) yige sushe jia::o (1.0)*
- 04 *uhm meiyou yif- meiyouyifude sushe (2.5) neige sushede ren bu xihuan chuan yifu*
- 05 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 06 Laoshi: (**) *mei you (**)?*
- 07 Qing: *mei you.*
- 08 Laoshi: *mei you?*
- 09 Qing: *mei you.*
- 10 Laoshi: *nande he nude?*
- 11 Qing: *nan- (.5) nande he nude*
- 12 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 13 Qing: *suoyi [:uhm*
- 14 Laoshi: *[ni zhu neige sushe ma?*
- 15 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 16 Qing: *hum:: keshi ta- tamende xiawu jihui hen you yise*
- 17 Wen: *dou bu kuai yifu?*
- 18 Qing: *(.5) uh (.5) bu keyi.*
- 19 Laoshi: *ni quguo?*
- 20 Qing: *quguo.*

- 21 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 22 Laoshi: *hen hao wan (1.5) ni qu (**) shenma dou meiyou?*
- 23 Qing: *meiyou.*
- 24 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 25 Qing: *hao wan*
- 26 Laoshi: *hen hao wan*
- 27 Qing: *Macalester daxue (2.5) you wenti ma?*
- 28 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
- 29 Laoshi: *you wenti ma?*
- 30 ((?): *uh::m*
- 31 *(2.5)*
- 32 Laoshi: *mei you wenti (1.5) uh*
- 33 Wen: *uh:: (1.0) was it Minzhou? Was that[(**)*
- 34 Laoshi: *[Min[(**)*
- 35 Wen: *[was that North Dak-[(**)*
- 36 Qing: *[Minnesota*
- 37 Wen: *oh (.5) Minnesota oh*
- 38 Laoshi: ((instructor laughter)) *Minzhou*
- 39 Qing: *zai Twin Cities*
- 40 Laoshi: *oh Twin Cities zhei liangge youmingde cheng*
- 41 Qing: *dui.*
- 42 Laoshi: *Xunbaoluo?*
- 43 Qing: *um hum*
- 44 Laoshi: *hai you ne?*
- 45 Qing: *Minneapolis*
- 46 Laoshi: *oh. (1.5) Mi-ni-a-po-lis (.5) oh*
- 47 Ming: *hum (.) qingwen (.) neige uhm meiyouchuanyifuderen (.5) tamen ((audible*
- 48 *laughter by members of class)) dongtian tamen meiyou chuan yifu?*
- 49 Qing: *bu shi (.2) za::I uh::m (.5) susheli*

English (lines 01 to 49)

- 01 Qing: about: (.5) uhm:: about eh *Macalester* uni::versity *Macalester* university students
02 are good (2.0) hmm different:: (1.0) ah (1.0) different: (.5) different:: kinds of
03 students is: good (1.0) also so different (2.5) one (.5) one dorm is called (1.0) the
→04 no cloth- the no-clothes dorm (2.5) those dorm students don't like wearing clothes
05 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
06 Laoshi: (**) none (**)?
07 Qing: none.
08 Laoshi: none?
09 Qing: none.
10 Laoshi: male and female?
11 Qing: mal- (.5) male and female
12 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
13 Qing: so [:uhm
14 Laoshi: [did you live in that dorm?
15 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
16 Qing: hum:: but th- their morning meetings are very interesting
→17 Wen: none of them wore clothes?
18 Qing: (.5) uh (.5) cannot
19 Laoshi: have you gone?
20 Qing: I have.
21 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
22 Laoshi: very fun (1.5) when you went (**) you didn't wear anything?
23 Qing: nothing.
24 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
25 Qing: fun
26 Laoshi: very fun
27 Qing: *Macalester* university (2.5) do you have questions?
28 Class: ((audible laughter by members of class))
29 Laoshi: do you have questions?
30 ((?)) uh::m

- 31 (2.5)
- 32 Laoshi: no questions. (1.5) uh
- 33 Wen: uh:: (1.0) *was it North Dakota? Was that* [(**)
- 34 Laoshi: [Min-[(**)
- 35 Wen: [*was that North Dak-*[(**)
- 36 Qing: [Minnesota
- 37 Wen: oh (.5) Minnesota oh
- 38 Laoshi: ((instructor laughter)) Minnesota
- 39 Qing: at *Twin Cities*
- 40 Laoshi: oh *Twin Cities* these two famous cities
- 41 Qing: yes.
- 42 Laoshi: Twin Cities?
- 43 Qing: um hum
- 44 Laoshi: the other?
- 45 Qing: *Minneapolis*
- 46 Laoshi: oh. (1.5) *Mi-ni-a-po-lis* (.5) oh
- 47 Ming: hum (.) excuse me (.) those uhm people who don't wear clothes (.5) they
- 48 ((audible laughter by members of class)) in the winter they don't wear clothes?
- 49 Qing: not (.2) in: uh::m (.5) the dorm

In line 4, *Qing* defines one dormitory at Macalester as the *meiyouyif- meiyouyifudesushe* (possessing no clothes sort of dormitory) and then remarks immediately following this that *neige sushederen bu xihuan chuan yifu* (these dormers don't like to wear clothes). Notice the pause between the initial attempt at *meiyouyifudesushe* and then the completed adjectival phrase immediately after in line 4. At this point, important lexical elements have been introduced: *meiyou* (does not possess), *yifu* (clothes), *ren* (person), and *chuan* (to wear). As well, we see an adjectival phrase structure built on the nominal marker *de* that then refers to the head noun *ren*.

In neither line 7 nor 9, two potential opportunities for repair, does the instructor make an overt lexical correction by substituting *luoti* (naked or nude) for *meiyouyifudesushe*, i.e., *luoti sushe*. Instead, in these lines, we find *Laoshi* responding to the semantic content of

meiyouyifu by twice requesting confirmation. In her next available turn, line 11, she requests confirmation of who, exactly, wears no clothes: *nande he nude?* (male and female?). Seven lines later, in line 17, *Wen*, a Heritage student, asks almost an identical confirmation request, asking *dou bu kuai yifu?* (none of them wear clothes?). Here the *kuai* seems to be a dialectal variation of *chuan* (to wear). Neither of the NS Chinese transcript reviewers understood which dialect *kuai* comes from, but both agreed that here its intended meaning is that of *chuan* (to wear). In fact, as we see in line 18, *Qing* orients to *kuai* as if it were *chuan*, answering *Wen*'s question from line 17: (.5) *uh* (.5) *bu keyi*. [(.5) *uh* (.5) cannot]. Here, then, *Qing* is orienting to the semantic phrase *bu chuan yifu* (*bu* = not) by replying with *bu keyi*, a truncation of *bu keyi chuan yifu* (cannot wear clothes).

Twenty-seven lines later, following two topics—whether *Qing* had ever gone to the nudist dorm and in which state and city Macalester College is located—a different student, *Ming*, claims the floor with a question.

Excerpt 28 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 47 to 48)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *qingwen* (.) *neige uhm meiyouchuanyifuderen* (.5) *tamen* ((audible
48 laughter by members of class)) *dongtian tamen meiyou chuan yifu?*

English (lines 47 to 48)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *excuse me* (.) *those uhm people who don't wear clothes* (.5) *they*
48 ((audible laughter by members of class)) *in the winter they don't wear clothes?*

Ming topicalizes his question with the lexical choice, *meiyouchuanyifuderen* (no clothes wearing people) followed by a brief pause much like in *Qing*'s original use of *meiyouyifudesushe*, where he interrupted his first attempt at using this phrase in line 4 (excerpt 27). *Ming* then asks his question: *dongtian tamen meiyou chuan yifu?* (winter they don't wear clothes?). Here, *Ming* has not only created his own unique lexical choice (*meiyouchuanyifuderen*) by incorporating elements recycled from the conversation spanning the initial twenty-three lines of the transcription (*meiyou* + *chuan* + *yifu* + *ren*

using a nominal particle *de*), he has also mirrored this with the structure of his question (*meiyou chuan yifu?*).

In line 47 and 48, immediately following the use of this lexical choice, it is apparent that other members of the audience understood its meaning; more importantly, *Qing* comprehends and begins to answer. This is clear by how he orients to *Ming*'s question in line 49:

Excerpt 29 (Qing Data)

Chinese (lines 47 to 49)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *qingwen* (.) *neige uhm meiyouchuanyifuderen* (.5) *tamen* ((audible
48 laughter by members of class)) *dongtian tamen meiyou chuan yifu?*
49 Qing: *bu shi* (.2) *za::I uh::m* (.5) *susheli*

English (lines 47 to 49)

47 Ming: *hum* (.) *excuse me* (.) *those uhm people who don't wear clothes* (.5) *they*
48 ((audible laughter by members of class)) *in the winter they don't wear clothes?*
49 Qing: *not* (.2) *in: uh::m* (.5) *the dorm*

Qing simply responds to the question without requesting clarification. Notice also that there is no gap in turns between lines 48 and 49, indicating that *Qing* does not treat the question as problematic. By the laughter from students following its utterance and by *Qing*'s response in line 49, the nominalized *meiyouchuanyifuderen* proves a viable lexical choice.

Long's (1996) Interactional Hypothesis states that "environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during *negotiation for meaning*" (p. 414; italics in original). This extended conversation shows that certain students were capable conversationalists able to adapt to lexical holes in their working oral vocabulary by relying upon a knowledge of nominalization that enabled them to create comprehensible lexical choices from recycled information. *Meiyoyifudesushe*, from the initial presentation (line 4), provided not only the topic around which the resulting questions/conversation revolved, it also provided essential

lexical items and syntactical structures to which other interlocutors oriented and implemented in order to participate in the interaction.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

By using CA methodology applied to the analysis of a routine speech event found in a CFL classroom, this research has shown the following. One, the larger organization of the speech event was bounded by two pre-allocated instructor phrases—*zhunbei hao le ma?* (are you prepared?) and *nimen you wenti wen ta* (if you have questions ask him). The use of these phrases, and the manner by which students oriented to them within the on-going talk-in-interaction, described the type of conversation in which learner input occurred, i.e., a classroom setting involving a monologue and Q/A session rather than a telephone conversation or an informal face-to-face encounter. Specifically, CA methodology allows for features of interaction to describe itself. Two, the nature of questions-answer adjacency pairs reveals that prior research into question categorization ignores the details and the manner in which questions promote and produce various participant responses. The micro-analysis implemented in CA shows that questions and answers cannot be displaced from their sequential environment. Three, with regard to repair organization and the issue of uptake, the data described how the instructor provided, though infrequently, both unsolicited and solicited other-repair on student errors in regards to lexical choices and pronunciation. Moreover, other learners also, though infrequent, provided unsolicited repair. Through the analysis of repair, it was clear how participants oriented to their roles within the speech event, with *Wu* actively structuring his turns so as to solicit repair from *Laoshi* compared to *Mao* constructing his turns more in response to instructor feedback and offers of how to proceed. Overall, *Wu*, *Mao*, *Ming* and *Yang* were each responsive to *Laoshi* repair of their ill-formed lexical choices and pronunciation mistakes, orienting to *Laoshi* in her role as instructor by offering uptake as well as to their own identities as CFL learners in a classroom setting. And four, by viewing the speech event as an extended form of input, it was evident that learners, by incorporating previously uttered lexical and grammatical elements, used relativization as a compensatory strategy within their turn-by-turn organization to participate in the on-going talk.

Granted, as the Firth and Wagner (1997, 1998) and the subsequent response articles reveal, there is an on-going contention within the field of SLA with the issue of acquisition and language use, and specifically, with regards to strict CA methodology as a non-mentalistic approach. However, much of the research in the Interaction vein has been premised on the view that there is a *causal* relationship between interaction, more specifically certain types of conversational input, and acquisition. According to Gass (1997), “the concept of *input* is perhaps the single most important concept of second language acquisition” (p. 1). The present research has attempted to show that there are similarities between the interaction research vein of SLA and CA methodologies applied to language learning contexts, i.e., use of repair and evidence of uptake and question/answer formation. At the same time, the issue of how instructors and learners orient to question/answers within the data calls for a re-evaluation of how researchers analyze the mechanics of how participants accomplish such turns.

Gass (1997) states that “[i]t is trivial to point out that no individual can learn a second language without input of some sort. In fact, no model of second language acquisition does not avail itself of input in trying to explain how learners create second language grammars” (p. 1). Though, due to its anti-cognitive basis, strict CA will never result in a model of SLA, it is the researcher’s belief that the methodology itself has inherent qualities that can shed light on as yet unexamined elements of conversational input.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Gabriele Kasper and Dr. Craig Chaudron for their insightful comments, careful attention, and helpful suggestions for revision. As well, I would like to thank the class instructor and student research participants for kindly taking part in the extensive data gathering. I am also indebted to Yan Liao and Zao Yang for their review of the data and Dr. Eric Hauser for the assistance and support he provided throughout the writing of each draft. I accept full responsibility for any mistakes within the research.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J., Frohlich, M., & Spada, N. (1984). *An investigation of second language teaching*. Boston: Ginn.
- Bilmes, J. (1988). The concept of preference in conversation analysis. *Language in Society*, 17, 161-181.
- Brock, C. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 47-59.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chun, A. E., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 537-547.
- Doughty, C. J. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 431-469.
- Doughty, C. J. (2000). Negotiating the L2 linguistic environment. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL*, 18(2), 47-83.
- Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. (2003). The scope of inquiry and goals of SLA. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Doughty, C. J., & Pica, T. (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 305-325.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Communication strategies in interlanguage production*. London: Longman.
- Fanslow, J. (1977). Beyond Rashomon: Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 17-39.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 91-94.

- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985). Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 37-57.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1989). Incorporated repairs in NNS discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- Geis, M. L. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Goodwin, C. (1999). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489-1522
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics. The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hayes, E. (1988). Encoding strategies used by native and non-native readers of Chinese Mandarin. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 188-195.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387-398.
- 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.
- Heritage, J. (1988). Current development in conversation analysis. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation* (pp. 21-47). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis in institutional talk: Analysing data. In D. Silvermann (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 161-181). London: Sage.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 39-63.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kasper, G. (1997). "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 307-312.
- Krashen, S. (1977). The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), *Viewpoints on English as a second language*. New York: Regents.
- Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Lightbrown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Long, M. H. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77. Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice* (pp. 278-293). Washington: TESOL.
- Long, M. H. (1980). Inside the "black box": Methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. *Language Learning*, 30(1), 1-42.
- Long, M. H. (1981a). Questions in foreigner talk discourse. *Language Learning*, 31, 135-157.
- Long, M. H. (1981b). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-278.
- Long, M. H. (1983a). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.

- Long, M. (1983b). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177-279.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp. 414-468). New York: Academic.
- Long, M. H., & P. Porter (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- McGinnis, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Chinese pedagogy: An emerging field*. Columbus, OH: Foreign Language Publications.
- McGinnis, S. (1995, March). *Student attitudes and approaches in the learning of written Chinese*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Long Beach, CA.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Meisel, J., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3, 109-135.
- Mitchell, R., Parkinson, B., & Johnstone, R. (1981). *The foreign language classroom: An observational study*. Stirling Educational Monographs No. 9. Stirling: Department of Education, University of Stirling, Scotland.
- Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: an analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(3), 323-347.
- Negretti, R. (1999). Web-based activities and SLA: A conversation analysis research approach. *Language Learning and Technology Journal*, 3(1), pp. 75-87.

- Ohta, A. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3-21.
- Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, participation, and comprehension: Redefining relationships. *System*, 19, 437-452.
- Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker/non-native speaker negotiation. What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. Mc Connell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text in context: Crossdisciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-237). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Pica, T. (1994). Review article research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493-527.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. J. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: a comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Maddens (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85-98). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., Doughty, C. J., & Young, R. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? *I.T.L. Review of Applied Linguistics*, 72, 1-25.
- Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. J. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 737-758.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 63-90.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 152-163). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action and sense-making practices. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as a social interaction* (pp. 1-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis - The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simple systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Sato, C. (1986). Conversation and interlanguage development: Rethinking the connection. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 23-45). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 89-101.
- Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *The American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies of ethnomethodology* (pp. 56-65). New York: Irvington.
- Schegloff, E. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 99-128.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1985). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Selinger, H., & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10(2), 209-231.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Oxford University.

- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. (1992). Towards and analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Teng, S., & Perry, L. (1996). *Taiwan today: An Intermediate course* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Cheng & Tsui.
- Uhlenbeck, E. (1978). On the distinction between linguistics and pragmatics. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language interpretation and communication*. New York: Plenum.
- Van den Branden, K. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning*, 47(4), 589-636.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.

APPENDIX A:

Sacks et al. (1974) 14-Point Constitutive Model of Turn-Taking (pp. 700-701)

1. Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs.
2. Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.
3. Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.
4. Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common.
Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.
5. Turn order is not fixed, but varies.
6. Turn size is not fixed, but varies.
7. Length of conversation is not specified in advance.
8. What parties say is not specified in advance.
9. Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance.
10. Number of parties can vary.
11. Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.
12. Turn allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in starting to talk.
13. Various “turn constructional units” are employed; e.g., turns can be projectedly “one word long,” or they can be sentential in length.
14. Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble.

**APPENDIX B:
Participant Data**

Caucasian Students

<i>Name</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Years of in-country experience</i>
1. Yao -	Undergrad	Pre-Med	None
2. Yang -	Undergrad	Unknown	None
3. Wu -	Grad	Asian studies	Taiwan 2yrs
4. Qing -	Grad	Asian Religion	China 1yr
5. Ming -	Grad	Undeclared	China 2yrs
6. Wang -	Undergrad	Asian Studies	None
7. Peng -	Grad	Asian Studies	China 3 mths
8. Liu -	Grad	Asian Religion	None
9. Song -	Grad	Undeclared	Taiwan 6 yrs

Heritage Students

<i>Name</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Years of in-country experience</i>
10. Zhou -	Undergrad	Unknown	None
11. Zhu -	Grad	Religion	None
12. Xie -	Undergrad	Information Technology	None
13. Han -	Undergrad	Information Technology	None
14. Mao -	Undergrad	Unknown	None
15. Zhang -	Undergrad	Unknown	Hong Kong

Japanese L1 Student

<i>Name</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Years of in-country experience</i>
16. Ren -	None	Japanese instructor	Taiwan 6-8 mths

**APPENDIX C:
Transcript Conventions**

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
((?))	indicates unknown speaker
.	period indicates a falling intonation
?	question mark indicates a question intonation
{xxx}	indicates information omitted for privacy sake
,	comma indicates falling-rising, continuing intonation
:	colon indicates a sound elongation, more colons indicate longer elongation
-	hyphen at the end and beginning of turns indicates latched turns with no gap or overlap; within turns indicates truncated word
<u>xx</u>	underlining indicates greater than normal stress
[left bracket indicates beginning of overlap
(.)	period within parentheses indicates a micropause; pauses greater than 0.2 seconds, measured to nearest tenth second
(xx)	'x' inside parenthesis indicates incomprehensible speech
(yes)	word/s inside parentheses indicates best guess at incomprehensible speech
(())	double parentheses indicate analyst's description of something in the transcript, or description of a problem with the transcript
<xxx>	words inside less-than and more-than signs indicate mispronounced lexis that produce other-initiated repair
=	equals indicate continued, same-speaker speech between turns where overlap occurs
!	indicates word said abruptly