6

Doing Word Explanation in Interaction[1]

Kristian Mortensen
Université du Luxembourg

Introduction

One of the things teachers in the second/foreign language classroom are faced with is how to teach new lexical elements. Since the days of grammar-translation, where formal structures and lexical items were taught explicitly and out of context (see, e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), different teaching methodologies, and communicative language teaching in particular, have sought to incorporate vocabulary teaching in more meaning-oriented discourse. Research on vocabulary teaching has used dichotomies such as implicit or explicit (DeCarrico, 2001) and planned or unplanned (Hatch & Brown, 1995) to refer to whether vocabulary is taught as separate activities or dealt with as part of the ongoing activity. Special tasks, such as filling-the-blank, semantic associations, and language games, may be designed specifically to practice new vocabulary. However, vocabulary, as well as other formal linguistic aspects, is always a possible and relevant aspect to be extracted "on the fly" from the ongoing course of action in the language classroom and made a subject for explicit teaching. Focus on form (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998) argues for meaningful classroom interaction with occasional shift[s] of attention to linguistic code features—by the teacher and/or one or more students—triggered by perceived problems with cowmprehension or production (Long & Robinson, 1998, p. 23).

In this way, teaching linguistic material is embedded within the ongoing (meaningful) interaction and is therefore highly context dependent.

Extracting linguistic material "on the fly" can be described in terms of repair[2] (Schegloff, 1997b, 2000; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977): Either the teacher locates a part of his/her turn as a *possible* problematic word and provides an explanation of the word (i.e., self-repair) or she or he explicitly asks the students whether or not they understand the word. Alternatively, the lexical item is located and pointed out by the students as problematic, and the teaching sequence thus takes the form of an other-initiated repair. In both ways, a word or words are identified in the ongoing interaction and made relevant for more or less formal instruction. These practices may evoke the institutional character of the language classroom and define the ongoing activity as "doing (vocabulary) teaching."

Vocabulary learning is an important aspect of second language acquisition (e.g., Carter & McCarthy, 1988; Schmitt, 2000). A substantial part of vocabulary-learning research focuses on how new vocabulary is processed and memorized and is primarily conducted within a psycholinguistic framework. On the other hand, teaching methodologies (see, e.g., Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), either explicitly or implicitly, provide suggestions for how to teach vocabulary to second/foreign language students in the classroom. These suggestions are often based on a theoretical set of assumptions about the nature of language and learning rather than on an emic perspective based on interactional analyses of classroom interaction (e.g., Evaldsson, Lindblad, Sahlström, & Bergqvist, 2001; Seedhouse, 1996, 1997, 2004). As a contrast, this study shows, by means of transcripts of recorded classroom interaction, *how* vocabulary is extracted from the ongoing course of action "on the fly." In which sequential environments does this occur? How is the vocabulary selected from the range of possible "teachable" words from the flow of classroom interaction? Drawing on conversation analysis (CA), I will describe a social practice that I call "doing word explanation."[3]

This chapter focuses on cases where the word explanation is jointly extracted and explained by teacher and students. In other words, I will not examine cases where the teacher teaches vocabulary without including the students. As we will see later, the social phenomenon that is described here is based on a sequential environment in which the students provide a candidate understanding of the word. I will show how the teacher sets up a frame in which a relevant action for the students is to display orientation to particular lexical item(s), and how this display provides for a word explanation to be requested. The analysis therefore highlights the joint accomplishment of vocabulary teaching as being constructed in and through interaction. Henceforth, I will refer to this interactional practice as "doing word explanation".

The data material consists of 25 hours of video recordings of Danish second language (L2) classrooms with adult learners. The recordings are part

of the cross-institutional research project "Learning and Integration—Adults and Danish as a Second Language" conducted by three Danish universities. The recordings were made in 2005–2006 with two individual cameras that were placed on tripods since the researcher was not present in the classroom during the recording. Transcription conventions follow Jefferson (see, e.g., Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, for overview), and include additional information about visual features (in particular gaze and gesture).

Looking at the examples in this article gives the impression that the vocabulary that is taught is part of the teacher's lesson plan. Most of the lexical items emerge from the ongoing interaction and are left again after a short formal explanation. The word explanations occupy a short sequence within whole class interaction and are embedded within the ongoing task accomplishment. However, although the lesson plan has been prepared prior to the lesson, it nonetheless has to be carried out during the lesson in front of, and in collaboration with, the students (cf. Suchman, 2007). Consequently, rather than treating the lesson plan as a "task-as-workplan" (Breen, 1989), I will examine how it is made relevant and included in the interaction.

Presenting "doing word explanation"

In this section, I will present the sequential format through which word explanation emerges. Example 1 is a typical example of the sequential structure that is central to the interactive construction of doing word explanation. Prior to the example, the class had a group discussion about fines, and Angela told a story about "a plain clothes police officer." The teacher circled among the students and, among other things, wrote "a plain clothes officer" on the board.

Example 1 [O620U2—34:40]

```
1    Te:   Mia hun havde:: nej ikk Mia undskyld (.)
           Mia she had no not Mia sorry (.)

2    Te:   Angela havde fået e:n bøde af (.)
           Angela had got a fine by (.)

   geTe:   /gazes and points towards "en betjent i
           civil"(a plain clothes police officer)
           on the blackboard
3 -> Te:   /en (1.4) en <betjent i civi:l>
           a (1.4) a plain clothes police officer
           "Mia she had no not Mia sorry (.) Angela
           had got a fine by (.) a (1.4) plain
           clothes police officer"
```

```
4      Ps:   (0.4)

5      Te:   hørte je
             heard I
             "I heard"

     gaTe:   /gazes towards students
6      Ps:   /(.)

7      Ca:   °(En) betjent (i civil)°
             A plain clothes police officer
             "A plain clothes police officer"

8      Ps:   (2.0)

9      Ca:   En betjent i civi[:l
             A plain clothes police officer
             "A plain clothes police officer"

10     Te:                    [Ja hva betyder det hva-
                              [Yeah what means that what

11     Te:   en betjent i civi:l hva er det
             a plain clothes police officer what is that
             "Yeah what does that mean what a plain
             clothes police officer what is that"

12     Ps:   (0.5)

13     Al:   De:::t en betjent uden uniform
             It an officer without uniform
             "It is an officer without a uniform"

14     Te:   Det en betjent uden uniform ja
             It an officer without a uniform yeah
             "It is an office without a uniform yeah"
```

A few comments should be noted about the sequence that leads up to the word explanation (line 13). (a) The first time the "noun phrase-to-be-explained" is produced is in line 3 after a hesitant turn by the teacher; the turn includes a micro pause as well as a substantial 1.4 second pause and a restart (the repetition of the article). The specific noun phrase is placed in a possible turn constructional unit (TCU)-final position and is produced at a slower pace than the surrounding talk. (b) The turn is followed by a 0.4 second pause and an increment (Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002) that provides a new transition relevant position. (c) A student repeats the noun phrase twice (lines 7 and 9), and the teacher asks for a word explanation (lines 10–11). In this way, the noun

phrase is oriented to as *relevant* to the ongoing activity by both participants. (d) The word explanation by a student, Ali, follows the consistent three-part IRF (Initiation-Response-Follow-up) pattern in classroom interaction as described, among others, by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Mehan (1979): In lines 10–11 the teacher requests a word explanation (Initiation), a student explains the word in line 13 (Response), and the teacher, in line 14, accepts the student's explanation (Follow-up).

In the following sections, I will elaborate on this pattern characterized by the following moves: (a) The teacher emphasizes a specific part of the turn, which (b) a student repeats, and (c) the teacher then asks for a word explanation, which (d) the student provides in the following turn. I will show how the participants collaboratively prepare the ground for the word explanation and discuss the context(s) in which this social practice is found. The sequence is interactively constructed, and I will show how the students orient to the teacher's emphasis of a part of the teacher's turn-at-talk, and how they contribute to the lexical explanation sequence.

Highlighting the target word

In the prior paragraph, we saw that the teacher highlights a part of his/her turn, and that the highlighted words therefore hold a prominent position within the turn. This seems to be an important aspect of "doing word explanation." Examples 2 to 4 show examples of how the teacher emphasizes a particular part of the turn.

```
1      Ps:    (2.4)

2      Te:    He:r i spørgsmål fem hvo::r han spør hvorfor
              Here in question five where he asks why

3      Te:    hun ikke køber en ny cykel, (0.3) så det
              she not buy a new bike (0.3) then it

4      Te:    fordi hun ikke har råd til det li´e nu (.)
              because she cannot afford it right now (.)

5 ->   Te:    også fordi hun skal betale <e:n bø:de>
              also because she has to pay a fine
              "Here in question five where he asks why
              she doesn't buy a new bike (0.3) so it's
              because she can't afford it right now
              (.) also because she has to pay a fine"

6      Ps:    (0.7)
```

Example 2 [O620U1—55:25]

```
1     Ps:   (2.4)

2     Te:   He:r i spørgsmål fem hvo::r han spør hvorfor
            Here in question five where he asks why

3     Te:   hun ikke køber en ny cykel, (0.3) så det
            she not buy a new bike (0.3) then it

4     Te:   fordi hun ikke har råd til det li´e nu (.)
            because she cannot afford it right now (.)

5 ->  Te:   også fordi hun skal betale <e:n bø:de>
            also because she has to pay a fine
            "Here in question five where he asks why
            she doesn't buy a new bike (0.3) so it's
            because she can't afford it right now
            (.) also because she has to pay a fine"

6     Ps:   (0.7)

7     Ca:   Ehrm::[:: °en bøde°]
            Ehrm:::: a fine
            "Ehrm a fine"

8     Te:         [E- e:n bøde] hva er det en bøde er
                  [A- a fine what is it a fine is
                  "A a fine what's that a fine is"

9     Ps:   (0.6)

10    Al:   Multa ((Spanish for fine))
            Fine
            "Fine"

11    Ps:   (1.1)

12    Al:   Ehrm: når du: DU LAVer no:get du skal betale
            Ehrm: when you you do something you must pay
            "Ehrm when you you do something you have to pay"
```

Example 3 [O620U2—27:15]

```
1     Te:   Hva hedder det=ehrm:::::::::::::::::::, Monika
            What do you say ehrm::::: Monika
```

```
2 -> Te:   hun kørte (0.5) forkert (.) i en=eller kørte
           she drove (0.5) wrong (.) in a or went


3 -> Te:   ind i en ensrettet gade
           into a one way street
           "What do you say ehrm Monika she drove (0.5)
           wrong (.) in a or went into a one way street"


4    Ps:   (0.3)


5    Al:   E:ns↓redde[::d¿
           One way
           "One way"


6    Te:              [Ensrettet hva er det¿
                      [One way what is that
                      "One way what is that"


7    Ps:   (0.5)


8    Al:   De::t e[r
           That is
           "That is"


9    Ke:          [ONE way.
                  [One way
                  "One way"


10   Te:   (Ja) one wa:y
           (Yeah) one way
           "(Yeah) one way"


11   Ke:   °One way.° [hm
           One way hm
           "One way hm"


12   Te:              [One way jaer
                      [One way yeah
                      "One way yeah"


13   Ps:   (1.0)


14   Te:   Å fik en bøde,
           And got a fine
           "And got a fine"
```

Example 4 [O620U2—25:20]

```
1    Te:   Eh::: å så hørte je at Monika hu:n kørte
           Eh::: and then heard I that Monika she passed

2    Te:   forbi: en eh:: (.) hun kørte f::- hurtigt
           by a eh:: (.) she drove t::- fast

3    Te:   (.) >alt alt< for hurtigt i bi:l
           (.) way way too fast by car
           "Eh and then I heard that Monika she passed
           by a eh (.) she drove t::- fast (.) way way
           too fast by car"

4    Ps:   (0.6)

5    Te:   eh:::: <midt om natten>
           eh:::: middle of the night
           "eh in the middle of the night"

6    Ps:   (0.3)

   moTe:   /walks towards blackboard
7    Te:   /(Det den her hedder) midt om natten her
           (that's this one it's called) in the
            middle of the night here
           "(That's this one it's called) in the
            middle of the night here"

   geTe:   /points at blackboard
8    Ps:   /(0.3)

9    Te:   forbi en sko:le (0.8) å blev=eh::: he- eh
           by a school (0.8) and was eh::: xx- eh

10   Te:   stoppet a:f (0.3) Du fik e:n (0.7)
           stopped by (0.3) You got a (0.7)

   geTe:   /picks up chalk   /starts writing on
            the blackboard
11-> Te:   /Hun fik en <fa:rt/bøde>
           she got a speeding ticket
           "by a school (0.8) and was eh eh stopped
           by (0.3) You got a (0.7) She got a
           speeding ticket"

   geTe:   /writes "hun fik en fartbøde" (she got a
            speeding ticket) on the blackboard
```

```
12   Ps:    /(3.2)

13   Al:    °En fartbøde°
            A speeding ticket
            "A speeding ticket"

14   Ps:    (5.8)

15   Al:    Fartbøde (0.2) hva er [det
            Speeding ticket (0.2) what is that
            "Speeding ticket (0.2) what is that"

16   Te:                          [Fartbøde
                                  [Speeding ticket
                                  "Speeding ticket"

17   Ps:    (0.6)

18   Te:    Fartbøde betyder du har kørt for hurtigt
            Speeding ticket means you have going too fast
            "Speeding ticket means you were going too fast"

19   Ps:    (.)

20   Te:    [Fart betyder s:peed (.) spe[ed (.) ikk
            [Speed means 'speed' (.) 'speed' (.) right
            "Speed means 'speed' (.) 'speed' (.) right"

21   ?:     [Nå:[:
            [Oh::
            "Oh"

22   Al:         [Ah: okay
                 [Oh okay
                 "Oh okay"
```

In these examples, we see that the teacher's turn is designed so as to emphasize a part of the ongoing turn. Several resources make the target word stand out from the ongoing TCU by framing it as productionally isolated (cf. Brouwer, 2000, ch. 6, 2004). In the following paragraphs, I will outline the resources that the teacher relies on in order to emphasize a part of the turn. Then I will show how the students orient to the emphasis. The resources will be described according to self-repair, prosodic resources, and visual resources in relation to the blackboard. As will be seen, the highlighting is frequently done through a combination of these resources. For instance, a pause does not highlight the following turn elements in and by itself but may serve other interactional business, for example, requesting and securing the gaze of the

co-participant (Carroll, 2004; Goodwin, 1980, 1981; Heath, 1984; Mortensen, 2009). However, when the element(s) that follow the pause in other ways are made relevant, the pause is one of the resources used to emphasize the words and produce them as productionally isolated.

It is to be noted that Examples 1, 3, and 4 all come from the same lesson related to a specific topic, namely, traffic (violations) and fines. The activity is centered on the students' prior stories during group work; the task is framed as, and organized in relation to, "fines" as the central word; and during the following whole class interaction, the teacher uses the opportunity to deal with relevant vocabulary with which the students may not be familiar. In these examples, the teacher has prepared vocabulary teaching prior to the lesson, and she includes the blackboard as a visual resource in selecting and explicating the relevant vocabulary.

TCU-final position
According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), TCUs are the basic building blocks of turns and central to the ways in which turn-organization is managed. Participants rely on recognizable (possible) completions of TCUs, since these positions constitute places where transfer from one speaker to another may be relevant (see, e.g., Jefferson, 1984). To project a possible completion of a TCU, current non-speakers rely on the action that the TCU accomplishes, on grammar/ syntax (Lindström, 2006; Schegloff, 1996; Steensig, 2001), on intonation (Ford & Thompson, 1996; Selting, 2000), and on gesture (Klippi, 2006; Mondada, 2006; Olsher, 2004).

The emphasized words occur in a (possible) TCU-final position. In Examples 2, 3, and 4 the teacher's turn is completed by the target word, and the highlighted word is followed by a substantial pause, which displays that turn-transition is relevant and that the students should or could do something at this point. In Example 1, the teacher continues her talk after the emphasis of a possible TCU-completing element by expanding the turn with an increment in line 5 *hørte jeg* [I heard]). Schegloff (1996) describes increments as RE-completing a possible completion, and the TCU has therefore come to a possible completion by the end of the emphasized noun phrase.

Self-repair
One way in which the teacher can highlight a part of the current turn-at-talk is through changes in the ongoing or projected turn. This can be described in terms of self-initiated repair, which according to Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977, p. 367) has the following properties:

Self-initiations within the same turn (which contains the trouble source) use a variety of non-lexical speech perturbations (e.g., cut-offs, sound stretches, "uh's etc.) to signal the possibility of repair-initiation immediately following.

Through modifications such as hesitations and pauses, the speaker may initiate self-repair of the turn and the target element can be productionally isolated, although it may be syntactically integrated in the ongoing TCU. In Example 3, the teacher self-repairs and restarts the turn where the target words could be produced syntactically (after *forkert (.) i en* [wrong in a]). She thus changes the projected course of the turn by producing a self-repair, lines 2–3, which substitutes *kørte forkert i* [drove wrong in] with *kørte ind i* [drove into]. In this way, the target words are highlighted through a lexical modification of the turn-design. In lines 9–10 in Example 4, the teacher restarts the ongoing TCU after *stoppet af* [stopped by] and changes the direction of the TCU with *du fik en* [you got a] which changes the projection of the next-possible element from, for example, *a policeman* to *fartbøde* [speeding ticket]. Through this method she modifies the turn-design to syntactically prepare for the word *fartbøde* [speeding ticket]. Additionally, she produces another restart, which changes the pronoun from *you* to *she*, thus changing the recipient roles of the turn from *you*, that is, Monika, to the whole class, and thereby highlights the relevance of the turn to the whole class. This changes the activity from initiating a story through reporting a prior conversation to teaching relevant vocabulary in a contextualized and syntactically appropriate sentence.

Hesitations such as pauses, prolongations, and (variations of) *ehrm*s are frequently used during word searches (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Helasvuo, Laakso, & Sorjonen, 2004; Lerner, 1996; Schegloff, 1979), in which the progressivity towards TCU completion has been halted, but the search is organized to show that an ongoing attempt is being made to continue the TCU (Lerner, 1996, p. 261).

Additionally, many turn units that end up containing word searches are designed in such a way that the search is placed near the end of the unit, thereby providing a place for candidates which will concomitantly be terminal item completions (Lerner, 1996, p. 262). So the hesitations seen in doing vocabulary explanation have several similarities with those in word searches. However, the collection does not include cases where the student(s) provides a candidate word, so the students do not seem to orient to the hesitations as word searches. And neither does the teacher, during the hesitations, visibly display that (s)he is engaged in a word search, for example, by withdrawing the gaze from the students or producing a "thinking face" as described by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986). Despite the similarities in the turn-design, this makes the activity seem different from a word search.

Prosodic resources

In Examples 2 and 5, the target word is marked *prosodically* by producing the noun phrase significantly more slowly than the surrounding talk and stretching the words by prolongations of vowels (Example 2) and stressing the word

(Example 5). These are interactionally common ways of attributing a "special status" to a part of the turn.

Example 5 [O620U2—38:20]

```
1     Te:   Eh:::: (.) å man bruger det osse::
            Eh:::: (.) and you use it also

    geTe:   /writes "ordre, plan, fremtid"
            (order, plan, future) on the blackboard
2     Ps:   /(7.4)

3     Te:   når man har en plan om noget
            when you have a plan about something
            "Eh (.) and you also use it (7.4) when
            you plan to do something"

4     Ps:   (0.6)

5     Te:   Når jeg kommer hjem så s:kal jeg
            When I get home then will I

6     Te:   ha (0.5) e:n kop kaffe
            have (0.5) a cup coffee
            "When I get home then I will have
            (0.5) a cup of coffee"

7     Ps:   (0.9)

8 -> Te:    å en lu:r
            and a nap
            "and a nap"

9     Ps:   (1.0)

10    Al:   Lur
            Nap
            "Nap"

11    Te:   En lur
            A nap
            "A nap"

    geTe:   /writes "en lur" (a nap) on the blackboard
12    Ps:   /(3.2)
```

```
13   Te:   That's a nap
           "That's a nap"

14   Ps:   (0.4)

15   Al:   Lur
           Nap
           "Nap"

16   Te:   Man lige sover lidt
           You just sleep little
           "You sleep for a short time"
```

The blackboard

The teacher often relies on *visual* resources to highlight the target word. In this regard, the blackboard plays an important role. Although the blackboard is an important socio-cultural artefact of the classroom, few studies have analyzed how it is used by participants to organize their ongoing courses of action (e.g., Pitsch, 2007). The approach adopted by Pitsch follows studies within linguistic anthropological research, which show how written documents are included in the interaction, and how participation is shaped by the participants' mutual orientation to texts, books or figures (Goodwin, 2000, 2003, 2007; Mondada, 2007; Nevile, 2004).

The blackboard may be used in two fundamentally different ways. On the one hand, the teacher may write on the blackboard during a turn-at-talk that includes the written version of the verbal talk. In Example 4, we see how the teacher uses the blackboard by *writing* the target words *hun fik en fartbøde* [she got a speeding ticket]. Writing, talk, and movement are delicately coordinated: After the first restart in line 10, the teacher walks towards the blackboard, picks up a piece of chalk from the chalk tray, and clearly projects that she is about to write on the board. However, at this point she makes another restart by changing the pronoun from *you* to *she* (see above). She thereby projects an activity in which the written words are relevant to the ongoing activity rather than related to just one of the students—that is, *you*. The TCU that is initiated through the restart prosodically emphasizes the word *fartbøde* [speeding ticket]. The writing is initiated in overlap with the verbal production of the word, and projects that *fartbøde* [speeding ticket] will be written on the board. However, the teacher writes the entire verbal phrase on the board, and thus embeds *fartbøde* [speeding ticket] within a syntactically complete sentence. Although the teacher prosodically emphasizes the word *fartbøde* [speeding ticket], it is up to the students to locate whether the particular lexical item or the entire written sentence is the relevant unit for the ongoing activity (see below).

On the other hand, the teacher may use what is already on the blackboard by including it into the ongoing course of action, for example, by *pointing*. Since what is written on the board is potentially relevant during the lesson, the blackboard is used as a resource to structure the activities in the lesson. For instance, in Example 3 the teacher uses gesture to point to the blackboard where she has written *ensrettet gade* [one-way street] at the beginning of the lesson. In this way, the teacher makes a specific part of the blackboard relevant through pointing and projects the turn-completion visually before producing the lexical affiliate, that is, the lexical item whose meaning the gesture is conveying (cf. Klippi, 2006; Schegloff, 1984). The text written on the board is thereby included in the ongoing interaction. Similarly, in Example 1 the teacher wrote *en betjent i civil* [a plain clothes police officer] during the prior group work. With this action, she projects that this is a relevant noun phrase to be included in a later part of the lesson. By pointing towards the text while reading it aloud, she invokes the conversation of the prior group work as well as the relevant participants—the members of the particular group. However, she does not specify which aspect of the written noun phrase is to be dealt with at this point.

As shown in the example, the teacher relies on *linguistic* as well as *visual/ embodied* resources, including physical artefacts, to emphasize the target word(s) during the turn, and thus makes it relevant to the ongoing interaction. Prosody seems to play a particular role in the highlighting and is a resource used in all the cases in the collection. Whereas pointing, writing, and self-repair may be present, they do all occur in relation to *prosodic emphasis*. This may be done through stressing the word or a part of the word, or by producing it at significantly slower speed than the preceding talk.

Turn-transition

The emphasized part of the teacher's turn is followed by a pause, which constitutes a possible completion point of the ongoing TCU. By not continuing the turn, the teacher provides space for the students to take a turn through self-selection (Sacks et al., 1974). In Example 1, the teacher turns the gaze towards the students after the noun phrase *en betjent i civil* [a plain clothes police officer] has been produced. She orients to the students as relevant recipients of the turn and thus as relevant next-speakers (Mortensen, 2010). A general feature of talk-in-interaction is what Sacks calls *contiguity* (Sacks, 1987 [1973]). He describes how speakers orient to next-position (Sacks, 1992, vol. 2, part viii, lecture 4) as a relevant position for dealing with the prior turn. On a sequence organization level (Schegloff, 2007), this means that a second pair-part (e.g., "an answer") is relevantly placed in the next-turn in relation to its initiating first pair-part (e.g., "a question"). This does not mean that a second pair-part will actually follow, but if it does not, the turn that comes "instead" of the second pair-part orients to the first pair-part by producing a relevant action. The second pair-part can

therefore be said to be conditionally relevant (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) in the turn following the first pair-part. At the same time, Sacks (1987 [1973]) argues, if a speaker orients to another turn but the prior one, (s)he needs to do extra work (e.g., *what you said before...*) to display that the incipient turn is not orienting to the immediate prior one. However, contiguity is also relevant at another level of organization. If a turn is designed to include a multi-question turn (Sacks, 1987 [1973]; e.g., *What's your name and where are you from?*) recipients tend to deal with the last question of the prior turn *first*. There is thus a preference for proximity, or what Jefferson (1972) calls "item-adjacency," in interaction.

If we return to "doing word explanation," we saw that the teacher designs his/her TCU to highlight a specific part of the turn in a (possible) TCU-final position. For instance, we saw how the teacher changes the course of the projected TCU to prepare the ongoing syntax for a particular lexical element (see Example 4 above). We now move on to the next-turn in the sequential structure and see how the students orient to the teacher's turn and the emphasized lexical item(s).

Repeating (a part of) the highlighted word(s)

Following the teacher's turn with the target word and the pause, one of the students repeats the target word. By repeating parts of the prior turn, the students treat the highlighted word(s) as response-worthy (Schegloff, 1997a) and display an understanding of the target word(s) as *relevant* to the ongoing course of action. They orient to this position as a relevant position for self-selection (Sacks, et al., 1974). Two things should be noted in relation to the design of the student's turn. Firstly, only the "target," that is, emphasized, words from the prior turn, are repeated.

Example 6 [O620U2—38:20]

```
1    Te:    Ud over fremtid så bruger vi det nå-
            In addition to future then use we it wh-

2    Te:    når det noget med en ordre
            when it about an order
            "In addition to future then we use it
            when it is about an order"

3    Ps:    (1.2)

4 -> Ay:    °Ordre°
            Order
            "Order"
```

```
5      Te:    En ordre (.) it's an order (0.2) du s:kal
              An order (.) it's an order (0.2) you have to
              "An order (.) it's an order (0.2) you have to"

6      Ay:    Okay
              Okay
              "Okay"

7      Ps:    (0.2)

8      Te:    vaske op
              wash up
              "do the dishes"
```

The students display an understanding of the repeated word(s) as being emphasized by the teacher. The teacher's syntactic construction is repeated, and (syntactic) modifications occur only within the repeated noun phrase. For instance, in Examples 5 and 6 the students do not repeat the entire noun phrase, but leave out the definite article and repeat only the head of the noun phrase. What is relevant for whether or not all the highlighted words are repeated is the *sequential distance* between the teacher's highlighted word and the student's repeat. When the repeat follows immediately after the highlighted words, the repeat does not necessarily include the entire noun phrase that was highlighted, but only a part of it as in Examples 3 and 5. When the repeat does not follow immediately after the highlighted words, the students often repeat the syntactic structure that was highlighted by the teacher (see, e.g., Example 1).

Secondly, the repeat does not display the students' understanding of what should be done with the target word, and in this sense the repeat seems to be an acknowledgment of the teacher's prior turn and the highlighted words. By repeating the target word, the students play the ball back to the teacher. At this point, they display a mutual understanding of the target word as being central to the ongoing action, but they have not specified what they are going to do with it.

Requesting a word explanation

Following the students' repeat, the teacher requests a word explanation. The teacher's "request for a word explanation" turn is constructed by a repetition of the target word and the request itself. By repeating the target word, the teacher acknowledges that the students have located the emphasized word in the teacher's prior turn. In Example 1, this is done explicitly through the

teacher's overlapping *yeah*, line 10. By overlapping the student's repeat, the teacher does not provide space for the student to explain what the repeat is doing (e.g., displaying that it is a problem of understanding or pronunciation). In this way, the teacher orients to the repeat as locating the relevant words in her own prior turn, which is necessary for the continuation of the word explanation sequence.

The request builds on the student's repeat, and this is an important step in the word explanation sequence. If the students do not repeat the target words, they do not participate in locating the word, and this is crucial for the word explanation to be built up interactionally. In Example 7, the teacher emphasizes the noun phrase *p-skive* [parking disc] by hesitating immediately before it is produced, stressing the word, and writing the word on the board.

Example 7 [O620U2—31:40]

```
1    Te:    .tsk Å så får man en bøde hvis man ikk har
            .tsk And then get you a fine if you not have

2    Te:    sat sin=ehh pe skive
            put your=eh parking disc
            ".tsk And then you get a fine if you
            don't use your parking disc"

   geTe:    /writes "p-skive" (parking disc) on the board
3    Ps:    /(1.5)

   geTe:        /gestures "clock"
4 -> Te:    Det /den der pe ski[ve
            It is this one parking disc
            "It is this one parking disc"

5    Ay:                         [°Pe skive°
                                 [Parking disc
                                 "Parking disc"

6    Ps:    (0.2)

7    Te:    Det hedde:r de:n lille: (.) tidstæller
            That's called the little (.) time
            indicator
            "That's what it's called the little (.)
            time indicator"

8    Ps:    (0.4)
```

```
9     Te:   på [bi:len
            on the car
            "on the car"


10    St:       [↑Ah::: (den der)
              [Ah that one
              "Ah that one"


11    Te:   Jaer
            Yeah
            "Yeah"
```

However, the students do not repeat the word and after a 1.5 second pause, the teacher provides a repetition of the word (line 4) as well as an iconic gesture (e.g., McNeill, 1992, 2000) resembling a watch. In overlap with *p-skive* [parking disc] in line 4, a student repeats the word, and the teacher then provides an explanation of the word (line 7). In this way, the teacher orients to the repeat in line 5 as a display of non-understanding of the word.

Previously, I described the teacher's turn as preparing the ground for his/ her request for a word explanation. Giving the students the opportunity to provide the word explanation seems to be pedagogically motivated: Rather than explaining the word, the teacher uses a sequential format which structurally gives space to request a word explanation by relying on the local context. The students thus have the opportunity to display whether they understand the word or not. By repeating the target word, the students extract the target word from the teacher's prior turn, and following the students' repeat, the teacher uses the local context to request a word explanation. However, the students may project non-understanding of the target word. In Example 4, a student initiates repair after the highlighted word has been produced in the teacher's prior turn. In the turn following the repair initiation, it is therefore conditionally relevant for the teacher to provide a word explanation.

Example 4, fragment [O620U2—25:20]

```
5     Te:   eh::::  <midt om natten>
            eh::::  middle of the night
            "eh in the middle of the night"


6     Ps:   (0.3)


    moTe:   /walks towards blackboard
7     Te:   /(Det den her hedder) midt om natten her
            (that's this one it's called)  in the
             middle of the night here
            "(That's this one it's called)  in the
             middle of the night here"
```

```
    geTe:  /points at blackboard
8   Ps:    /(0.3)

9   Te:    forbi en sko:le (0.8) å blev=eh::: he- eh
           by a school (0.8) and was eh::: xx- eh

10  Te:    stoppet a:f (0.3) Du fik e:n (0.7)
           stopped by (0.3) You got a (0.7)

    geTe:  /picks up chalk   /starts writing on
           the blackboard
11-> Te:   /Hun fik en <fa:rt/bøde>
           she got a speeding ticket
           "by a school (0.8) and was eh eh stopped
           by (0.3) You got a (0.7) She got a
           speeding ticket"

    geTe:  /writes "hun fik en fartbøde" (she got a
           speeding ticket) on the blackboard
12  Ps:    /(3.2)

13  Al:    °En fartbøde°
           A speeding ticket
           "A speeding ticket"

14  Ps:    (5.8)

15  Al:    Fartbøde (0.2) hva er [det
           Speeding ticket (0.2) what is that
           "Speeding ticket (0.2) what is that"

16  Te:                         [Fartbøde
                                [Speeding ticket
                                "Speeding ticket"
```

In line 13, a student repeats the target word. However, this is produced in a low volume while the teacher is writing the target word on the blackboard. Since the teacher does not react to the repeat of the target word, the student repeats it again in line 15 and pursues a response from the teacher. During the 0.2 second pause in line 15, the teacher turns towards the student, but before she has completed the bodily re-orientation, the student initiates a repair by requesting an explanation and specifies the trouble source as a problem of understanding the target word in the teacher's prior turn. In line 18, the teacher responds to the request by providing an explanation.

A repair initiation from the students creates a sequential environment in which it is relevant for the teacher to explain the word. The teacher orients to

(possible) repair initiation in the turn following the highlighted word. In Example 2, a student projects repair in the turn following the teacher's introduction of the target word.

Example 2, fragment [O620U1—55:25]

```
5     Te:   også fordi hun skal betale <e:n bø:de>
            also because she has to pay a fine
            "Here in question five where he asks why
            she doesn't buy a new bike (0.3) so it's
            because she can't afford it right now
            (.) also because she has to pay a fine"


6     Ps:   (0.7)


7 -> Ca:   Ehrm::[:: °en bøde°]
            Ehrm::::  a fine
            "Ehrm a fine"

8     Te:         [E- e:n bøde] hva er det en bøde er
                  [A- a fine what is it a fine is
                  "A a fine what's that a fine is"
```

In line 7, the student projects a repair initiation by hesitating and repeating the highlighted word in a low volume. She thereby displays trouble in relation to the prior turn. However, the trouble source has not been located when the teacher initiates a new turn (line 8). In overlap with the hesitation, the teacher repeats the target word and requests a word explanation that builds on the projected repair by the students.

What we have seen here is that participants orient to the normative character of the sequential structure. They orient to a repeat of the target word by the student in next-turn position. In Example 4, we saw that the student who produces the repeat orients to the repeat as providing the teacher the opportunity to request a word explanation. However, the teacher may not necessarily request a word explanation but provide it him/herself. This is the case in Examples 5 and 6. In both cases, she relies on an English translation to explain the target words. By explicating the word, the teacher minimizes the break away from the ongoing focal activity. In this way, she does not turn it into an interactional word explanation sequence, which provides the students the opportunity to display their understanding of the lexical item. By explicating the word(s) through a self-repair, the teacher does not initiate such a sequence and therefore does not turn the explanation into an interactional pedagogical task of teaching and/or testing the student's knowledge of the particular vocabulary.

The students' repeat as a repair-initiation?

On the basis of the analyses presented here, it makes sense to ask whether the students' repeat of the target word(s) is a repair-initiation (Schegloff, 1997a; Schegloff et al., 1977), that is, whether it orients to interactional *trouble* in terms of hearing or understanding that is impairing intersubjectivity, or whether the teacher sets up a frame in which it is relevant (cf. Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) for the students to produce a next-turn repeat of the emphasized elements. Mazeland (1986, reported in Brouwer, 2000, p. 78; Mazeland, 1987) describes the actions that a next-turn repair initiation performs: (a) It signals that there is interactional trouble; (b) it locates the trouble source; (c) it identifies the kind of trouble that is causing problems; (d) it displays how the repair is to be accomplished, that is, by self or other (Schegloff et al., 1977); and (e) it suggests a repair method. A crucial point to the present analysis is the location of the trouble source, and maybe even more importantly, *who* locates the trouble source—teacher or student. The students do this in and through the repeat. We have seen that the students' repeat reuses the same elements that the teacher emphasized in a possible TCU-final position in the prior turn. However, in Example 4, the teacher does not respond to the repeat and the student produces it again, but this time without the determiner. In this way, the student locates the exact word, *fartbøde* [speeding ticket], which is central to the ongoing business. However, we sometimes find cases where the teacher points out the target word. In Example 3, the teacher emphasizes the noun phrase *ensrettet gade* [one way] by pointing to a written version of the phrase on the blackboard. However, as a student repeats the noun phrase (line 5), the teacher overlaps the student's repeat. The overlap is initiated towards the end of the word *ensrettet* [one way], which is not the final element of the noun phrase. Here, the teacher does not orient to the entire noun phrase as the relevant words to the explained, but only to the word *ensrettet* [one way]. Both teacher and student can therefore be said to collaborate in selecting which of the possible emphasized words are relevant to be explained.

In the above, we saw that if the students do not repeat the emphasized words, the teacher may orient to the lack of a turn by the students and set up a frame in which it is possible and relevant for the students to "do something" with the emphasized words. By providing a repeat, the students take part in locating the key word(s) and participate in the sequential unfolding of the word explanation sequence. Without the students' repeat of the emphasized word(s), the teacher may or may not request and pursue a word explanation or provide the explanation him/herself, but in that instance the word explanation is not interactively produced, depending solely on the teacher.

Word explanation and sequence closing

The teacher does not select a next-speaker to provide the word explanation but allows the students to self-select. It is therefore up to the students to find out who will, or is able to, provide an explanation. If the teacher accepts the student's explanation, (s)he evaluates the response as in Example 1, where the teacher repeats the student's explanation and evaluates it with a *yeah* in line 14. Following the sequence-closing, the teacher resumes the sequence, which was expanded by the word explanation sequence. After the assessment (line 12) and a 1.0 second pause in Example 3, the teacher resumes the turn she initiated in lines 1–3 and frames it as a continuation of the introduction with *and* (line 14). She thereby treats the word explanation sequence as a side sequence (Jefferson, 1972) which emerges from the ongoing activity and is left as a secondary activity.

Discussion and implications for language teaching

So far we have conducted a sequential analysis of a particular social practice: how teacher and students collaboratively extract lexical elements from a turn-at-talk and treat it as an opportunity for vocabulary teaching. The word explanation sequence has been described as a side sequence that puts the ongoing interaction on hold while dealing with a parenthetical, linguistic issue. This analysis suggests some implications for language teaching, in particular the teaching of vocabulary.

(Un)planned word explanation and pedagogical intentions
The analysis shows how participants interactionally negotiate (a) *that* they initiate a word explanation sequence, (b) *how* they do it, and (c) *which* lexical items are relevant for explanation. The word explanation sequence emerges from the ongoing activity, for example, a post-task activity during a storytelling (Examples 1, 2, 3, and 4), which is (briefly) put on hold while the relevant vocabulary is explained (cf. Doughty & Williams, 1998). In this way, although the lexical item(s) is already present in the lesson (e.g., has been written on the blackboard prior to this point) it is made relevant "on the fly" at this moment.

In the beginning of this chapter, I referred to the common distinction in the vocabulary teaching literature of planned versus unplanned teaching of lexical items (e.g., Hatch & Brown, 1995). This distinction is primarily based on *pedagogical intentionality* and preparation (or not) of the lesson. However, the present analysis reveals how the participants deal with the accomplishment of the task *in situ* (cf. Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Hellermann, 2007, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002, 2004; Szymanski, 2003). In the above, I noted that several of the examples come from the same lesson. For instance, Examples 1, 3, and 4 all occur within a period of approximately seven minutes.

It therefore seems that the lesson and the ongoing activity are organized so as to *facilitate* vocabulary teaching, and that the vocabulary teaching is related to a specific topic, namely traffic (violations) and fines. By selecting key-words in advance and organizing the activity around a well-defined topic, the teacher makes vocabulary learning a central aspect of the lesson.

Topic initiation

In several of the analyzed examples, the highlighted word(s) is intimately tied to the initiation of a new activity. In Examples 1, 3, and 4, the highlighted words invoke the students' stories during the prior group work and become part of initiating a new activity. The highlighted word in Example 5 emerges from an explanation about how future tense is grammatically constructed in Danish. The highlighted word, *lur* [nap], provides an example of how this can be done. The teacher uses the grammatical teaching context to include a lexical item which might be unfamiliar to the students and embeds a vocabulary sequence within the grammatical explanation.

Teaching linguistic material which emerges from the immediate context is always potentially relevant in the (second/foreign) language classroom. By using the ongoing activity as a point of departure for a (brief) "formal teaching sequence" like "doing word explanation," the teacher takes what is already contextually present to teach formal aspects of the second language. Therefore, it does not (necessarily) break with the pedagogical intentions of the ongoing activity but rather builds on it and expands the activity in sequentially relevant ways.

In this chapter, I have shown how vocabulary explanation may occur in one such sequential environment and how the ground which leads to the word explanation is interactionally constructed between the teacher and the students. The pedagogical implications that can be drawn from this analysis are twofold. On the one hand, it shows how vocabulary is taught not necessarily due to interactional problems but rather due to teachers' pedagogical aims. On the other hand, the way in which the word explanation sequence is constructed includes the students as relevant participants—the students' lack of participation has implications for the teacher, since their repeat of the emphasized lexical items is a relevant sequential step in creating an interactionally shaped word explanation sequence. Through different forms of participation, the students display strong interactional awareness. Not only do they orient to the teacher's turn-design and provide a coherent and relevant next move, they also do this in cases where they may know the meaning of the particular emphasized words (see Example 3, in which the student who repeats the lexical items is the same student who produces the word explanation). The present analysis of the "doing word explanation" practice thus adds to the range of studies that show how students participate in creating the frames for their own learning opportunities (e.g., Hellermann, 2007; Koole, 2007; Koshik, 2002; Markee, 2005; Mori, 2004; Ohta, 2001; Sahlström, 1999).

Notes

1   Thanks to Catherine E. Brouwer, Gabriele Pallotti, Johannes Wagner, and one anonymous reviewer for constructive criticisms on earlier versions of this article.
2   For repair in classroom interaction, see for example, Kasper (1985), Macbeth (2004), McHoul (1990), and Seedhouse (2004).
3   As described in this chapter, "doing word explanation" has some (sequential) similarities with what Brouwer (2000, 2004) calls "doing pronunciation."

References

Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187–206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brouwer, C. E. (2000). *L2 listening in interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Denmark, Odense.

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

Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201–220). London: Continuum.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Vocabulary and language teaching.* New York, NY: Longman.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of a second language acquisition task from an activity theory approach. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173–194). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.

DeCarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 285–299). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evaldsson, A.-C., Lindblad, S., Sahlström, F., & Bergqvist, K. (2001). Introduktion och forskningsöversikt [Introduction and research overview]. In S. Lindblad & F. Sahlström (Eds.), *Interaktion i pedagogiska sammanhang* [Interaction in pedagogical context] (pp. 9–35). Stockholm: Liber.

Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (2002). Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 14–38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ford, C. E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E.

A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 134–184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry, 50*(3–4), 272–302.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Practices of color classification. *Mind, culture and activity, 7*(1–2), 19–36.

Goodwin, C. (2003). The body in action. In J. Coupland & R. Gwyn (Eds.), *Discourse, the body, and identity* (pp. 19–42). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goodwin, C. (2007). Participation, stance and effect in the organization of activities. *discourse & society, 18*(1), 53–73.

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62*(1–2), 51–75.

Hatch, E., & Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary, semantics, and language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, C. (1984). Talk and recipiency: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 247–265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Helasvuo, M.-L., Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (2004). Construction of word search in conversations of Finnish speakers with aphasia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*(1), 1–37.

Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus in task openings. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(1), 83–96.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis. Principles, practices and applications.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294–338). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric* (pp. 11–38). Padua: Cleup Editore.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in second language acquisition, 7,* 200–215.

Klippi, A. (2006). Nonverbal behavior as turn constructional units. *Texas Linguistic Forum, 49,* 158–169.

Koole, T. (2007). Parallel activities in the classroom. *Language and Education, 21*(6), 487–501.

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

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindström, J. (2006). Grammar in the service of interaction: Exploring turn organization in Swedish. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 39*(1), 81–117.

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form. Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33*(5), 703–736.

Markee, N. (2005). The organization of off-task talk in second language classrooms. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*. London: Palgrave.

Mazeland, H. (1986). Repair srganisatie in onderwijs interakties [Repair organisation in classroom interaction]. In A. Scholtens & D. Springorum (Eds.), *Gespreksanalyse* [Conversation analysis] (pp. 233–246). Nijmegen: Instituut Nederlands.

Mazeland, H. (1987, August). *A short remark on the analysis of institutional interaction: The organization of repair in lessons*. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) Conference, Antwerp, Belgium.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349–377.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

McNeill, D. (Ed.). (2000). *Language and gesture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: Projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 117–129.

Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies, 9*(2), 194–225.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 501–518.

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.

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 536–550.

Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing recipiency in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes, 46*(5), 491–515.

Mortensen, K. (2010). Selecting next-speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next-speaker in planned activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 55–79.

Nevile, M. (2004). *Beyond the black box: Talk-in-interaction in the airline cockpit.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221–245). London: Continuum.

Pitsch, K. (2007). Unterrichtskommunikation *revisited.* Tafelskizzen als interaktionale Ressource [Classroom communication revisited. Blackboard drawings as intractional resource]. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée, 85*, 59–80.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1987 [1973]). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation. Volumes 1 & 2* (Gail Jefferson Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the hill backwards.* Uppsala: Uppsala Studies in Education.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics volume 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 75–119). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On some gestures' relation to talk. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis.* (pp. 266–296). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23*, 499–545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language 2* (pp. 31–40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205–243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*, 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*, 289–327.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom interaction: Possibilities and impossibilities. *English Language Teaching Journal, 50*(1), 16–24.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing "No": The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning, 47*(3), 547–583.

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

Selting, M. (2000). The construction of units in conversational talk. *Language in Society, 29*(4), 477–517.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steensig, J. (2001). *Sprog i virkeligheden: Bidrag til en interaktionel lingvistik* [Language in reality: Contributions to an interactional linguistics]. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Suchman, L. A. (2007). *Human-machine reconfigurations: Plans and situated actions* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Szymanski, M. H. (2003). Producing text through talk: Question-answering activity in classroom peer groups. *Linguistics and Education, 13*(4), 533–563.

L2 Learning
as Social Practice
Conversation-Analytic
Perspectives

edited by
Gabriele Pallotti
& Johannes Wagner

NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa