

**A CONVERSATION-ANALYTIC  
STUDY OF WORD SEARCHES IN  
EFL CLASSROOMS**

**FENLAN LIN**

**Thesis Submitted for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

**Integrated PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics**

**Newcastle University**

**School of Education, Communication and Language  
Sciences**

**November 2014**

## Abstract

Using a conversation analytic methodology, this PhD thesis describes and analyses an interactional practice called “word search” in adult Taiwanese EFL classrooms. Word searches are launched when speakers have problems in producing a linguistic item to continue their talk, which may be completed by speakers themselves or another participant. This study focuses on the instances where a word search is interactionally resolved by the participants. More specifically, it examines how EFL learners resolve their word finding troubles with the assistance of other participants (their teacher or fellow learners) in the classroom.

The research draws upon transcriptions of 15 hours of video and/or audio recordings of teacher-fronted EFL classrooms in Taiwan. The corpus yielded 62 word search instances where a learner’s word search is interactionally resolved. The findings show that the accomplishment of a word search is through the participants’ coordination with each other’s action, demonstrating that a word search is a social activity and is collaborative in nature. The findings also suggest that despite their possible limited linguistic competence, the EFL learners are social and interactional competent individuals who are able to make use of various interactional strategies and resources to co-resolve the communication breakdown with their teacher or fellow learners. The findings also reveal that participants in the EFL classrooms use word search mainly as an interactional resource to facilitate talk. But at times, it is observed that word searches develop into explicit pedagogical discourse where the teachers and learners are engaged in teaching and learning the searched-for-word. The explicit orientation to learning is also observed when the learners continue eliciting teachers’ confirmation on the correctness of their own candidate items to the search. Finally, the data show that the teacher can play a key role in assisting the learner’s word search by closely monitoring its progress and actively eliciting more clues about the target lexical item.

## Acknowledgements

This thesis would have not been possible without the support of many. First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Professor Steve Walsh, who never failed to offer his friendly support with patience and professionalism. I must also thank the teachers and students who participated in this study. They generously allowed me to record their lessons despite potential discomfort and inconvenience. Without their cooperation, I would not have been able to collect the data. Their participation will never be forgotten.

I thank my friends and family remembers in Taiwan and the UK. They were always supporting me and encouraging me with their best wishes. Especially, I thank my parents for giving birth to me at the first place and supporting me spiritually throughout my life. I humbly dedicate my thesis to them.

My two lovely sons, Yu-Chen and Yu-Yang, deserve special thanks too. Their bright little smiles were the best support when I felt frustrated about my research. Last, but not least, my heartfelt thanks go to my loving husband, Chun Chao, who was always there to encourage me when I thought it was impossible to continue. I also thank him for his willingness to be our sons' primary caregiver while I was fighting with my thesis writing. Words would never say how grateful I am to him. Without him, it would have been simply impossible to complete this journey.

## Abbreviations

CA	Conversation Analysis
CS	Code-Switching
EFL	English as-a-Foreign-Language
ESL	English as-a-Second-Language
FPP	First pair part
SPP	Second pair part
IC	Interactional competence
CIC	Classroom interactional competence
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
ST	Sociocultural Theory
TCU	Turn-constructional unit
TRP	Transition relevance place
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development

# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose and Scope of the Study.....	1
1.2 Research Context.....	3
1.3 Methodology and Research Questions.....	4
1.4 Organization of the Study.....	5
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Previous Studies of Word Searches.....	6
2.2.1 <i>Word searches in CA tradition</i> .....	6
2.2.2 <i>Word Search Studies in L1 Data</i> .....	9
2.2.3 <i>Word Search Studies in L2 Data</i> .....	11
2.2.4 <i>Gaze and Gesture in Word Searches</i> .....	15
2.3 Theoretical Background of Sociocultural Theory.....	16
2.4 Interactional Competence and Classroom Interactional Competence.....	19
2.5 CA and L2 Language Learning.....	21
2.6 Conclusion.....	22
Chapter 3. Methodology.....	24
3.1 Introduction.....	24
3.2 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....	24
3.3 Conversation Analysis.....	25
3.4 Rationale for the Use of Conversation Analysis.....	29
3.5 Participants and Data Collection Procedures.....	30
3.5.1 <i>Recruiting Participants</i> .....	30
3.5.2 <i>Data Collection Methods</i> .....	34
3.6 Data Transcription.....	35
3.7 Ethics and Permission.....	36
3.8 Validity, Reliability and Reflections on the Data.....	37
3.9 Conclusion.....	40
Chapter 4. Data Analysis.....	41
4.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 The Organization and Accomplishment of Word Searches.....	43
4.2.1 <i>Basic Word Searches</i> .....	45
4.2.2 <i>Extended Word Searches</i> .....	62

4.2.3 <i>Delaying Acceptance of the Candidate Word</i> .....	68
4.3 Pedagogical Sequences Emerging from the Learner's Word Searches .....	73
4.3.1 <i>Explicit Vocabulary Teaching and Learning Sequence Following the Resolution of the Word Searches</i> .....	73
4.3.2 <i>A Deviate Case: Withholding the Candidate Solution</i> .....	79
4.4 Vocabulary Check in Word Searches .....	84
4.5 Conclusion .....	92
Chapter 5. Discussion .....	94
5.1 Introduction.....	94
5.2 Sequential Organization and Interactional Management of Word Searches.....	94
5.3 The Resources Utilised in Projecting Word Searches and Inviting Co-participation .....	96
5.4 Pedagogical Discourse and Vocabulary Check in Word Searches .....	100
5.5 Word Search and Second Language Learning.....	102
5.6 Conclusion .....	104
Chapter 6. Conclusion.....	106
6.1 Implications for CA-SLA.....	106
6.2 Implications for EFL pedagogy .....	108
6.3 Limitations and Further Research Considerations .....	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	111
APPENDICES .....	122

# Chapter 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose and Scope of the Study

The purpose of this study is derived from an interest in investigating word search practices in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interaction. It aims to describe and analyse the sequential development of learner-initiated word search practices in small EFL classes. Adopting conversation analytic perspectives, this thesis will reveal how the EFL learners resolve their word finding trouble with the help of other participants (their teacher or fellow learners) in the classroom. Apart from that, this study also concerns the features that characterise word searches in the setting of classrooms.

Word searches in this study refer to the practice where speakers self-interrupt the flow of the on-going talk, displaying difficulties in producing a lexical item to express what they want to say. The flow of the talk is delayed while the problem is being resolved. The management of such a problem by the participants is often referred to as the activity of word search in Conversation Analysis (CA) (e.g. Brouwer 2003; Goodwin M.H. 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Hayashi 2003; Kurhila 2006; Laakso 1997; Lerner 1996). This practice is common to both first language (L1) speakers and second language (SL) speakers. For L1 speakers, most of the time they search for words which they cannot recall temporarily; while for L2 speakers, they not only search for words that they cannot retrieve momentarily but also for words that they have not acquired or not fully acquired ( Koshik & Seo 2012).

When a word search is initiated, it can go different directions. It may be abandoned or the speakers may find the target word by themselves and complete the word search. But when they are unable to do that, it often becomes a multi-party word search in which another participant comes to offer the target word. Due to the time frame of a PhD study and the word limit of the thesis, this study will focus only on the instances where the word search is interactionally resolved by the participants in the classroom.

EFL learners' display of troubles in expressing what they want to say and their attempts to resolve the troubles were first studied under the framework of "communication

strategies” (e.g., Bialystok 1983; Faerch & Kasper 1983; Kasper & Kellerman 1997). However in recent years, these studies have been criticised by a number of researchers. For example, Willey (2001) and Kurhila (2006) challenged the taxonomies and the methodology that the studies on communication strategies have used. They argued that these studies neglect the sequential development and the interactional aspects of the strategies used by the EFL learners to resolve their communication trouble. In line with the critical view, this study aims to contribute to the emerging body of research that attempts to investigate how EFL learners or L2 speakers interact with others from a more interactionally and sequentially grounded perspective.

Word searches were first studied, using Conversation Analysis, in the context of English mundane conversations. It was referred to as a type of repair practice, i.e. forward-oriented self-repair (Schegloff 1979). Only recently has it become the research focus of EFL/L2 interaction in ordinary conversations (e.g. Brouwer 2003; Carroll 2006; Hosoda 2000, 2006; Kurhila 2006; Park 2007) and in pedagogical settings (e.g. Mori & Hasegawa 2009; Park 2007; Seo 2008; Willey 2001). These studies have resulted in insightful contributions to the exploration of word search practices; however, there is still much need for research to better understand how EFL/L2 word search practices work in various settings. Furthermore, most of the previous word search studies did not build a sizeable collection, except Kurhila’s (2006) and Willey’s (2001) studies, and thus there is a need to include more instances to the body of word search research.

This study has built a sizeable collection of 62 word search instances which occur in teacher-fronted EFL classroom interaction in Taiwan. As will be shown in the literature chapter, word searches have been investigated in both L1 and L2 talk-in-interaction, and in the discourse involved people who have specific language impairments. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, there is relatively little research which is focused on the data in teacher-led classroom interactions. The only one I could find is Willey’s (2001) study on ESL conversation classes. Given that the EFL classroom has its unique features (see Seedhouse 2004 and Walsh 2006 for the discussion of the features of L2 classrooms), which is different from ordinary conversation or other forms of pedagogical talk (e.g. one-on-one ESL tutoring sessions, see Park 2007 and Seo 2008 for word search practices in ESL tutoring ), we cannot assume the organization of word search practices happening inside and outside of the EFL classroom is the same, and

therefore it is necessary to examine what it is like in EFL classroom contexts. In addition, we should not ignore the fact that in EFL countries, such as Taiwan, China, Japan, Korea, the classroom is still the major place where EFL learners learn and use the language of English, and very often it is their only exposure to English. This suggests that it is particularly important to investigate the language use in the EFL classroom setting in these countries. To fill the gap in the literature and contribute local classroom interaction data, this study has chosen to focus on the data in teacher-fronted EFL classroom interaction in Taiwan. It is hoped that through investigating the ways in which word search is accomplished in the classroom this study can provide more insights into class-based learning and teaching.

## **1.2 Research Context**

The research context for this present study is English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) classrooms for adult learners in Taiwan. Crystal (1995 p.108) defines “EFL” as “English seen in the context of countries where it is not the mother tongue and has no special status”. In Taiwan, English is learned and used as a foreign language as it is not the mother tongue in Taiwan and has no special status. Unlike in the countries where English is used as a second language (ESL), people in Taiwan usually have less chance to use English in their everyday life; as a result, for some EFL learners, classrooms become the only places where they can interact with people in English. Due to its widespread use over the world, English has been considered the most important foreign language in Taiwan. In order to meet the demand for English language learning, a great number of English language programs exist throughout the country. These courses occur outside of the formal English education at school and have attracted more and more learners regardless their ages and levels. They are often offered by private language schools or language centres at universities and the class size tends to be small. Adult learners are in particular interested in these programs as they are the only places they can further receive their English education after they finish their formal school education.

The data for this thesis came from seven EFL classrooms for adult learners. These adult learners came to the class mainly to improve their speaking and listening skills. In general, the teacher and students met about once or twice a week and each lesson lasted around one and a half hours to two hours. These classes can be characterised as

“monolingual English classes” as the learners all share the same first language i.e. Chinese Mandarin, other than English, and share the same culture too (c.f. Atkinson 1993). However, it should be mentioned that all of the teachers participating in the study are English native speakers, who do not share the same culture and the first language with the learners. However, it was observed in the recorded data that two of the teachers occasionally displayed their knowledge about Chinese Mandarin but it was difficult to judge their level of Chinese Mandarin.

### **1.3 Methodology and Research Questions**

The methodological framework of the present study draws upon Conversation Analysis (Sacks 1992; Sacks et al.1974; Hutchby & Woofitt 1998; Ten Have 1999). CA was rooted in Ethnomethodology but was further developed by Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson and their associates into an independent discipline which examines the system and structures of talk-in-interaction through an emic perspective. This methodology is adopted in this thesis for a number of reasons. First of all, CA analyses *naturally occurring talk*, therefore allowing the word searches to be studied as they actually happen in authentic communication. Furthermore, CA looks at interaction from an *emic perspective*, that is, how the participants themselves display to each other that a particular issue is relevant at a particular moment. This view prevents researchers from making any analytic claims according to their own view, that is, an etic, and outsider’s view. Thirdly, CA sees interaction as *sequential and procedural*, implying that any action in talk is related with each other but not an individual act. This perspective permits word search practices to be understood in their sequential context. More specifically, it allows researchers not only to look at how the speakers initiate a word search but also how their recipients react to it.

Utilising CA to analyse the data, the present study will address the following research questions:

- (1) *How are the learners’ word searches sequentially developed and jointly accomplished by the participants in EFL classrooms?*
- (2) *What are the resources the learners employ to initiate a word search and extend an invitation for co-participation?*
- (3) *Are there any sequentially distinctive features in the word searches in EFL classrooms, compared to those in ordinary conversations?*

## **1.4 Organization of the Study**

This study is structured in the following manner. Chapter 2 provides a review of previous studies on word search activities in different discourse settings and issues related to learning and competence. Chapter 3 describes the methodology. In this chapter, an introduction of CA approach to investigate talk-in-interaction is given. This is followed by information on participants, the research context, data collection procedures, and transcription procedures. Finally, a brief discussion on research issues such as ethics, validity, reliability and reflections on the data are presented. Chapter 4 analyses and discusses the instances of the learner-initiated word searches, from a CA perspective. Section 4.2 presents some instances selected from the collection to illustrate how word searches are sequentially developed and jointly resolved by the participants. Each example is closely analysed in order to reveal (1) how the speakers mark their word finding difficulty and extend an invitation for co-participation?, (2) how the recipients formulate their co-participation according to the speaker's verbal and nonverbal conducts?, and (3) how the participants indicate that a word search is resolved and resume the original talk?. Section 4.3 looks at the instances where a word search results in an explicit pedagogical talk, displaying the participants' orientation to their role as a teacher and a learner. Section 4.4 deals with a specific type of word search practices where the speakers initiate a "vocabulary check" (Hosoda 2006) on their own candidate word, orienting themselves as less competent speakers in the target language. In chapter 5, the findings are summarised and discussed. The thesis is completed with a conclusion chapter, in which implications for CA-SLA and EFL pedagogy, as well as the limitations of this study and suggestions of some areas for future research are presented. Additionally, a list of transcription symbols is found in appendix A, as well as the sample consent letters.(appendix B and C, respectively).

## **Chapter 2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In this chapter, I will first review previous word search studies in different types of talk-in-interactions such as L1 ordinary conversations, aphasic conversations, L2 ordinary conversations and pedagogical discourse. Following the review of word search studies, I will present some research which is potentially relevant to the present study, including the notion of ZPD and scaffolding in the social cultural theory of learning, classroom interactional competence and CA-for-SLA.

### **2.2 Previous Studies of Word Searches**

#### **2.2.1 *Word searches in CA tradition***

Word searches in this study refer to the phenomenon where speakers self-interrupt their turn in progress in order to search for the linguistic item they need to continue their talk. In Conversation Analysis, word search is regarded as a specific social practice that can be recognized and oriented to by the participants in interaction once it unfolds (Brouwer 2003; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986). This view is very different from that in psycholinguistics, which sees word search mainly as a cognitive process which occurs in an individual's mind (e.g. Levelt 1989). In this thesis, I have adopted a CA perspective to investigate the language learners' word searches.

Word search itself can be investigated as a separate activity, but it also falls into the domain of repair organization (Schegloff et al. 1977; Schegloff 1979). CA uses the term "repair" to describe the participants' management of problems in talk-in-interaction. It has been thoroughly investigated by Schegloff et al. (1977). It is important to note that repair does not equal correction which often is seen as a replacement of an error or mistake. Rather, any problem in talk can be repairable, including speaking, hearing or understanding problems. Furthermore, hearable errors are not necessarily repaired. The participants can choose to "let it pass" (Firth 1996). Another key concept in repair initiation is: who initiates the repair and who completes the repair? This results in four repair trajectories. I can initiate repair on my own utterance and complete it by myself, which is called "self-initiated self-repair". If it is completed by another speaker, it is a "self-initiated other-repair". Someone else can also prompt the problem in my talk, and

if I manage to repair it, it is an “other-initiated self-repair”. But if the problem is resolved by other people it is called other-initiated other-repaired.

Under CA’s view on repair, word search can be treated as a specific kind of self-initiated repair, i.e., forward-oriented self-repair (Schegloff 1979; Carroll 2006). Such repairs are forward oriented as they target a possible upcoming problem in the portion of the turn to be produced. More specifically, the speaker may initiate repair on his/her upcoming talk by beginning a word search. This is to be distinguished with the cases where the speakers initiate repair on the prior talk. Carroll (2006, p.234) describes word search as, “with repairables that ie in the future rather than the past—in what Schegloff (1979) refereed as forward-oriented self-repair. ....this broad phenomenon is also widely known by the more common, though somewhat imprecise term word search”.

From the viewpoint of sequence, a word search can be characterised as an incidental sequence. Schegloff (2007) describes incidental sequences as a type of sequence that occurs within another sequence; however, they are different from insertion sequences. An insertion sequence comes between the first pair part (FPP), e.g. question, and the second pair part (SPP), e.g. answer, of an adjacency pair. It is deployed to enable the speaker of the SPP to perform the SPP when for some reason they cannot provide it immediately. For example, a request for clarification may be needed in order to facilitate the SPP. Here is an example to illustrate insertion sequences.

1 A: Can I have a bottle of Mich? Q1

2 B: Are you over twenty-one? Q2

3 A: no. A2

4 B: no A1

(Levinson 1983, p.304, in Seedhouse 2004)

As shown in this extract, A needs to know if B is old enough to buy beer so he can answer the question, and therefore another question-and-answer adjacency pair (line 2 and 3) is inserted in the base adjacency pair (Line 1 and 4). Line 2 and 3 is thus viewed as an insertion sequence. Schegloff (2007) observes that there are, however, sequences that seem to lack any reference to the base adjacency pair and are related to other sequential and interactional structures. They do not occur between a FPP and SPP, but rather within a first or second pair part, or even outside of the context of an adjacency

pair. Schegloff (ibid.) refers to such sequences as incidental sequences. He observes that incidental sequences can arise for a various conditions and one of them is when a speaker initiates a word search. Since a word search is not designed to facilitate a SPP but to enable a current speaker to continue saying what they want to say, when it is joined by another participant, it therefore, develops into an incidental sequence.

As mentioned earlier, word search is a type of self-initiated repair. With regard to the initiation techniques, Schegloff et al. (1977, p.367) note that “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”. This observation along with other findings in CA word search studies in English data have shown a number of verbal and nonverbal practices which are used by speakers to signal a word search is underway (c.f. Carroll 2006; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Lerner 1996; Schegloff et al. 1977). I summarise them as follows:

- 1) Speech perturbations: a word search is a type of self-initiated repair. When it occurs, it breaks up the syntax of an utterance, and the point of interruption is typically marked by speech perturbations such as sound stretches, various turn holding markers (e.g. um, uh, ehm ‘uh’s etc.), cut offs, pauses and repetitions, which indicates the next item due is unavailable at the moment.
- 2) Lexical expressions: “wh –questions” (e.g., what is it; what’s the name of that girl) and meta linguistic comments ( e.g. I can’t think of the word; I don’t know how to say it ) ) are also commonly observed in speakers’ word search turns. These are regarded as explicit word search markers (c.f. Brouwer 2003; Kurhila 2006). According to Carroll (2006, p.237), wh-questions are often deployed much later in the search and they can serve to reaffirm the speaker’s commitment to the search.
- 3) Nonverbal cues: speakers also use a variety of embodied cues to signal their word finding difficulty, including a characteristic “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986), gaze aversion, and iconic gestures that represent some features of the searched-for-item.

### **2.2.2 Word Search Studies in L1 Data**

Works completed by Charles and Marjorie Goodwin in the 1980s (C. Goodwin 1980, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986) have contributed to our understanding of the organization of word searches in English native-speaker ordinary conversation. According to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986), a word search is typically preceded by sound stretches, “uh”s, and a pause. Wh-questions, such as “what was her name?”, were also observed in a word search activity. They also identified a range of non-verbal practices used by both speakers and recipients to co-complete the word search activity. They have reported that the speakers systematically withdraw their gaze from the recipient when they begin to be involved in the word search and may also produce a “characteristic thinking face”( *ibid.*,p.57), signalling that they are engaged in a self-directed word search. At this moment, recipients typically do not interrupt. On the other hand, if the speaker directs gaze at a recipient while a search is in progress, they invite the recipient to collaborate in the search. Thus in face-to-face interaction gaze shifts are a typical feature of word search. Goodwin and Goodwin (*ibid.*) suggested that by framing the beginning of a word search as an individual one, the participants display a preference for a self-over-other outcome. But they also noted that “rather than operating simply on the basis of a fairly general preference, participants might be able to negotiate within the word search activity itself the type of co-participation it is to receive” (*ibid.*, p.53).

Lerner (1996) has studied the organization of word searches by looking at the “progressivity” of a turn at talk based on English syntactic structures. He described word searches as being grammatically designed for conditional entry by recipients. That is, when the turn construction unit (TCU) is not moving forward due to the interruption of a word search, it creates a slot for the recipient to jump in with the next possible word. Lerner (1996) noted that the search is often placed near the end of a TCU, a design which makes a collaborative completion easier. Similar to the findings in other studies, the speakers in his data typically produced non-lexical speech perturbations such as sound stretches, “uh”s, and /or pauses when they are not able to continue the TCU in progress. However, he found word cut-offs and word repetitions were also typical word search indicators in his data. Lerner also discussed the different way that a contribution is made and associates it with different timing. He found that a “try-marked” guess comes well after the onset of a word search, while an “assertedly correct” guess typically arrives when a word search has just begun (*ibid.*,p.262).

Word search has also been investigated in a different type of data: the interaction involving people who have specific language impairments (e.g. Laakso and Klippi 1999; Oelschlaeger 1999; Oelschlaeger & Damico 2000). One of the distinctive features in these data is that the word search sequences can become extended. In ordinary non-aphasic conversation, word finding troubles are resolved more quickly. The search is completed quickly either by the speaker who initiated the search or by a co-participant in the next turn. In aphasic conversation, however, it is not uncommon that the resolution of a word finding problem takes more time and is expanded to several turns. The lengthy repair sequences devoted to resolve the word search have been closely examined by Laakso and Klippi (1999). They found these so called “hint and guess” sequences, are structured orderly with four distinctive phases: problem establishment phases, establishing a framework for co-participation, hint and guess phase, and long confirmation phase. Prolonged word search sequences are also found in the word searches in L2 data (e.g. Kurhila 2006), suggesting they might be more likely to occur in the kind of conversation that involves people who have a deficient linguistic knowledge in the target language.

Oelschlaeger (1999) has investigated when and how a conversation partner participates in the word searches of a person with aphasia. He reported that collaboration in word search participation was determined by interactional techniques and interactional resources. The aphasic speaker in the data employed interactional techniques, including direct and indirect invitations to evoke co-participation from his conversational partners. Direct invitation was constructed via direct gaze or a wh- question while indirect invitation was constructed with verbal and nonverbal signals, including specific meta-language and downward gaze. The recipients, on the other hand, made use of interactional resources, including information derived from one’s world knowledge, life experience shared between the participants and online analysis, to formulate their collaborative solution. Based on the same data, Oelschlaeger and Damico (2000) identified four conversation strategies that were systematically used by the conversational partner to assist with the word searches of an aphasic person. These include: guess, alternative guess, completion, and closing strategies. The authors suggested that such detailed analysis increases our understanding of how conversation strategies evolve in natural conversation and may contribute to partner training of strategies.

These studies, both in English ordinary conversation and aphasic talk, have important implication to the present study data. They provide me an opportunity to look at how word searches are collaboratively accomplished in different types of data and I can draw on their findings to observe whether there are any distinctive features emerging in my data.

### **2.2.3 Word Search Studies in L2 Data**

Early research addressing L2 or EFL learners' word finding problems were conducted under the framework of communication strategies (e.g. Færch& Kasper 1983; Kasper & Kellerman 1997; Kellerman & Bialystok 1997 ), generally defined as the learners' resource, as their means to compensate for their deficient linguistic knowledge (Færch& Kasper 1983, pp.52-53). Researchers working in this field have identified various communication strategies that language learners utilized to solve their problems in producing utterance. They include: interlingual transfer, code switching, paraphrasing, and restructuring. Although the main interest of these studies was not on word search activities specifically, the communication problems they describe may apply to the notion of a word search in CA tradition. For example, Kasper and Kellerman (1997) suggested that researches should look at lexical strategies under the situations:

“where a speaker wishes to label a concept for which she does not have the lexical resources, or where these resources are available but cannot be recalled, or where available and retrievable resources cannot be used successfully because of contextual constraints” (p.8)

Studies on communication strategies have contributed to the identifying and classifying the different types of lexical strategies that are often employed by the L2 learner, however, they have been critiqued for a number of reasons (see detailed discussion by Firth & Wanger 1997; Kurhila 2006; Willey 2001). First of all, based on traditional SLA theory, they view communication strategies as mental plans which occur in individual's heads only, thus fail to examine the roles of these strategies in the interaction. Furthermore, the data are typically produced in experiment settings rather than naturalistic ones. Kurhila (2006) points out, “this kind of work on communication strategies lacks the interactional aspect which is crucial in communication analysis” (p.94).

In recent years, a fair amount of research has studied word search by using CA methodology and presented detailed analysis of word search in naturally occurring L2 interaction across different settings and languages. Although the focus of each study varies in terms of their aims and the specific settings and languages in their data, in general their close examination of relevant cases have depicted how L2 learners' word finding problems can result in a joint activity through their recipients' co-participation, how such activity is co-constructed through the participants' public display of their relevant actions, and how it evokes the participants' shifting orientations to their identities (e.g. L1 speakers, L2 speakers, students, teachers, friends).

Schwartz (1980) examined word searches within other repair sequences. Her data showed that word searches are organized in ways in which the participants negotiate with each other to connect a word with its meaning. She observed speakers use a variety of non-verbal strategies, i.e., eyegaze shift, posture, and hand rotation, to indicate the word search is in progress and they also use a variety of verbal-strategies such as providing definitions, synonyms, and examples in an attempt to clarify the meaning of the target word. Gaskill (1980) found other corrections are infrequent in his NS and NNS data, but when they occur they tend to follow a word search. He states that "other-corrections are elicited in the context of word searches, where the search constitutes a kind of correction –invitation format" (p.136).

Hosoda (2006), analysing self-initiated other repair in casual L1 and L2 Japanese conversations, found a distinctive practice called "vocabulary check" in L2 speakers' word searches. She reported that L2 speakers occasionally stopped the turn construction unit (TCU) in progress in order to check the correctness of the vocabulary item they had just produced (pp. 32-33). Specifically they were found to signal the candidate vocabulary item as an uncertain one and request confirmation/correction from their recipient by marking it with rising intonation preceded by repair-initiation techniques such as sound stretches, cut-offs, and/or nonlexical speech perturbations. They typically looked closely at their L1 recipient while presenting the vocabulary for check. She found such practice only occurred in the L2 data, but not in L1 data. She stated that by seeking help on everyday vocabulary items, the L2 speakers make relevant their roles, at this moment, as a novice in the target language while at the same time positioning their recipients as a language expert. Similar vocabulary check sequences were also reported and discussed in other CA studies on repair in L2

interactions ( see for example Koshik & Seo 2012 on ESL tutoring sessions, Lee 2004 on L2 conversation in English; Willey 2001 on ESL conversation classes). In another study ( Hosoda 2000), which she examined the same data but with a different focus, she closely examined the other repair in the course of word searches and found that nonverbal practices as well as verbal practices effectively invite other repair. This confirmed the previous word search studies but she also found there was subtle difference between the way L1 speakers and L2 speakers verbally self-initiate other repair, that is, L1 speakers used the Japanese demonstrative pronoun “are” (similar to “that” in English) as a way to hold a place for a noun or a noun phrase that is under search, while the L2 speakers stayed more with the kinds of repair initiation they knew from English (p.48).

Brouwer (2003) discussed L2 speakers’ word searches from the perspective of language learning. She challenged the claim made by some researchers who presumed lexical communication strategies equal to acquisition attempts. She suggested that whether or not they offer affordances for language acquisition is not clear so it requires a close examination on a turn by turn basis. By analysing word search instances in conversations between L1 and L2 speakers of Danish, she demonstrated how a close analysis allows us to identify the types of word search sequences that afford opportunities for vocabulary learning. She concluded that the sequences that may qualify as language learning opportunities share the following characteristics: “(a) the other participant is invited to participate in the search, and (b) the interactants demonstrate an orientation to language expertise, with one participant being a novice and the other being an expert” (p.542).

Kurhila (2006) presented a collection of word search instances in L1-L2 Finnish interactions. Her collection showed that the word searches in her data were typically constructed into two phases: self-directed and other directed phases. First, the L2 speaker displays hesitancy and marks being engaged in the search. In the subsequent phase, the L2 speaker produces some material by uttering either a candidate solution or initial syllables of the target word, providing clues for the L1 speaker to participate the word search. She also noticed how the target items searched by L1 speakers are typically names that belong to the domain of expertise of the L2 speaker, while in the searches by L2 speakers, the target items can be names or other lexical items. Another difference in relation to the type of the element being searched is that in addition to

lexical searches, L2 speakers also search for grammatical items, typically initiated through repetitions and self-corrections. Koshiko & Seo (2012) also found similar examples in which the language learners display problems with syntactic constructions of their utterance. Grammatical searches seem to be organized in the same way as the vocabulary check sequence (Hosoda 2006) discussed above. That is, in both cases, a piece of material, either a complete or an incomplete linguistic item, is produced but is awaiting to be confirmed/corrected by the L1 speakers. Thus in both cases, the participants' linguistic identities as L1 and L2 speakers are made relevant through the interaction.

So far I have reviewed word searches in L1 ordinary conversations, aphasic talk, and L2 ordinary conversations. I will now discuss the previous word search studies in L2 pedagogical settings. Park (2007) systematically examined a collection of word search instances in conversations between L1 and L2 speakers of English. Her data were collected from both formal (ESL tutoring) and informal (casual conversations among friends) settings. In line with CA's view on word search she argued that word search is a social action that "can be manifested through visible phenomena that advance the interactional work among interlocutors" (ibid.: p.18). Through her detailed analysis she demonstrated the ways through which the participants coordinate this sequential and public action. By comparing word searches in the two different types of setting, she also found that in a tutoring setting the initiation and the ending of word searches tend to be more marked. Specifically, the tutee in the tutoring session requests the help of the tutor more explicitly through directly asking a question (e.g. how to say?) or claiming his uncertainty (e.g. I don't know), and in the closing stage, the tutor also repeats the proposed word following the tutee's acceptance of it. Park (ibid.) noted that this seems to reflect the institution-specific goal of this particular setting, that is, language teaching and practice.

Seo (2008) examined students' initiated repair in ESL tutoring sessions, with a focus on the instances where students elicit confirmation of the candidate solution in lexical searches or searches for syntactic construction. These instances resemble "vocabulary check" found in Hosoda's study (2006), however her analysis also revealed two notable differences. First, the tutors, faced with their tutees' confirmation request, often tried to elicit completion from the tutee instead of providing them with the correct version

directly. Second, the sequences were occasionally expanded into mini teaching sessions on the target items.

Against the taxonomic perspective adopted by traditional communication strategies studies, Willey (2001) showed how they could be understood more fully by using CA as an analytic tool. He closely examined a communication strategy, i.e., “appeal for assistance” (Tarone 1978, cited Willey *ibid.* p.6) or “appeal for help” (Dörnyei 1995, cited Willey *ibid.* p.6) embedded in the course of a word search, using videotaped and closely-transcribed data from advanced English conversation classes. He found the students either proffer words for confirmation, or elicit words after first beginning to search for them. Willey further discussed the contribution of this type of analysis to our understanding of lexical acquisition. He noted that the analysis can show “how students publicly display their knowledge of vocabulary and their confidence in that knowledge to their co-participants in the interaction and secondly—or better yet, incidentally—to researchers” (p. 123).

Although there has been an increasing number of studies which investigated word search in L2 data from a CA perspective, very few of them have built a sizeable collection of word search instances. Furthermore, none of them have studied the instances occurring in the setting of teacher-led classroom interaction, except Willey (2001). In this thesis, I will fill the gap in the literature by building a collection of word search instances occurring in teacher-led EFL classroom interaction. Classroom interaction is a type of institutional talk which has its own unique institutional features, and thus the word searches maybe organized differently in such a context.

#### **2.2.4 Gaze and Gesture in Word Searches**

The role of nonverbal behaviours in word searches have been systematically examined in L1 ordinary conversations (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Hayashi 2003; Schegloff 1984), in L2 novice speaker conversations (e.g. Carroll 2006), and in aphasic conversations (e.g. Klippi 2006). In general, the nonverbal resources examined in word searches include the participants’ gaze direction and the different gestures performed in the course of a search. It has been observed that participants use gaze and gesture to project and organize word searches. They can mark an upcoming word search by shifting their gaze away from their recipients (e.g. Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Hayashi

2003). Carroll (2006) found that gaze aversion often occurs before any audio signs of repair initiation. While speakers are looking away and engaging themselves in the search, other participants usually do not disturb but look towards speakers to show their continued attention to the search. If speakers manage to find the target word, they return their gaze towards the recipients while completing the repair, thus projecting the search is about to terminate. If they fail to find the word, they also redirect gaze to the recipients, but the gaze is oriented as an invitation to offer possible candidate word (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986).

Speaker's gesture in word search has been shown to be another nonverbal resource to project the upcoming word search and its initiation (e.g. Carroll 2006; Schegloff 1984;). For example, Schegloff (1984) has observed how speakers produce gestures to project the upcoming production of their speech affiliates before they are uttered. The prepositioned gestures, accompanied by vocal word search indicators such as sound stretches, thus serve to indicate the emerging repair. Carroll (2006) has noticed in her data the speakers' embodied signals (i.e., gaze and gesture) in a word search typically co-occur or preface audio repair indicators. Hayashi (2003) has also presented several examples to show how speakers' embodied conducts, coordinating with verbal conducts, provide recipients with an opportunity to accomplish a collaborative entry into an on-going word search. He has found that the deployment of iconic gestures not only enhances the "projectability" but also the "specificifiability" of the searched-for-item. Specifically, through iconic gestures, the speakers make specific features of the searched-for-item publicly available to the recipients and thus help them to formulate a possible candidate solution. In short, the examination of the use of gaze and gesture in these studies has demonstrated how they are oriented by the participants as resources to organize word searches. These findings are relevant for identifying word search examples in the present study.

### **2.3 Theoretical Background of Sociocultural Theory**

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), the cognitive perspective has been the major approach in understanding language learning. It interprets learning as a change in an individual's cognitive state. Acquiring a new language relies largely through individual mental progress and through exposure to input. This view has been challenged by a socio-cultural perspective which emphasizes the social, cultural, and

interactional aspects in language learning. Under this view, learning is a social process, which occurs not merely through input, but through the participants' joint construction in interaction. Ways of evaluating learning can include: "a) comparing evidence of a learner's current ability with that demonstrated in scaffolded interaction; b) explicating the progress of the learning process; c) portraying the progress of socially-distributed cognition; (d) showing changes in patterns of participation" (Walsh & Jenks 2010, p2).

The sociocultural theories of L2 learning have their roots in Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory of mind. The fundamental concept of Vygotsky's theory is that the human mind is mediated. Human beings make use of symbolic tools or signs to interpret and regulate the material world or their own and each other's social and mental activity (Lantolf and Thorne 2006, p79). According to Vygotsky, higher cognitive abilities are mediated through social interaction with more experienced or capable people (Lantolf 2000). He rejects the notion that learning occurs only in one's head but proposes the view that new knowledge is first encountered in social interaction. It is mediated by an "expert" through collaborative use of semiotic tools, such as language, and subsequently internalized and transformed into one's own version of knowledge and abilities. (Lantolf 2000).

Another important concept in sociocultural theory is that learning can most effectively take place in what is known as Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

Vygotsky (1978) defines the ZPD as:

"the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers"(p.85).

Specifically, learning may occur through socially mediated processes in which an expert provides support with which the less knowledgeable person can participate in social interaction.

Vygotsky's original formulation of the ZPD was concerned with children's development, but it is also relevant to L2 acquisition in the formal context (c.f. Lantolf 2000). Researchers in the field of SLA have applied these ideas to a board range of L2 learning and teaching. Ohta (2001) revised Vygotsky's definition of ZPD as:

“For the L2 learner, the ZPD is the distance between the actual developmental levels as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer” (p.9)

The ZPD paradigm has important implication to our understanding of L2 language learning and teaching in the classroom. It shows that learners need to be assisted to progress from one stage to another. Such an enabling process is normally referred to as “scaffolding”, which is referred as the supportive dialogue given by a teacher to a learner (Bruner 1975). Two important notions arising from scaffolding are “challenge” and “support”. Teachers should be able to give appropriate and challengeable support to guide learners to understand a task. In other words, the linguistic support given by the teacher should be effective. Too much assistance or instruction that lacks challenge does not lead to development, and too little assistance or instruction that falls out of a learner’s ZPD does not lead to development either (Ohta 2001). The notion of effective support sheds light on the crucial role of teachers in L2 classroom interaction. Teachers must be able to provide mediation through supportive dialogue within the learner’s ZPD. That is, they must be able to first identify the gap between what the learner can do alone and what they can do potentially and then structure appropriate assistance to help the learner operate at his/her potential developmental level. Walsh (2006) points out the amount of scaffolded support given will depend very much on the teacher’s perception of what is exactly needed by the students. In a classroom context, where so much is happening at once, such fine judgement requires “great sensitivity and awareness on the part of the teacher” (Walsh 2006, p.36). He further suggests that the evidence of “good teaching” may be observed by a teacher’s ability to use unplanned scaffolding in the co-construction of learning activity (ibid., pp.37-38). Teachers’ ability to manage complex interactional process will be further discussed in section 3.3.

The concept of assisted performance in the ZPD can be potentially relevant to the phenomenon investigated in this thesis, i.e. “word searches”. Specifically, when the learners are not able to say what they intend to say and elicit help, it displays a gap between what they can do with the language and what they want to accomplish with this language, and how the gap may be filled through interaction with more knowledgeable participants, including the teacher and other students. Since the context of this thesis is teacher -led classroom interaction, the ways teachers participate in the learners’ word search become a potentially relevant concern to this study. How teachers make

appropriate online decision through their talk to facilitate the teaching and learning in the classroom has been investigated by Walsh (2006, 2011, 2012) in developing the idea of Classroom Interaction Competition, which will be discussed in the following paragraph.

## **2.4 Interactional Competence and Classroom Interactional Competence**

Before moving to discuss classroom interactional competence (CIC), I will first briefly review some of the work on interactional competence (IC). The notion of interactional competence was first proposed by Kramsch (1986, cited Walsh 2012, pp. 2-3). She challenged the traditional way of measuring L2 learners' oral proficiency, which focuses on accuracy, and called for a move to focus on learners' ability to communicate intended meaning and to establish joint understanding. More recently, research in SLA has been further focused on IC (e.g. He and Young 1998; Markee 2008; Young 2011), but until now IC has not yet been thoroughly explored through academic research. Young (2011) defined interactional competence as "a relationship between the participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed" (p. 428). According to Young (2011 p. 429) IC includes seven resources, which are: (1) Identity resources, including participation framework; (2) Linguistic resources, including register and modes of meaning; (3) Interactional resources, including speech act, turn-taking, repair, and boundaries.

Young (2011) pointed out that although IC builds on the previous theories of competence, it is a very different notion from communication competence. The fundamental difference, as he noted, is that "IC is not what a person knows; it is what a person does together with others" (p. 430). Here then, Young highlights that IC concerns how these resources are mutually and jointly used by the participants in specific social contexts. Markee (2008) also emphasised the notion of "co-construct meaning in contexts" when he talked about IC. He stated that developing interactional competence in a second language involves learners' "co-constructing with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2" (p.3).

How EFL learners display their IC, including non-verbal resources as well as linguistic and interactional resources, in dealing with an interactional problem, i.e., word search, will be seen in the analysis chapter.

The discussion now turns to classroom interactional competence (CIC) proposed by Walsh (2006, 2011, 2012). CIC is built on the construct of IC but with a focus on how teachers and learners enhance learning and learning opportunities through their interactional decisions and subsequent actions, as can be seen in its definition: “teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (Walsh 2011:158). Adopting conversation analytic perspective, Walsh examined the ways teachers displayed CIC in classroom interaction. He identified some specific features of CIC. These include: (Walsh 2006, 2012, pp.6-9)

- (1) CIC is the convergence of language use and pedagogic goals. Any evidence of CIC must therefore demonstrate that interlocutors are using discourse which is both appropriate to specific teaching goals and to the agenda of the moment.
- (2) CIC facilitates interactional spaces. Interactional space is maximized through increased wait-time, by resisting the temptation to “fill silence” (by reducing teacher echo), by prompting extended learner turns and by allowing planning time.
- (3) CIC “shapes” learner contributions by seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling, or repairing learner input. Through shaping the discourse, a teacher is helping learners to say what they mean to say by using the most appropriate language to do so.
- (4) CIC makes effective use of eliciting. The ability to ask questions, to refine and adjust those questions and to clarify for learners is an important feature of CIC.

Walsh (2012) suggests that in order to enhance learning and learning opportunity, teachers should begin by developing their own interactional competence. He also calls for more research in different settings with different participants so that we can explore more interactional resources and techniques that determine CIC. In the section 4.2 of the analysis chapter, I will provide instances in which a learner initiates a word search and the teacher, by using certain interactional resources and techniques, encourages the learner to clarify his/her intended meaning. As a result, the teacher is able to produce a satisfactory word to resolve the communicate breakdown caused by a word finding problem.

## 2.5 CA and L2 Language Learning

Although the primary aim of this research is to examine the organization of the word searches in EFL classrooms but not to bring evidence of learning, due to that word search is a kind of repair which is potentially a *loci* for learning (c.f. Brouwer 2003; Okamoto 2010), it makes relevant to discuss CA's perspective on language learning.

CA is not a learning theory and was not designed originally to study language acquisition; however, it has been increasingly adopted as a method to investigate the issue of language learning in recent years (e.g. Jenks 2010; Markee 2008; Pekarek Doehler 2010;). These studies adopt a different approach to learning than the mainstream psycholinguistic theories and research on SLA. In general, they see language as a social practice that is embodied in interaction in situated activities. This view on learning was inspired by the critique made by Firth and Wagner in 1997. They challenged the psycholinguistic perspectives on language learning and called for a reconceptualization of Second Language Acquisition. Essentially, the call was for (1) becoming awareness of the contextual and interactional aspects of language use, (2) adopting an emic, participant-relevant, perspective to fundamental concepts, (3) broadening the traditional SLA data base (Firth and Wagner 1997, p. 285). Their article inspired wide discussion about the nature of L2 language learning and some researchers started to address the possibility of using conversation as a methodology tool to investigate L2 learning and teaching. The publications that discussed this issue culminated in the special issue of the *Modern Language Journal* in 2004 (Markee & Kasper 2004). For example, Kasper (2004, p.551-567) studied learners' situated identities in dyadic conversations, and Mori (2004, p.536-550) investigated students' orientations to learning opportunities in the Japanese foreign language classroom.

Although there have been a growing number of L2 researchers applying CA to study language learning in interaction, the ways they position CA in their research are different. Kasper (2009) elaborates on the use of conversation analysis (CA) in L2 learning in one of her articles. She suggests there are currently three divergent views on CA for SLA. One position, according to her, is that there are still not enough CA studies on L2 interaction so SLA researchers need to give priority to the study of interactional competence "as a condition and resource for L2 learning, rather than as its object" (ibid.,p.12). Such a stance can be seen in Lee's study (2006) about communicative competence in L2 classroom. Another position, she further points out, is to attach other

theories to the CA of L2 data. For example, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004) incorporate Vygotskian sociocultural theory in their study, and Young and Miller (2004) adopt theories of communities of practices in their study. As mentioned above CA was not originally designed to study language learning and thus the lack of a “learning mechanism” (ibid, p.12) in CA compels these researchers to bring in other theories. However, such a view, Kasper notes, is rejected by other researchers who argue that CA’s own theoretical and analytical resources are necessary and sufficient to account for L2 learning as a social practice (e.g., Markee 2000, 2008; Seedhouse 2005; Seedhouse & Walsh 2010). Kasper claims that she also takes this stance herself and she further notes that CA can make a distinctive contribution to the field of SLA by its unique perspective on “cognition as socially shared and grounded in interaction” (ibid.,p.12). In general, researchers who take this stance, such as Seedhouse (2005), Markee( 2000; 2008), and Kasper (2009), have embraced the CA’s position on “socially shared cognition” in addressing the issue of L2 learning. It should be mentioned that this does not mean CA is able to establish the cognitive state of individuals in isolation, as Seedhouse (2010, p.128) puts it, CA is unable to gain a direct access into what the interactants really mean, but it is able to portray and explicate the progress of intersubjectivity or socially-distributed cognition. That is to say, through displaying their understandings to each other in the details of their talk, participants make their cognition public and available to researchers for analysis. Thus, according to this stance, researchers can examine language learning through solely observing the change of learners’ socially-displayed cognitive state in their talk without the help of other theories of language learning.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter, the relevant literature has been outlined and discussed. Section 2.2 introduced the practice of word searches from a CA perspective, with a particular focus on its position in sequence organization and repair mechanism. Previous studies which have examined word searches in interaction in various settings were also reviewed. Such research has aided our understanding of word search practices in general and also revealed some similarities and differences across different settings. Nevertheless, the review has shown that there was relatively little research which has examined word searches in the interaction involving the teacher. Furthermore, most of the research did not build a sizable collection. By examining a sizeable collection of word search

examples in the context of teacher-fronted EFL classroom interaction, this study addresses a research gap. The remainder of this chapter presented an overview of the theoretical stances taken in this study, including the sociocultural theory of L2 learning (with a focus on the construct of ZPD), interactional competence and classroom interactional competence, as well as CA-for SLA. An understanding of such research in L2 learning and teaching helps to interpret and discuss the data. Before moving on to the analysis chapter, I will introduce the methodology that is used in this study.

## Chapter 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology of the present study. It includes a description of the research questions, the participants, the collection methods, the transcription of the data, and the transcription conventions. It also gives an introduction of CA as an approach to investigate naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. Finally, a brief discussion on research issues such as ethics, validity, reliability and reflections on the data are presented in the remainder of this chapter.

### 3.2 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyse the interactional practice of the learner-initiated word searches in EFL classroom interactions in Taiwan. Adopting conversation analytic perspectives, this thesis aims to reveal how the EFL learners in the data resolve their word finding trouble with the help of other participants, either their teacher or fellow learners. Apart from that, this study also concerns the features that characterise word searches in the setting of classrooms. To support these aims, the following research questions are addressed:

- (1) How are the learners' word searches sequentially developed and jointly accomplished by the participants in EFL classrooms?*
- (2) What are the resources the learners employ to initiate a word search and extend an invitation for co-participation?*
- (3) Are there any sequentially distinctive features in the word searches in EFL classrooms, compared to those in ordinary conversations?*

The first research question will describe how the learners initiate a word search, how they extend an invitation for co-participation, how the recipients join the word search, and how the participants indicate a word search is resolved and resume the original activity. The second research question will identify the various verbal and nonverbal resources used by the EFL learners to initiate a word search and invite co-participation. The last question will aim at revealing some unique features which characterize the word searches in this particular context. The details for addressing each research question will be made clear in chapter four.

### 3.3 Conversation Analysis

The primary methodological tool applied in this study is the qualitative methodology of conversation analysis (CA). CA is used to describe and analyse how word searches are collaboratively accomplished in the classroom. The whole research project, including the design, data collection, and data analysis, was developed under the principles of CA methodology. In the following paragraph, I will briefly discuss the origin of CA and its fundamental principles.

CA is “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p.13). It was established by sociologist Harvey Sacks and his associates in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Sacks 1992; Sacks et al. 1974). Although CA’s initial aim was to reveal the organization of casual, mundane conversations that occurs between friends and acquaintances, it has further developed into an investigation of a wide range of structures and practice in institutional talk including classroom interactions in L1 (e.g. Lerner, 1995; Macbeth 2004; McHoul 1990;) and L2/EFL classroom interactions (e.g. He 2004; Kasper 1985; Lazaraton 2004; Markee 2000, 2004; Mori 2004, 2007; Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler 2004; Olsher 2004; Seedhouse 1997, 2004; Walsh 2002).

CA’s epistemological roots lie in ethnomethodology, introduced by Harold Garfinkel. Ethnomethodology refers to the study of the common sense methods that ordinary members of society use to make sense of everyday activities, to account for their own actions and those of others (Heritage 1984b; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Richards 2003; Ten Have 1999; Seedhouse 2004). Garfinkel rejected the traditional view in sociology which relies heavily “on the construction and imposition of categories created by the analyst”, while proposing a different view in that “categories are developed by the actors in social situations as part of a dynamic progress of situated knowledge and shared understandings” (Richards 2003, p. 31). His view on the relationship between people, interaction and society, as well as the emic approach he adopted in looking at people’s social behaviours, play a crucial role in Ethnomethodology. Inspired by Garfinkel’s ideas, Sack founded Conversation Analysis to uncover the organization of social order (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974). He asserted that the best way to gain analytic access to the common sense knowledge proposed by ethnomethodology is through the analysis of naturally occurring talk (For a full discussion of the historical

development of CA see e.g. Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998; Markee 2000; Seedhouse 2004; Ten Have 1999).

CA, therefore, is involved in the study of the organization and order of people's talk-in-interaction, whatever its character or setting. By paying close attention to the details of the interaction, in institutional settings or otherwise, CA practitioners have discovered that the participants in the interaction are performing the following in order to accomplish their talk: they will take turns at talk, usually once at a time; their talk will be sequentially ordered; they repair each other's turn to achieve mutual understanding; and the most important of all, their talk is organized for the purpose of social action (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005). CA's interest in revealing social actions by means of language makes it distinctive from other linguistic approaches. Seedhouse (2004, p.3) observes that the fundamental difference between CA and other linguistic approaches is that while the primary interest of descriptive linguistics is in language, CA's main interest is in how social acts are packaged and conveyed in linguistic items. However, it should be noted that CA does not equal a social action and a linguistic item, rather it "reveals and portrays the fact that utterances often perform several actions simultaneously and are specially designed to do so" (Seedhouse 2004, p.40). In other words CA is used to illustrate ways in which specific linguistic items can be used in a number of ways to perform different social actions.

There are four fundamental methodological rules of CA, according to Richards (2003, pp.26-27). These include:

- 1) *Use naturally occurring data*: invented data is never used, even for the purpose of illustration. Sacks emphasises the point repeatedly: "the kinds of phenomena I deal with are always transcriptions of actual occurrences in their actual sequences" (1984, p.25).
- 2) *Move from observation to hypothesis*: CA is not hypothesis testing. The analyst's aim is to treat the talk as something fresh, something to be approached on its own terms.
- 3) *Rule nothing out*: nothing that occurs in interaction can be ruled out, a *prior*, as random, insignificant, or irrelevant.
- 4) *Focus on sequences*: conversation is jointly constructed, we must treat each utterance in the context of its response to what has gone before and its relevance to what follows.

Some of the issues above will be discussed in relation to the present study. The first rule suggests a CA project should always use natural occurring data as primary data. In this study, the only data are the recordings of naturally occurring EFL lessons. They allow the researcher to know what actually happen in the interaction. Such data, however, look unorganized in comparison with the data collected form laboratory settings, evidence from which, as Sacks (1992a) puts it, “is extremely rich and inexhaustible, which includes crucial details from the analysis” (cited Ten Have 1999, p.33). The second rule implies the analysis is “bottom-up and data driven”, and no contextual factor should be treated as relevant unless there is evidence in the interaction that the participants themselves are orienting to it (Seedhouse 2004, p.15). While analysing the word search sequences in this study, the researcher did not make any assumption with regards to the participants’ identities or L2 competencies. These were discussed only when the participants displayed their orientation to them. However, Ten Have (1999) argues that it is unreasonable to completely ignore the findings and insights built up by the previous CA work. He therefore proposes a moderate approach to the issue, that is, start the analysis with the data at hand, but allow a limited amount of reference to earlier CA work. In the present study, I adopted Ten Have’s view. For example, I identified word search examples from the recording by referring to the existing literature on word searches. The third rule suggests that in order to “rule nothing out” it is crucial to develop a highly detailed transcription system in CA, including both audio and visual features of talk. In this study, this is achieved through repeatedly listening to/watching the recordings to transcribe the data, and writing them down using standard CA transcription convention. However it is important to note that even though efforts were made to include as many details as possible, it was impossible to create a transcript which matches perfectly with the recordings. For example, sometimes it was difficult to describe every movement and action of a speaker. Also, consideration needed to be taken with regard to the readability as too much annotation would make it difficulty to read. As a result, the quantity of detail in the transcript in this study became “a compromise between readability and exhaustiveness” (Pallotti 2007, p. 41). The final point refers to the view that the meaning of a turn must be understood in relation the sequential context. While analysing the word search activity the researcher closely examine how the participants display their next turn according to their understanding of the prior turn. Specifically, the analysis was carefully conducted through a “next-turn-proof procedure” (Sacks et al. 1974, p.729) in order to understand how the participants initiate and complete a word search.

There are four key concepts in the organization of talk in interaction, i.e. turn-taking, sequence, preference, and repair. They were uncovered by Sacks and his associates in early days through the analysis of ordinary conversation and are now commonly employed by CA researchers to analyse their data. Space does not allow a full account of this inherent system, but see Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), Pallotti (2007), Seedhouse (2004), and Ten Have (1999) for a full discussion. In the following paragraph, I will only give a brief illustration of the notions which are more relevant to my analysis, i.e., sequence, turn-taking, and repair.

### 1) Sequence

From CA perspective, conversation is organized sequentially, “one thing can lead to another” (Ten Have 1999, p.113). The concept of action sequence can be exemplified by the minimal format: adjacency pair. Adjacency pairs are paired utterances that are produced by two different speakers. Speaker A produces the first pair part and speaker B makes a relevant response in the second pair (e.g. question-answer, request-acceptance/rejection). However, the second pair part is not always available or provided immediately. If it is delayed, absent, or not “fit” to the first pair, it is “noticeable” and “accountable”. Specifically, the speaker might insist to get the response or the recipient may provide an account for its absence or delay (Ten Have 1999). In cases like this, another sequence is embedded in the adjacency pair and the second pair is temporarily suspended. Seedhouse (2004, p.21) states that sequence organization is the mechanism by which the interactants “display to one another their understanding of each other’s turn” and this allows analysts to be able to analyse their course of the interaction to “follow the progress of their intersubjectivity”. In my analysis, the notion of adjacency pairs and sequence organization plays a crucial role in examining how the participants jointly resolve the word search in talk. When the speaker displays his/her trouble in producing the next item due and extend an invitation (the first pair part), it creates a slot for the recipients to provide a collaborative solution in their next turn (the second pair part). When the recipients are unable to produce the solution immediately, the speaker insert a side sequence to clarify the meaning of the trouble source until the recipients are able to give the second pair part, that is, the search-for word. Thus each word search activity is analysed in its action sequence.

### 2) Turn taking

One of the essential features of natural conversation is that the participants construct their talk on a turn-by turn basis with minimal gap and minimal overlap. This

phenomenon is termed “turn taking” in CA (Sacks et al. 1974). However, how is it accomplished so efficiently, in particular when participants do not explicitly allocate the turn to others, for example, through calling their names? According to Sacks and his associates, this coordination can be achieved through participants’ orientation to a “transition relevance place” (TRP). TRP is positioned at the end of a “Turn-Constructional Unit” (TCU). At this point, speakership may change as listeners can project when a speaker is going to finish their turn. It should be noted that the basic unit of analysis in CA is not “turn” but “Turn-Constructional Unit” (TCU), which can be sentence, clauses, or words. Seedhouse (2004, p.30) notes that a TCU is essentially a social concept rather than a linguistic item. It can be understood as a “single social action performed in a turn or a sequence”.

### 3) Repair

In CA repair is referred to as the treatment of a trouble source in talk in interaction. A repair sequence starts with a repairable item. If a repair is initiated by the speaker of the trouble item, it is called a “self-initiated repair”; while if it is taken by anyone else, it is called an “other-initiated repair”. The repair itself can be dealt with by the speaker of this problematic talk, “self repair”, or by others in talk, “other repair” (Ten Have, 1999). Repair is the key method for interactants to pursue mutual understanding in talk and is closely relation to the present study. In CA tradition, word search practice can be considered as one specific type of self-initiation of repair within the same turn (Schegloff 1979; Schegloff et al.1977). Carroll (2006, p. 234) termed it “forward-oriented repair”. It can be completed by self, i.e., a speaker initiates a word search on his/her ongoing talk, and then provides candidate solutions by him/herself to complete the search; or it can be another repair pattern, i.e. a speaker initiates a word search on his/her ongoing talk, and invited other interlocutors to provide candidate solutions to complete the search. The resolution of a word search itself is in fact a process of achieving mutual understanding through repairs, as will be shown in the analysis chapter.

## **3.4 Rationale for the Use of Conversation Analysis**

Before moving to describe the data in this study, a justification for adopting CA as the methodology for the present study will be discussed. The present study was designed to provide a detailed description of the interactional practices that deal with EFL learner’s word finding difficulties. Given this, I found CA more suitable for my research aim and

purpose than other methodologies which are commonly used in classroom discourse research (e.g. Discourse Analysis). First of all, the activity of word finding difficulties under investigation is essentially a type of learners' initiation communication but not a teacher initiation sequence and thus does not fit into the DA's IRF patterns that are typically found in a more traditional L2 classroom. Consequentially, DA approach to classroom research was not considered as an appropriate method in this research. Another reason for opting for CA lays in CA's insistence in capturing all the details of interaction. It allowed me to see how non-lexical resources, such as sound stretches, "uh's", cut-offs, pauses, and intonations, as well as visual resources such as gaze direction and iconic gestures, are used by participants in the development of a word search activity. These non-linguistic, "small" features in interaction are often ignored in other classroom discourse methodologies that also look at transcript data. Furthermore, CA's obsession with sequential context enabled me to see how a certain resource emerged in its local context, how it could carry multiple functions, and how it could influence other participants' relevant response. This cannot be achieved through a coding based approach (e.g. Discourse Analysis) in which the data is typically simplified and reduced and thus the details of the sequentially development of talk is often neglected. Finally, I chose the CA approach because it coincides with the theoretical perspective towards class-based foreign language learning adopted in this research. This viewpoint is that language learning is also a process of socialization, not just a cognitive process that happens in the learner's mind, and thus it is necessary to include a more social participatory perspective to the traditional mainstream, cognitive second language acquisition studies. CA's emphasis on the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use perfectly matches this perspective.

### **3.5 Participants and Data Collection Procedures**

#### **3.5.1 *Recruiting Participants***

CA regards the recordings of people's interaction as the primary data source and thus gaining the permission to record people's talk is crucial to a CA project. However, it is a fact that many people dislike the idea that their spontaneous actions is analysed in great detail by someone else. This is, in particular, true for classroom teachers because they may be afraid of being judged by the researcher in one way or another.

Furthermore, even though teachers and their students have given permission, it is possible that the school or institution itself may refuse to give the researcher access for

recording purposes. Consequently recruiting participants in CA based EFL classroom for research purposes can be challenging.

The researcher first tried contacting some private language institutions directly through their key administrators, but none of them were prepared to accept any form of recording in their classes. In fact, I had been warned that most of the private EFL institutions were very conservative in terms of allowing people into their classrooms to observe or record the lessons, but I did not know it was so strict until I experienced it. Faced with the rejections from several private language institutions, I decided to approach the teachers first. EFL teachers were recruited in two ways. On the one hand, I posted messages in an online EFL forum which EFL teachers in Taiwan often visited. Only two teachers responded but one of them was living too far away so in the end only one joined this study. On the other hand, I contacted a few teachers through mutual acquaintances. I managed to recruit one and through her help I was able to gain access to a private language school, where three teachers agreed to participate in my research. After the successful recruitment of the teachers, I asked them to discuss the possibility of recording with their students and their supervisors. All of the teachers received positive responses, except one. One of the teachers did not receive permission from his supervisor even though the researcher would give a detailed explanation of the research purpose. After some negotiation, I finally obtained permission but the recording had to be done in a coffee shop, not in their classrooms. In the end, I successfully recruited five teachers and their students to participate in this study.

It should be noted that although the teachers were not given any instructions about what or how they should conduct their lesson, they were required to offer conversation lessons or discussion-based lessons as these lesson may offer more and richer data.

### **3.4.2 Data Information**

The data for this study comes from several adult general EFL classrooms in Taiwan. The data collection was carried out between the end of October 2007 and the middle of November 2007. The participants in the classrooms were adult Taiwanese EFL learners and native English speaking EFL teachers. Four of the teachers are from the US and one is from the Republic of South Africa. In terms of the learners' general language ability, it ranges from upper elementary to higher intermediate. Approximately fifteen hours of audio/video and audio recordings were collected. It should be noted that not all of the lessons were video recorded. Due to some technical problems on the day of recording

two of the lessons were only recorded on an audio recorder. Note that the recordings came from different classroom settings, which will be described in detail.

1) Data collected from a private language institution

This school offered both general English and English for Specific Purpose (ESP) courses for adults. Three teachers and their students from this school participated in this research. All of them are native speakers of English and they are all from the US. There were 6 general English conversational lessons (each one lasted about 90 minutes) collected from this school. Although it was crucial to have access to non-verbal aspects in each moment of interaction, especially in the word search activities where the speakers frequently use gaze and iconic gestures to initiate their repair, two of the lessons were not audio recorded due to lack of video recorders on the day of the recording. What happened was that two of the participant classes were having the lessons at the same time, but unfortunately I had only one camcorder with me, consequently only one class could be video recorded. It is worth noting that the size of each class in this school was very small. In general, each class had no more than nine students. According to one of the teachers, this is this school's policy. The physical size of the classrooms was very small too; some of them could seat only six students. The number of the students in each recorded class ranged from one to five. The class with only one student present was supposed to have three students but on the day of recording two of them were absent.

2) Data collected from an English lesson conducted in a coffee shop

The data from this source is unique in terms of its physical setting. There was a teacher who wanted to participate in this research but the institution he worked for did not allow any member of staff to be involved in any form of recording within the setting of the institution. This school also offered adult general EFL classes. Nevertheless, an agreement was made to record the lesson in a coffee shop. It was on the second floor of the shop and there were no other customers so the class had some privacy. In this lesson, the teacher prepared a few questions about travel for the students to discuss. The lesson proceeded like a normal teacher-fronted classroom discussion activity, despite music in the background and the lack of a blackboard. The music was a bit loud and therefore the quality of the recording was not very good. It is important to note that the recording was agreed by the institution. The institution had a policy that encouraged teachers to take their students out to a coffee shop to conduct a lesson once a month.

The purpose was to give the students a more relaxing environment to learn English. After some negotiation with the institution, they agreed that I could make the recording when the class was having their monthly special lesson in a coffee shop. As I had difficulty in recruiting enough teachers at that time I had to accept this option. I was thinking as long as teaching and learning was still involved, the physical setting of the class might not be a major problem. My concern was the quality of sound since the recording was going to be made in a public place. There were five students attending the class on the day of the recording. Approximately one-and-a-half hours of video recording were obtained from this class.

3) Data collected from English classes in a government institution.

Approximately four-and-a-half hours of video-taped data were obtained from this setting. This institution employed an American teacher to teach their employees English during the lunch break in one of the meeting rooms on the weekdays. Two classes (three lessons) were video-taped. The number of students in each class was very small. One class had three students and the other had four. According to the teacher, the registered students were about twenty in each class but only several of them turned up regularly. The lessons were conducted in a big meeting room, and there was a whiteboard for the teacher to use. The summary information about the database is shown in table 1.

<Table 1>

Source	Teacher	Class	No. of students	Length	Recording venue	Recording type	Class level
Language school A	TED	Class A	1	1.5 h	classroom	audio	U.I.
		Class A	2	1.5 h	classroom	audio/video	U.I.
		Class B	5	1.5 h	classroom	audio/video	U.E.
Language school A	TAR	Class C	3	1.5 h	classroom	audio	I.
		Class C	3	1.5 h	classroom	audio/video	I.
Language school A	TJO	Class D	4	1.5 h	classroom	audio/video	L.I.
Language school B	TCH	Class E	5	1.5 h	coffee shop	audio/video	U.I.
Government Institution	TLY	Class F	4	1.5 h	meeting room	audio/video	U.E.
		Class F	3	1.5 h	meeting room	audio/video	U.I.
		Class G	3	1.5 h	meeting room	audio/video	U.I.

**Note 1:** Abbreviation for proficiency level used in the table:

**U.E.:** Upper Elementary Level/ **L.I.:** Lower Intermediate Level /**I.:** Intermediate Level/  
**U.I.** Upper Intermediate Level

**Note 2:** each language institution used its own placement procedures so there might be some inconsistency of proficiency level among the different institutions.

The size of the data collected in the present study merits some attention. According to Seedhouse (2004, p.88) the validity of a CA based study is mainly related to the quality of the analysis rather than the size of the database. He suggests that “a total of between five and ten lessons has generally been considered a reasonable database from which recent classroom research into communication in both LI and L2 classrooms has been able to generalise and draw conclusions” (ibid.:p.106). Thus, drawing on his claim, the size of the present database (fifteen hours from ten lessons) can be considered adequate to describe the phenomenon to be investigated in my thesis.

### **3.5.2 Data Collection Methods**

CA regards naturally occurring talk as the primary data and the method to collect them is through audio or video taping. According to Silverman (2005, p.162), there are three advantages for working with this kind of data.

*“(1) Tape is a public record. That is, it is public accessible so that it can be examined by other researchers to increase its validity. Other kinds of qualitative data do not have such a characteristic. (2) Tapes can be replayed and transcripts can be improved, which means different analyses can be further developed without being limited to the original transcripts. (3) Tapes preserve sequences of talk so that researchers are able to focus on the actual details of how people construct a social world through talk” (p162).*

Although it is possible, within CA, to analyse audio-only recordings even when the participants have visual access to one another (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), in order not to miss interactional features, such as gestures and eye movements, the main method to collect data in this thesis was through videotaping. The interaction in the classroom was taped using a digital camera. In addition, a MP3 recorder was recording at the same time to catch any sound that might not be captured by the video camera. After all, the major data for CA research is the talk and it needs to be transcribed in high detail, so it is important to make sure that the sound would be clearly recorded. The use of video recording is especially important in this research because non-verbal resources play a crucial role in word search practice (c.f. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Hayashi 2003). Once the permission for the recording was obtained, the site and time for recording were soon arranged. A digital video camera was mounted on a tripod and placed in the position that could catch most of the interaction but without being too obtrusive. Ideally,

the best data for this thesis would be the kind of video recording that involves both the teacher and students in the same shot; unfortunately this goal was not achieved while the data were being collected. In fact, most of the data in this thesis only show images of the students. There were two reasons. One was that some teachers had asked not to focus the camcorder on them. As a result they were out of shot. The other was due to the physical size of the room. Some rooms were too small to find a right place to include both the teacher and the students in the same shot. In most classes, I was present during the recording of data. However, in some classes, I was asked not to stay during recordings. In such cases, I placed the camera or audio recorder at the beginning of the lesson and then left. All the teachers that were filmed were told not to change their teaching plan in any way, but rather to proceed with the lesson as usual. Approximately fifteen hours of data were collected, and about three hours of them were only audio-recorded due to some technical problem with the data recording. It is worth noting that the absence of the video images may downgrade the value of the data.

### **3.6 Data Transcription**

Although recordings of authentic interaction are viewed as primary data in CA research, such recordings are not used on their own by just repeatedly listening or reviewing. Transcripts need to be produced for intensive analysis by analysts themselves or other readers. Ten Have (1999, p. 33) points out, “while the tapes contain the primary material on which the analysis is to be based, it is elaborated, clarified, and explicated by the transcripts”. Thus, the production and use of transcripts become essential research activities in CA projects.

Unlike other approaches which use recorded talk as their data such as discourse analysis (DA), interactional sociolinguistics etc., CA has developed a highly detailed transcription system. For example, it includes gaps, pauses, overlaps, prosodic cues, and audible breathing. CA’s preference of using such fine-grained transcriptions can be seen to reflect the fundamental methodological rules discussed before. In other words, in order to capture the ‘rich’ and ‘inexhaustible’ detail of naturally occurring talk, to avoid ruling out ‘something’, and to carefully examine the sequential contexts, it is essential to include as many details of interaction as possible in the transcript (Silverman 2005).

The recorded data in this study were transcribed using conventions adapted from Gail Jefferson (see Atkinson and Heritage 1984 ), but some modifications were made for the purpose of the study. Significant time and efforts were spent while transcribing the data in order to present interactional details as accurately as possible. Following the basic procedure for CA transcription (Ten Have 1999), I first transcribed vocal features of talk and then added the visual information on the line below it. However for the benefit of readability, I only transcribed the most relevant visual features. When adding the visual information I used a +sign to mark the onset of non-verbal behaviour. In the data, although English was used most of the time, the learners' shared L1 (Chinese), which was employed sometimes. I translated these Chinese utterances into English and I highlighted the English translations in *italics* and placed them below the Chinese utterances. But if I needed to add non-verbal information and translation at the same time, I placed the translation below the non-verbal description or after the Chinese utterance if there was any room. Further details of the transcription method of the data are given in Appendix A.

### **3.7 Ethics and Permission**

Making and later on using recordings of natural occurring interaction can be seen as a violation to the privacy of the participants in the interaction because their spontaneous behaviours will be analysed in great detail. In the classroom setting, it is also very likely that the recording will disturb the teaching and the learning process no matter how carefully it is arranged. Furthermore, whatever the purpose of a research is, it is sometimes unavoidable that the teacher's teaching and the learners' performance will be judged in one way or another. Therefore, it is important to consider the rights of the participants in the interaction. According to Ten Have (1999, p. 61), three basic rights need to be considered. The participants should have the right to refuse:

- 1) *To be recorded or to give access to the situation for recordings purposes;*
- 2) *Permission to use the recording for research purposes;*
- 3) *Public display or publication of the recordings in one form or another.*

To protect the rights of the participants in this study, the permission to have access to the settings and recordings was well secured in advance before the recording time. In addition, all the participants were orally informed of their rights following the recording

explicitly on the day of the recording. A written consent was then given to them to sign (See appendix B and appendix C).

It should be mentioned that although the consent form is produced in English, I clearly explained the content to the students in Chinese to ensure their comprehension. Another common concern in relation to research ethics is the anonymity of the participants. Throughout the extracts presented in the thesis, the five different teachers are always identified with a capital T. They are referred as “Ted”, “Tar”, “Tjo”, “Tch”, and “Tly”, in order to protect their identity. However, I did not change the names of the students for the reason that these English names are not their real names. They are often used only in the EFL classrooms or among friends know through leaning English. Thus, these names themselves can be considered as a form of pseudonym.

### **3.8 Validity, Reliability and Reflections on the Data**

The accomplishment of validity and reliability is essential and crucial to any research project. Its importance is what Kirk and Miller (1986) and Silverman (2001) point out “the issues of reliability and validity are important, because in them the objectivity and credibility of (social science) research is at stake” (cited in Peräkylä 2004:283). However, it should also be noted that the questions of validity and reliability take different forms in different qualitative methods (Peräkylä 2004:284).

According to Peräkylä (2004), CA’s unique aim to investigate the talk in interaction in its own right has made the issue of validity in CA distinct from other qualitative methods. In CA research, the accomplishment of validity is closely link to its fundamental research perspective, that is, an emic or participant’s perspective. The close link between the issue of validity and the emic perspective is explained by Seedhouse (2004, p.255):

*“However, the crucial point in developing an emic perspective is that it is the participants' perspective, rather than that of the analyst's. Conversation analysts know what the participants' perspective is, because the participants document their social actions to each other in the details of the interaction by normative reference to the interactional organisations. We as analysts can access the emic perspective in the details of the interaction and by reference to those same organisations. Clearly, the details of the interaction themselves provide the only justification for claiming to be able to develop an emic perspective. Therefore, CA practitioners cannot make any claims beyond what is*

*demonstrated by the interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective and hence the whole validity of the enterprise".*

In this thesis, the validity is demonstrated through providing a turn by turn analysis of how the participants make sense of each other's talk to co-construct a word search sequence, that is, the participants themselves make the claim that they are involved in such an activity through a "next-turn proof procedure" (c.f. Peräkylä 2004). The validity is then tested by the reader's own analysis. Having discussed the issue of validity in CA, I am now moving to another important research issue: reliability. A key question in reliability is that "whether the results of a study are repeatable or replicable" (Bryman 2001, cited Seedhouse 2004, p.254). Seedhouse (ibid.) provides a clear explanation of how this is achieved in CA studies. He states:

*"Many research methodologies do not require presentation of the primary data on which a study is based in publications about that study, and hence the reliability of major sections of the analyses of that data is not available for scrutiny. By contrast, it is standard practice for CA studies to include the transcripts of the data they employ and increasingly to make audio and video files available electronically via the Web. Furthermore, the conversation analyst makes the process of analysis transparent for readers. This enables readers to analyse the data themselves, to test the analytical procedures which the author has followed and the validity of his/her analysis and claims. In this way, conversation analyses are rendered repeatable and replicable to readers. Also, it is standard practice for CA practitioners to take their data and analyses to data workshops and to send their work to a number of other practitioners for comment before sending them for publication" (pp.254-255).*

Based on Seedhouse's claim, the reliability of this thesis has been satisfied to some degree. First of all, I have made the transcripts of the data and their analysis accessible for other researchers to challenge. Secondly, I presented my data in three different data sessions in 2008 and 2011 in MARG (Micro Analysis Research Group) at Newcastle University. In each session, the presented recordings and transcripts were reviewed and examined by other researchers.

The accessibility of the data and the transparency of analysis certainly is CA's strength in terms of its validity and reliability; however it does not warrant the reliability of observations. Peräkylä (2004) points out that it is important for the researchers to pay more attention to the technical quality of recordings and the accuracy of transcripts while producing them.

Efforts were made in this thesis in trying to ensure the quality of recordings and transcripts. The quality of the recordings was good in terms of the clearness of the sound and images; however, it was a great pity that most of the time the teachers were not in the shot. There were two main reasons. First of all, one teacher did not want to be filmed so in the recording he was always out of the shot. This was beyond my control. Another reason was that as I had only one camera and with only one camera it was impossible to include all of the participants so I made the decision to focus on the students. As I started to transcribe the recordings and analyse the data, it soon became clear that the limited access to the teachers' embodied behaviours had made it difficult to make some analytic claims. Thus the current data is "imperfect" in that not all transcripts of the word search sequences include all the relevant and necessary actions of the teachers. Thus it is clear that when recording teacher-fronted classroom interactions, it is necessary to set up at least two cameras in order to catch the relevant non-verbal information from both the teacher and the learners. If I had to do this study again, I would certainly place two cameras to avoid missing relevant non-verbal information. It is worth noting that although using multiple cameras can increase the adequacy of the recordings, the researchers need to be aware of their obtrusiveness in the classroom. It seems that it remains a challenge for researchers to maintain the accuracy of the recordings and to avoid their intrusiveness at the same time.

The issue of "observer's paradox" (Labov 1972) in this study requires some reflection. In some classrooms I was permitted to stay but I tried to act as unobtrusively as possible. For example, I chose a less intrusive place to sit in and I did not make any attempt to move the camera to follow the movement of the participants while recording. On the occasions when I was not permitted to stay in the room, I set up the camera and left. Even though efforts were made to reduce the intrusiveness, the presence of the researcher and /or camera still made some influence on the participants. For example, in one of the recordings, the participants were making a joke about who is going to be the host of today's show when they saw the camera. Fortunately, these instances were rather short. It seemed that the participants may have been initially aware that they were being recorded, but they forgot about it soon after they started to engage themselves in the lessons. However, due to there not being any prolonged observation of these classes before the recording was made it is difficult to determine whether the participants changed their usual behaviour in the classroom or not.

### **3.9 Conclusion**

This chapter has detailed the methodological framework chosen for this study, i.e. Conversation Analysis. It has shown that how CA provides a useful set of analytic tools to address the questions being investigated in this study. Overall information about the data collection tools and procedures has also been presented. Additionally, transcript procedures, including some transcription conventions used for Chinese and non-verbal information have been introduced. Finally, various research issues for the study including ethics and permission for the data collection as well as validity and reliability have been considered. The following chapter, Analysis, will present detailed analyses of the examples selected from the word search collection. It will demonstrate the result of the application of the methodology and also reflect the theoretical stance taken in this study.

## Chapter 4. Data Analysis

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter will present research findings which address the research questions: (1) How are the learners' word searches sequentially developed and jointly accomplished in EFL classrooms? (2) What are the resources the learners employ to mark their word finding difficulty and extend an invitation for co-participation? (3) Are there any sequentially distinctive features in the learners' word searches in EFL classrooms, compared to those in ordinary conversations?

During the initial review of the data, it was observed that the learners often interrupted themselves in their talk by displaying hesitations and disfluencies, such as repetitions, cuts-off, uh's, sound stretches or pauses (usually described as non-lexical speech perturbations in CA studies, see Schegloff et al. 1977) when they have trouble in producing the next item due, but they managed to continue their turn after the interruption without being interposed by the co-participants. Here is an example from the data set.

#### Extract 1: health club /TED /151107

The class was about to start a new unit "sports" in the textbook. The teacher is warming up the unit by asking the students if they like sports or not. One of the students, Gale, nods her head so T starts to ask her some further questions.

```
1      Ted:      wow great=great
2      Gale:      ((nodding))
3      Ted:      where do you jog?
4 →    Gale:      (1.0)  in a:::(6.0)
5                      +Gale shifts gaze away, closes her eyes,
6                      knits her brows and purses her lips
7                      health-healthy-(.) club=
8                      +Gale opens eyes and looks at T
9      Ted:      you go to a health club okay
10     Gale:      ((nodding))
11     Ted:      you jog on a track ↑mill
12     Gale:      ((nodding))
13     Ted:      oh nice=nice good great okay
```

Prior to this extract, Gale told the teacher she jogs at least three times a week. The teacher responds with a positive assessment (line 1). He then starts to elicit more information in line 3. In response to the question, Gale displays trouble producing the place where she goes jogging. She demonstrates her word search by the lengthened

“a:::”, and a major pause of 6.0 second long. As she projects the delay, Gale shifts gaze away from the teacher and simultaneously produces a “characteristic thinking face”, suggesting she is engaged in a “solitary” word search (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986). In other words, she is using her facial gesture to tell her recipients that she is trying to recall the word on her own. Following the long silence, she finally produces the word she has been trying to recall “healthy club”. Subsequently, the teacher acknowledges her answer and simultaneously resumes the original topic.

In this instance, we see that although the speaker delays her talk to search for a word, she completes it by herself. The recipient does not interpose while she is searching for the word she needs. Cases like this one, where the word search is self-initiated and self-completed, occur by and large in the data. Although they are worth investigating (see Carroll 2006 for an elaborated analysis on this type of word searches), they are excluded in the present study. I have chosen to focus on those instances where the search is resolved through the collaboration of the participants in talk. In such cases, a word search is first initiated, and at some point, another participant at talk offers a candidate word that, if accepted, resolves the communication breakdown. Such a sequence is often referred to as one specific type of repair, self-initiated, other completed repair (Schegloff et al. 1979). In CA word search studies, it is sometimes termed “collaborative word search” (Carroll 2006) or “participatory word search” (Oelschlaeger & Damico, 2000). In her analysis on word searches in NNS-NS talk, Kurhilar (2006) pointed out the need to make a restriction in order to get a sharper scope of cases. She chose to focus only on what she refers as “substantial word searches” (ibid., p.147), where the speaker and the recipient(s) are involved in the resolution. According to Kurhilar, using the definition from CA literature—disruptions in turn—constructional units preceded by pauses or hesitations to build a collection of word searches in NNS data could be problematic. She points out speech perturbations are very common in NNS talk and therefore it is likely that almost all turns produced by NNS could have been identified as word searches. It is therefore necessary to make some type of restricting definition when building the collection. In this thesis, the selection of word search examples is made based on Kurhilar’s (2006) notion of substantial word searches, but for ease of expression I will call these cases “collaborative word search”.

A total of 62 collaborative word searches are identified from the present data. In section 4.2, I will select some of these extracts to illustrate how the participants jointly resolve a

word search. The analysis of these examples will cover, (1) how do the speakers mark their word finding difficulty and extend an invitation for co-participation? (2) how do the recipients, formulate their co-participation according to the speaker's verbal and non-verbal conducts? (3) how do the participants indicate that a word search is resolved and resume the original talk? Section 4.3 will illustrate the instances when the word search results in an explicit pedagogical talk, displaying the participants' orientation to learning and teaching. In section 4.4, I will describe a different type of word search identified from the data. In these instances, although the speakers manage to produce their own candidate solution to the word search, they frame it as uncertainty and elicit the teacher's confirmation on the correctness or appropriateness of the word they have just produced. These word searches are organized differently from the collaborative word searches described in section 4.2. They constitute a sub-dataset and are illustrated in a separated section. A total of 14 instances are identified from the present data.

## 4.2 The Organization and Accomplishment of Word Searches

The examined data show that each collaborative word search sequence is unique in its own way and can only be analyzed and understood within its sequential context. But a close look at these instances also reveals a basic sequential format: (1) first of all, the speaker displays difficulties in finding a word and extends an invitation for collaboration, (2) following the initiation, another participant, either the teacher or a peer, joins the word search by offering the searched-for word. However, the successful candidate word does not always come right after the speaker's initial word search turn. Sometimes, further negotiation is needed in order to identify the missing word. Thus the sequence is expanded into more turns, (3) after the right candidate word is proffered, the speaker confirms the word by uttering the token "yah", or repeating the word, or nodding, indicating the word search is resolved. (4) After the confirmation, the participants resume the main sequential action. A prototypical illustration of the basic format is shown in extract 2.

### Extract 2 tomb/TJO/ 131107(1)

This extract is taken from a teacher-led discussion activity where the class is talking about superstitions in different countries.

1	Farah:	[I- ]I
2		hear:d if you not married
3	Tjo:	mm-hmm
4	Farah:	hhh if you die:d(.)£you can't:£(2.5) ((laugh))

5 LL ((laugh with Farah))  
 6 Farah: you can't-  
 7 + looks back at T, maintains gaze at T through  
 8 line 19  
 9 Tjo: ((clear throats))  
 10 → Farah: your uh your body can not-(0.1) put in the  
 11 your family↑:::  
 12 +draws a square in the air; looks at T  
 13 → Tjo: tomb  
 14 → Farah: ya family tomb  
 15 +nodding and draw a square in the air again  
 16 Tjo: okay  
 17 Farah: just women

Farah is telling the class about a superstition concerning unmarried women in Taiwanese culture. She enters into a word search at the end of her turn in line 11, indicated by the sound stretch “*family*↑:::” and an iconic gesture. She maintains her gaze at the teacher while she is stretching the sound and gesturing, making the teacher’s co-completion of her turn relevant. In other words, she is inviting the teacher to supply the word she needs. The teacher provides the candidate word “tomb” in the next turn and Farah subsequently confirms its appropriateness by producing a token “*yah*” and nodding her head. She also repeats the word. Following the confirmation the participants resume to the interrupted course of action: telling about a Taiwanese culture. In this rather compact instance, we can observe the basic format as described above: (1) in line 11 the speaker initiates a word search and invites collaboration; (2) in line 13 the teacher joins the word search by offering a candidate word “tomb”; (3) in line 14 the speaker accepts the word; (4) subsequently, the participants return to the original talk, in line 17.

In this section I will use some selected examples to describe the sequential organization, from the initiation to the resumption of the original talk, in order to illustrate how a word search is collaboratively resolved. However, it should be noted that although there is a basic format among these examples, i.e. initiating a word search and requesting help, offering a candidate solution, and displaying acceptance, the specific ways the participants use to perform these actions are various (e.g. using L1 or gesture to elicit a candidate solution, accepting the candidate word by repeating it or displaying a token). Thus I will elaborate each phase in order to address the following questions: (1) what are the resources the speakers use to mark their word finding trouble and extend an invitation for co-participation?, (2) how do the recipients (teacher and/or a peer), formulate their co-participation according to speakers’ verbal and nonverbal conducts?

(3) how do the participants indicate a word search is resolved and resume the original talk?

This section will be divided into three sub-sections. In section 4.2.1, I will first examine basic word search instances. By basic word search, I mean the instances where a successful outcome is supplied after the speaker's initial search turn. I will select some of the instances to illustrate the word search sequence and also to look at the various ways the participants use to initiate a word search and extend an invitation for co-participation. In section 4.2.2, I will illustrate extended word search instances. By extended word search, I mean the instances where the successful outcome comes after further clarification of the source of trouble. The focus of the analysis in this section is to highlight how the participants continue to negotiate with each other to make the missing word identifiable. Finally, in section 4.2.3, I will present two deviate instances where the learners display that they are unable to confirm the candidate word, highlighting the linguistic asymmetry between the learners and the teacher.

#### **4.2.1 Basic Word Searches**

In this sub-section, I present the basic word search examples according to the way the speakers organize their initial search turn in order to illustrate the various resources they use to elicit a collaborative solution. In the data, the learners' initial turn in a word search is typically delivered in a disfluent manner. They self-interrupt in the mid-course of a TCU with "speech perturbations" (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977; Brouwer 2003) such as sound stretches, various turn holding markers (e.g. um, uh, etc.), cut-offs, pauses and repetitions to signal some trouble ahead. In many of the cases, but not always, these perturbations are accompanied with gaze withdrawal from the recipients to show the speakers' attempt to find the word by themselves. Such a practice is often referred as a "solitary word search" (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986) or "self-directed search" (Kurhila 2006). Iconic gesture is another resource which is observed in the learners' initial search turn. The speaker uses it to represent a certain feature of the searched for word item therefore narrowing down the range of possible candidates. The learners also sometimes explicitly express their lack of the word with verbal expressions such as "how can I say", "what is it", "I don't know" etc. It is also found that, Chinese (the learners shared L1), occurs regularly in their initiation turn. They either implicitly request the missing word through merely uttering its Chinese equivalent or explicitly

request the word by producing a syntactic question in Chinese. Finally, they also display verbal attempt to formulate the lexical item in their initial search, which not only indicates their word search but also provides important information about the target word. It is important to note that each practice does not appear alone. It often happens that the speakers use multiple resources to initiate their word searches. Now I am using eight examples (extracts 3-10) to illustrate the various resources used by the learners to design their initial search turn and their sequential development.

### Extract 3 tomb/TJO/ 131107(1)

(Extract 2 is reproduced here as extract 3)

This extract is taken from a teacher-led discussion activity where the class is talking about superstitions about unmarried women in different countries. Prior to this extract, the teacher asked the class if anyone knows anything negative affecting unmarried woman in Taiwan. Farah volunteers to tell the class a superstition about unmarried women in the Taiwanese culture in line 1.

1 Farah: [I- ] I  
 2 hear:d [if you not married  
 3 Tjo: mm hmm  
 4 Farah: hhh if you die:d(.)£you can't:£(2.5)  
 5 + Farah glances through T  
 6 and other peers  
 7 LL ((laugh with Farah))  
 8 Farah: you can't-  
 9 + looks back at T, maintains gaze at T through  
 10 line 17  
 11 Tjo: ((clear throats))  
 12 Farah: your uh your body can not-(0.1) put in the  
 13 → your family↑:::  
 14 +draws a square in the air; looks at T  
 15 Tjo: tomb.  
 16 Farah: yah. [family tomb.  
 17 +nodding +draw a square in the air again  
 18 Tjo: okay.  
 19 Farah: just women.

In lines 1 through 13 Farah seems to have some trouble formulating her narrative, indicated by the disfluency in her turn but she manages to move it forward. Despite the hesitancy and some linguistic errors, the content of her talk is rather clear so far (i.e., if you not married if you died your body cannot put in your family:::). Towards the end of her turn, she initiates a word search through a sound stretch (“*family:::*”) but she frames her word search as a collaborative word search through her gaze. Specifically, she looks at the teacher while stretching the sound, making his co-participation relevant (cf. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986). Thus rather than using the sound stretch to hold the turn to achieve self-repair, which is a preferred outcome in ordinary conversations, the speaker here seems to use the sound stretch as an interactional device to elicit the

recipient to take a turn at talk. Following the sound stretch, the teacher quickly supplies the word “tomb” with certainty as indicated by the falling intonation, thereby completing Farah’s unfinished turn. In the next turn, Farah confirms and accepts the word with multiple practices such as head nods, yah, and repetition, indicating the termination of the word search (lines 16-17). In line 18, the teacher acknowledges Farah’s telling with a token “okay”. In line 19, Farah continues her narrative by adding additional information “just woman”, indicating the resumption of the original talk. It is important to note that in her attempt to invite co-participation, Farah does not only mobilize a sound stretch and gaze but also employs an iconic gesture, i.e. she draws a square in the air while initiating the word search. By providing a nonverbal description of the searched-for-item she provides a crucial feature of the missing word for the teacher, i.e. it is something with a square shape, thereby narrowing down the range of possible candidate solution. It is possibly the reason why the teacher can quickly supply the target word with certainty immediately after the first hitch. But of course it cannot be denied that other contextual clues, for example the words used in the preceding talk, such as “die”, “body” and “put”, also contribute to making the missing word more identifiable.

Another interesting observation with regard to the iconic gesture in Farah’s initiation turn is its timing. It comes before the sound stretch. This implies her word search may emerge earlier than the verbal word search indicator, that is, before the sound stretch on the word “family”. Non -lexical speech perturbations such as sound stretch and “uh”s or “um”s, are often observed as the first indicator of a repair initiation. (cf. Carroll 2006; Schegloff et al. 1977 ). However, Carroll (2006, p.244) suggests that it is not always the case if we examine the speakers’ embodied actions closely. He notes that embodied displays of word search initiation occasionally precede audio repair initiators in his data and he uses two examples to illustrate how the speakers preannounce their word search through gaze aversion before the production of sound stretches. This study confirms his finding but provides a different kind of non-verbal evidence, i.e. an iconic gesture.

One final interesting note to add in relation to gesture is that that Farah does not only draw a square while initiating a word search, she does it again while repeating the word “*family tomb*” in her confirmation turn (line 16). Thus we see a different way of confirming the candidate solution in a word search which is not reported in the previous literature. The use of multiple verbal and non-verbal practices to acknowledge the

teacher's contribution, i.e. the token "yah", repeating the candidate word, nodding, and the iconic gesture, also suggests her strong agreement with the candidate word.

In sum, this extract demonstrates how the speaker deploys various practices, i.e. a sound stretch, gaze, and an iconic gesture in her initial search turn to successfully elicit a collaborative solution from the recipient. In the next example, the speaker also displays non-lexical speech perturbations and an iconic gesture in his initial search, but he does not directly invite the recipient's co-participation.

#### **Extract 4 erase /TAR/161107(1)**

The teacher has just finished teaching a sentence pattern and had the students practice this pattern. He is now going to erase what he has written on the whiteboard to close the teaching sequence.

1 Tar: can I erase this?  
2 (0.8)  
3 Samue: yes=  
4 Eldon: =yes of course  
5 Tar: and ↑Morgan (1.5) don't make me write this again  
okay?  
6 Morgan: okay no problem=  
7 Tar: =I really hope you can remember this pattern=  
8 → Samuel: =maybe you-(0.2) Morgan can help you u::h  
9 +looks towards T +slightly moves  
10 his gaze away  
11 (1.5)  
12 +Samuel leans towards the white board, raises his  
right  
13 hand, makes a gesture of wiping something up and  
down  
14 >↑bru[sh< the-  
15 + moves gaze towards T, rises his eyebrows;  
16 Tar: [erase?=  
17 Samuel: =[erase the-(.) <board> to wake him up ((laugh))  
18 Eldon: =[erase  
19 Tar: that's a great idea  
20 ((every one laughs))

The teacher checks if the students still need the notes on the whiteboard in line 1. Two students confirm individually in line 3 and 4. Afterwards, the teacher addresses Morgan, the one who has made the most mistakes while practicing this sentence pattern, reminding him not to forget this language pattern again. Morgan accepts it in line 6 and the teacher emphasizes his point again in the next turn. Subsequently, Samuel suggests to the teacher that Morgan can help him do something, perhaps as a punishment, but he encounters a moment of word search. He displays the trouble in producing the missing item (the thing that Morgan can do to help the teacher) through a turn holding device

“*u::h*”, and a pause of 1.5 second (lines 8 and 11). Note that the pause here is not an empty moment but is filled with his embodied actions. He leans and looks towards the whiteboard and mimics the action of erasing something. These verbal and nonverbal features make it obvious that he is searching for a word. However, unlike the previous instance, he does not frame his word search as a collaborative one by maintaining mutual gaze with his main recipient, the teacher. Rather, he displays that he is engaged in a solitary word search through gaze withdrawal from the teacher (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986). That is to say, he is trying to recall the word. After the temporary interruption, Samuel redirects his gaze towards the teacher and produces his own solution (“*brush*”) and continues to talk, in line 14. At about the same time when he utters “*brush*”, the teacher also supplies a candidate word “*erase*”, which overlaps with Samuel’s solution (line 16). Upon hearing the teacher’s candidate word, Samuel stops talking as shown by the cut-off (the-). Subsequently he accepts the teacher’s candidate solution by immediately incorporating it into the unfinished turn that is temporarily interrupted by the search (line 14). The word search then comes to an end.

This extract differs from the previous one in terms of the speaker’s eye gaze. Note that, in this example, Samuel’s gaze does not send out any invitation message while he is struggling to find the word, i.e. he is not looking at the teacher. It has been suggested that during a word search maintaining eye gaze is an important indicator of inviting collaboration while gaze aversion typically suggests a self-directed search on the part of the speaker (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Kurhila 2006). In this instance, the teacher nevertheless offers a candidate word without Samuel’s direct solicitation. This suggests that the recipient can play a more active role by taking part in the word search when they have a candidate word ready even though there is no explicit sign of appeal such as eye contact or a wh-question.

There is some other difference between these two instances. In this instance, the teacher’s candidate solution is marked as a guess, while in extract 4 it is produced with certainty. Such a difference seems to relate to the timing of the contribution. According to Lerner (1996, p. 262), contributions which are made immediately after the word search begins are usually marked as “assertedly correct” with falling intonation. In contrast, delayed contributions are more often marked as a “try-marked” guess with rising intonation. In this instance, the teacher’s candidate word arrives well after the

onset of the word search and therefore it is not surprising that it is produced with less certainty.

In sum, the two examples above demonstrate how the learners deploy non-lexical speech permutations as well as nonverbal resources, i.e. gaze and iconic gesture, to initiate a word search and elicit a collaborative solution. In both cases, the recipient provides a candidate solution right after the speaker produces an iconic gesture, with or without gaze invitation, suggesting that providing hints in the initial search turn (e.g. displaying relevant iconic gesture) is crucial in soliciting the recipient's collaborative solution. This is particularly evident in extract 5 where the speaker has not provided enough contextual clues in his preceding talk (i.e., Morgan can help you u::h). Thus the key to the successful completion of the word search in this example lies in the display of the iconic gesture.

In the previous two examples, the recipient's candidate solution comes right after the non-lexical speech perturbations. But at times the speakers' trouble source turn may become extended due to an unsuccessful solitary search. Consider the following example:

### **Extract 5 behaviour / TED/131107/**

(This is an audio only recoding)

Tracy is telling the teacher about a bad experience she had. Tracy and her husband were once stopped by a police officer at midnight while they were driving home. The police officer was rude while talking to them so when he asked them to show their driving licence, they refused. Instead, they asked the police officer to show his ID first. Tracy was the only student who came to the class on the day of filming so there are only two participants, Tracy and the teacher, in this dialogue.

1 Tracy: and (0.5) and he said okay this is my  
identification.  
2 Ted: mm-hmm,  
3 Tracy: and: I now I I think uh I- we start talk about the-  
4 → uh I think you have to:: you have to:: u::h to::  
5 → (1.0) °°to= to::° ° °ca::re about::t° your::(0.5)  
6 your::(1.2) °°what is ↓that?°° ((a frustration sound))  
7 I forget WHA:::T((screaming voice))(1.5) it-=  
8 Ted: =you were telling the police officer(.) he needed  
9 to care about his: (0.2) behaviour?=  
10 Tracy: =behaviour ((exciting voice))  
11 Ted: cares about his beha↑viour m[m  
12 Tracy: [ya behaviour  
13 Ted: mm-hmm  
14 Tracy: and uh if you want us to do anything you should

In line 1, Tracy reproduces what the police officer said when he was asked to show his ID (the “he” in line 1 refers to the police officer.). After receiving a continuer “*mm-hmm*” (Gardner 2001) from the teacher, she continues her story telling. In line 4, in attempting to reproduce what she said to the police officer (I think you have to:), she displays major difficulties in completing her turn, as shown in the “*u::h*”, a pause of one second, and the extensive use of sound stretches and repetitions (lines 4-6). The stretch on each “*to::*” strongly projects the next relevant term is a verb phrase. Indeed, after the final “*to::*”, she produces a verb phrase “*ca::re abou::t*”, making her interrupted turn precede forward (I think you have to care about). However, as she continues, she runs into difficulty again, initiating another search as shown in the immediately following speech perturbations, including repetitions, sound stretches, and pauses in lines 5-6 (“*your::(0.5) your::(1.2)*”). It seems that she has foreseen the second problem when she produces the word “care about”, as evident in the sound stretch. She seems to stretch the word in order to gain more time to retrieve the next item. After the prolonged delay, she still cannot come up with the target word, and the teacher does not provide any help either. Subsequently, she produces some additional talk (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986), i.e., a wh-question “*what is that?*” and a meta linguistic comment “*I forget WHA::T?*”. The way she utters “*WHA::T?*” (loud voice, emphasize, and sound stretch) as well as the frustration sound preceding it suggest her great frustration with the extensive unsuccessful initial search. The teacher eventually supplies a candidate word “behaviour” in line 9 after Tracy produces another 1.5 second silence and a cut-off (it-). It is formatted as a guess, indicating his uncertainty. This is not surprising since it comes well after the onset of the word search (Lerner 1996). In the next turn, Tracy immediately confirms it by repeating it with an exciting tone, showing her excitement of obtaining the word after a prolonged initial search. It is interesting to note that the confirmation is rather marked in this instance. The speaker, Tracy, confirms it twice (lines 10 and 12). The teacher also confirms it (line 11).

As there is no video information we do not know whether or not Tracy invites the teacher to join the word search via gaze. But when the speaker’s initial search becomes elaborated, gaze may not play a crucial role in eliciting co-participation. The extensive initial search and Tracy’s verbalization of “*I forgot what*” make it clear that she is not

succeeding in her solitary search, and if she cannot find the word someone else in the talk has to so that the conversation can continue. This knowledge can implicitly invite the teacher to assist with Tracy's word search even though there is no direct verbal or gaze invitation. The implicit invitation and its collaborative response also demonstrate a basic but important character of communication. It shows communication is fundamentally collaborative in nature.

The interrogative in line 6 (°°what is ↓that?°°) deserves special attention. Previous literature of word search has reported wh-questions produced in a word search environment as explicit word search indicators ( e.g. Brouwer 2003; Kurhila 2006). Kurhila (2006, p.98) notes that by producing a wh question the speakers can overtly tell the recipients that they lack a word. Previous studies have also shown that some wh – questions, although syntactically have the form of a question, they are not necessarily treated as real questions that projects answer. It is said that when a wh-question is produced with a voice which is lower or quieter than the surrounding talk, usually accompanied by a gaze aversion, it functions as a “self-addressed ” question (cf. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Brouwer 2003; Kurhila 2006). Brouwer (2003, p.538) notes that this type of interrogative creates the impression that the speaker is not trying to direct the obligations of an interrogative to the recipient, but rather to themselves. That is to say, the speaker is not requesting the recipient to give the candidate solution through the wh-question. Rather he is displaying his attempt to retrieve the word in order to achieve self-repair. The wh -question found in the extract is more likely to be a self-addressed question with regards to its prosodic feature: it is produced in a soft voice. Unfortunately, there is no video information to further support this assumption with Tracy's gaze. But since there are only two participants in this dialogue, the lower volume is more likely to be a sign of private talk (cf. Hauser 2003; Otha 2001). Additional evidence is that the teacher does not give a response after the question and this is not oriented by Tracy as being problematic, as evident by her subsequent talk following the wh-question.

Another noticeable feature in this instance is Tracy's extensive use of repetitions and sound stretches. These repetitions, sound stretches, together with the self-directed question do not seem simply signal Tracy's word finding trouble, they are also useful interactional resources used by Tracy to organize her initial search. Specifically, instead of producing a silence, which may invite the other speaker to take the floor, Tracy

skillfully uses these resources to reserve the turn so she has more time to retrieve the target word. It is probably the reason why the teacher does not enter the halted turn earlier but gives her time to find a solution on her own.

In the previous extract we see that the speaker utters a wh-question after some speech perturbations to show her further commitment to the search. In the following section, I will present the examples where after a brief initial search the learners overtly request the searched-for-word through wh-questions. These wh-questions are either produced in English or the learners' shared L1: Chinese. I will first discuss the practice of using an English wh-question to invite co-participation. Consider the following instance taken from the data:

### **Extract 6 Steel toe /TAR/ 161107(2)**

This extract comes from a role play activity where the students need to schedule a day out with their partner. Prior to this extract, Morgan and Samuel had just finished their role play exercise. It took them a long conversation exchange to finally find a day which was free for both of them to go bowling together. After their conversation the teacher started to joke with them. He gives a comment in line 1 "you must really love bowling" to imply that that's why they were trying so hard to schedule a day out.

1 Tar: you must really love bowling.  
 2 Morgan: yah. ((laugh))  
 3 Tar: very good maybe he can give you a cigarette too.  
 4 LL: ((laugh))  
 5 Morgan: no fmy father will kill mef  
 6 LL: ((laugh))  
 7 Tar: how-how will he kill you?  
 8 Morgan: with[ his boots.  
 9 Eldon: [use the bowling ball to fkillf((laugh))  
 10 Tar: [fwith a bowling ballf  
 11 Morgan: [NO not a- not a bowling ball with his boots.  
 12 + looks at Eldon  
 13 Tar he will [kick you.  
 14 → Morgan: [and his boots] will: with a::  
 15 +Looks at Eldon +looks down  
 16 → >how can I say< "tiěp- gāng- búxiùgāng"  
 17 ((iron piece-steel-stainless steel))  
 18 +shifts gaze back to Eldon; leans slightly towards  
 19 Eldon  
 20 Eldon: (1.0)[u::h  
 21 + Morgan continues looking at Eldon  
 22 Tar: [<steel toe >  
 23 Eldon: °ye[s°  
 24 Morgan: [steel <toe> and just((makes a gesture of  
 25 Killing and then starts to smile)) and then I have  
 to

The teacher makes a joke about Morgan in line 1 and he continues to make another one in line 3. He suggests that Morgan's role play partner, Samuel, can give Morgan a cigarette when they go bowling (note: Morgan is a teenager, and he has previously mentioned in another role play activity that his father would kill him if he smoked. This is perhaps the reason why the teacher plays such a joke here.). In line 5 Morgan aligns with the joke saying that his father will kill him if he smokes. In line 7, the teacher asks him how his father will kill him, which he replies with "with his boots". Eldon also suggests another way jokingly in line 9 but Morgan rejects it and insists on his own answer (line 11). In lines 14 and 16, he attempts to explain why his father's boots can kill but he lacks a word to finish what he wants to say ("*and his boots will: with a::*"). He stretches the word "a::", projecting that he is looking for a noun to complete his turn. He has been looking at Eldon since line 11, however, he shifts his gaze away from him and looks down during the brief sound stretch, suggesting he might be engaged in a solitary search. But he soon gives up his solitary efforts and extends an invitation for Eldon's participation. He turns his gaze back to him and directly asks him "how can I say". He also provides the Chinese equivalent of the searched-for item "búxiùgāng (stainless steel) following the wh-question, clearly making the missing word identifiable to Eldon, who shares the same L1. With Morgan's gaze, Eldon knows that he is the invitee at this moment but his relevant response is delayed as indicated in the one second silence and "u::h", in line 20. It seems that he also has trouble producing the target word even though he is now a "knowing recipient" (Goodwin 1987) of the content of the searched-for-word. During the delay Morgan maintains his gaze at Eldon, continuously making his invitation relevant. After the 1.0 second silence, the teacher self-selects himself to take the turn to give the candidate word "*steel toes*" in line 22, which is delivered in an articulating way and is in overlap with Eldon's turn holding device "u::h". Upon hearing the word, Eldon gives up his turn by ceasing his up-coming talk. In the next turn, Eldon acknowledges the candidate word with an affirmative token "yes". The original searcher, Morgan, also displays his acceptance by incorporating the word to continue his talk (line 24).

In short, this instance shows how the speaker overtly requests the addressed recipient to join the word search through a wh-question and L1 equivalent of the missing word. Accompanied by a fixed gaze towards the recipient, the wh-question "how can I say", in

this instance, is interpreted as a collaboration invitation but not as a sign of further engagement in attempting to self-repair (e.g. “°what is that°” in extract 6).

The wh-question “how can I say” deserves more attention. It is very unspecific in its reference, that is, it says nothing about what kind of answer the speaker is expecting to hear. By contrast, the wh-questions used by English native speakers when they request help in finding their words are typically more specific in their referents (e.g. what’s the name of the girl? Where is it?). Jung (2004) refers to this kind of expressions as “formulaic expressions” and he states they were used by the L2 learners in his data to “initiate repair, clearly displaying production problems and appealing for the supply of L2 vocabulary”(ibid.,p.14). Almost every English wh-question used to elicit assistance in the present data comes in the form of a formulaic expression. The format of these wh-expressions varies somewhat to include “*how (what) can I say?*”, “*how (what to say)*”, and “*how to say this word?*”.

Formulaic expressions such as “*how can I say*”, “*how to say*” are observed as a common practice used by L2 speakers /learners to elicit assistance in a word search. (e.g. Brouwer 2003; Jung 2004; Park 2007). This holds true for the instances found in the present data. However, a close examination of the instances in my data also reveals an interesting finding which may not have been discussed. These formulaic expressions in my data are typically followed by verbal or /and nonverbal clues about the searched-for-word. For example, in the example above it is followed by the Chinese equivalent of the target word. As these questions usually come shortly after the speakers signal their word finding difficulties, there has not been much information about the missing word until this point; thereby it is necessary to give some clues subsequently in order to elicit a collaborative solution. Thus these formulaic wh-questions are not real questions that request an answer from the recipient. Rather, they seem to function as interactional devices to attract the recipients’ attention to the upcoming clues.

Another type of wh-invitations observed in the word searches in the present data is L1 wh-questions when the speaker requests a translation from their peer. When they extend their invitation through L1 wh-questions, they stop and wait for the candidate word. A prototypical example of L1 wh-invitation is seen in extract 7.

## Extract 7 I can't manage my money /TAR/ 161107(1)

This extract is taken from a role play activity where the students are practicing how to make a polite refusal. Eldon is acting someone who is asking Morgan to donate money to their organization, and Morgan has to make an excuse to refuse this request.

- 1 Eldon: please only one thousand NT dollars only one  
£thousand  
2 NT dollar £not one bi- one £million NT dollars£  
3 [((laugh))  
4 Morgan: [£no I can't no I can't £  
5 +looks at Eldon  
6 → becau- u:h it can not °er::h°  
7 +puts his hand on the forehead, looks  
away  
8 °wǒ bùnéng zuòzhǔ zěnměijiǎng a?°  
9 +shifts gaze to Eldon, holds it at Eldon  
10 ((How to say not up to me))  
11 Eldon: (0.5)  
12 Morgan: ° zuò[zhǔ °  
13 +looks at Eldon and writes the two Chinese words in  
14 the air  
15 ((up to someone))  
16 Eldon: [u::h(1.3) °zuòzhǔ °= ((tr. up to someone)  
17 +withdraws gaze from Morgan  
18 I can not:, (5.0)  
19 +looks down, keeps looking down, brings his gaze  
20 back to Morgan briefly, then puts his head down  
again))  
21 um:: bùzhīdào ei= ((I don't know))  
22 +looks back to Morgan and then brings gaze to  
teacher  
23 Samuel: =I can't manage my money.=  
24 Morgan: =°yeah° [ >°°I can't manage my money°°< ]  
25 Eldon: [ °o↑:h°  
26 Tar: [↓oh you ↑don't ]control your money?

Prior to this extract, Eldon asked Morgan to donate one thousand NT dollars to their organization but it was rejected by Morgan with the reason that he was experiencing financial difficulties. Eldon did not give up but kept persuading him. He further suggested that Morgan could ask his parents to give him some money since they were rich people (jokingly). In the beginning of this extract, Eldon makes the request again. Morgan turns it down with “no I can't no I can't” (line 4). While attempting to explain that he cannot use the money (owned by his parents) at his will, Morgan displays trouble in continuing his talk (line 6). He self-interrupts his turn with a stretched “er::h” after “it can not”, indicating the delay of the next word due. As soon as he starts to utter “er::h”, he directs his gaze away from his role play partner, whom he has been looking at, and at the same time putting his hand on his forehead, displaying a characteristic “thinking face” ( Goodwin and Goodwin 1986). Specifically, he is informing the recipients that he is trying to resolve the problem by himself. But he is not

able to produce the target word after the brief disengagement and he then turns to Eldon for help. He brings his gaze back to Eldon and at the same time directly requests him to provide the word he needs in their shared L1 in the form of a wh question, i.e. *wǒ bùnéng zuòzhǔ zěnmejiǎng a ?*” (tr. How to say it’s not up to me?). But Eldon does not take the turn as indicated by the 0.5 second silence, in line 11. The lack of response is oriented to by Morgan as being problematic so *he* initiates a self-repair in his subsequent action: he repeats the main part of the syntactic question, i.e. “*zuòzhǔ*” (tr. *it’s up to me*) to Eldon. By doing so, he makes Eldon’s response relevant again. This time Eldon does take the turn; however he is unable to offer the candidate translation so he starts his own word search. This is displayed by “*u:h*”, a repetition of the target word “*zuòzhǔ*” in a quiet voice, a verbal attempt to produce the target phrase “*I can not:*”, a long pause of 5 seconds, and another turn holding device “*u:m*”. His involvement in a solitary word search can also be seen by his embodied display. He turns his head away from Morgan as soon as he starts his search, and as his solitary search continues, he looks down most of the time. After the prolonged search, he officially announces he has abandoned pursuing the word by verbally claiming he does not know how to say the word (line 21). It is notable that no one attempts to take the turn during the long silence of five seconds. It is only at the precise moment when Eldon announces he does not know how to say the word that another student, Samuel, takes the turn to supply the candidate solution “*I can’t manage my money*”. It has been observed in the previous studies on L1 English word searches that other participants usually do not jump in until the speaker signals their failure and invites co-participation verbally or non-verbally (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Lerner 1996). Here we see that the language learners are acting exactly the same. It shows that they are competent speakers who are able to mobilize interactional strategies and resources to co-construct their talk. In line 24, Morgan immediately accepts Samuel’s candidate word by uttering an agreement token “*ya*” and repeating the word. Eldon also displays his new understanding of the successful outcome by uttering a change of state token “*o↑:h*” in line 24 ( Heritage 1984a). Subsequently the original talk is resumed by the teacher, in line 26.

Unlike the formulaic expression “how can I say” in the previous extract, the L1 wh-invitation shown in this extract is very specific in terms of its reference. It contains the target word in L1 thus making it clear to the addressed recipient what the notion of the missing word is. Therefore there is no need for the speaker to clarify the meaning in the

subsequent talk. Across the data this is the most explicit way of requesting the candidate word. It occurs more regularly than the practice of inviting through formulaic expressions. It seems to be very efficient as it not only explicitly extends an invitation but also simultaneously provides clues about the target word. However, it should be noted that although the notion of the searched-for-word is made clear through the L1 resource, it does not guarantee that the addressed recipient knows how to say the word in the target language even though they shared the same L1. For example in this extract, the addressed recipient, Eldon, cannot provide the word. It is another peer who does the job. It is also possible that none of the learners know how to say the word in the target language. When it happens, further clarification is needed in order to make the word identifiable to the teacher who is a native English speaker. This phenomenon will be illustrated in section in section 4.2.2.

A final additional comment is that these L1 wh-invitations observed in the present data are typically uttered in a lower volume. It seems that the speaker is marking the request as a private exchange between him /her and the addressed recipient (c.f. Hancock 1997).

In the present data, the learners' shared L1, Chinese, is the most common linguistic resource used by them to resolve their word finding difficulties. We have seen in extract 6, the speaker utters a formulaic expression "how can I say" and the L1 equivalent of the searched-for-word to elicit the recipient's participation. In extract 7, the speaker directly produces a L1 wh- question to request a translation to complete his word search. Apart from these two practices, the learners in the data also use L1 to invite a translation in a more implicit way. That is, they replace the missing word with its Chinese equivalent to complete their initial search turn. However, these Chinese words are typically treated as being "marked constituent" (Kurhila 2006, p.109) which need to be oriented to after they are produced. The following examples illustrate the point.

### **Extract 8 Fridge/ TAR/131107(2)**

(This is an audio only recording)

The class is about to do a role play activity where one offers drink or food and the other person rejects it politely. Before this extract the teacher was warming up the activity by asking the students whether they have been in an situation where they are offered something to eat when they visit someone else's house . Morgan volunteers to answer the teacher's question as shown in line 1.

1 Morgan: u:h I went to my friend's house an:d his father sa:y do



evident in the next turn. In both cases, an English translation is offered (line 5 and line 16, respectively), which is then confirmed by the speakers through repetition (line 6 and line 17, respectively). Another evidence to support the assumption that these L1 utterances are only temporary placeholders (Okamoto 2010) that need further comment, is their prosodic feature. In both cases the L1 is produced in a quieter voice. Kurhila (2006) found that one of the features of “loan words” ( she uses “loan word” to replace the term “code switching”) in her data is that they are pronounced in a soft or normal voice. She suggests that by marking them unstressed, in comparison with the real solution which is typically stressed, the speakers treat them not as the resolution itself but as a means to find the resolution. That is to say, these loan words are projected as “material to be processed further“ ( *ibid.*, p. 111). The Chinese words used in the word search environment in the present data are also typically pronounced in a soft voice, supporting Kurhila’s finding.

The way in which Chinese phrases are treated as something that needs further attention is particularly revealing in extract 10. Morgan has been looking at the textbook while he is answering the teacher’s question, but he shifts his gaze to Eldon while he starts to display his word finding difficulty “*have a::(0.2)correct*” in line 10. He then continues looking at Eldon while uttering the Chinese word. The gaze shift to the non-main recipient can be interpreted as an invitation for him to respond to the word. However, Eldon does not say anything. His lack of response might be because he is not aware of Morgan’s gaze invitation since he has been looking down. During the silence, Morgan continues looking at Eldon, making his invitation attempt even more salient. Although the invited recipient does not respond, another student, Samuel, self-selects himself to take the turn to provide the translation. The fact that he does so without being invited makes it even clearer that the Chinese word is not oriented as an unmarked element.

In sum, these examples show another way of using L1 as a resource to signal and invite a word search. They are less explicit in comparison with the examples described in extract 6 and 7, but the recipients seem to have developed a shared practice of supplying the missing word even though when it is not framed by a wh-question.

So far we have seen cases where the speakers either supply iconic gestures or L1 as resources for their recipients to formulate their collaborative solution. In these cases,



The prolonged pause at the end of line 2 deserves special attention. It is the longest one found in the initial search turns in the data. Although Gale does not make other collaboration relevant (i.e., she has been looking down without making any eye contact with anyone else.), a long pause of seven seconds itself can be seen as an invitation by others to jump in and take the speaker's turn. It may be particularly inviting to teachers as silence is often seen as a threat to them. As pointed out by Walsh (2002, p.12):

*“silence, to many teachers, may be threatening, a sign of weakness, perhaps, or indication that they are simply not doing their job”.*

By not entering Gale's turn during the silence, the teacher allows her time to think. From the perspective of teaching and learning, teacher's extended wait-time is highly valued (see, for example, Seedhouse and Walsh 2010). In the environment of learner's word search, allowing silence is important too because sometimes learners do know the word but they simply need more time to retrieve it. The positive result of the extended wait-time in this extract is seen in its subsequent sequential development. More specifically, after the long pause Gale manages to retrieve some part of the target word. Although the partial retrieval is not a successful self-repair itself, it has provided crucial information to help the teacher identify the searched-for word.

So far, we have seen how the speakers use various resources to elicit the recipients' cooperation, and how the recipients make use of the resources provided by the speakers to formulate their collaborative solution. In these cases, another participant (either the addressed one or others) is able to identify the source of the trouble and provide the right candidate word after the speakers' initial search turn, either in the format of an asserted correct answer (i.e. extract 4,7,8,9,and 10) or a guess (extracts 5,6, and 11).Although gaze and wh-questions were often reported as important interactional techniques to invite co-participation (e.g. Oelschlaeger 1999), the above analysis shows that another crucial factor to determine a successful collaboration is the hint given by the speaker in their initial search turn.

#### **4.2.2 Extended Word Searches**

Section 4.2.1 presents eight basic word search instances to show how the participants jointly resolve the word search. In this section, I will use four extended word search

instances to demonstrate how the recipients continue negotiating with others to achieve a successfully outcome.

### Extract 11 make a financial report /TAR/161107(1)

This extract is a continuation of extract 7. Please refer to extract 7 for the preceding talk.

1 Samuel: =I can't manage my money.=  
 2 Morgan: =°yah° [>°°°I can't manage my money°°°<]  
 3 Eldon: [°o↑oh°  
 4 Tar: [↓oh you ↑don't]control your money?  
 5 Morgan: I can't because my::jus- I have a pocket money but I  
 6 → every week I have a:: tch °bàozhàng zěnmejiǎng?°  
 7 +frown eyebrows, +shift gaze to Eldon  
 8 looks down)) ((how to say make a  
 9 financial report?))  
 10 Eldon: (2.0) °erh::°=  
 11 +shifts gaze from Morgan after a brief eye contact  
 12 and then puts his head down  
 13 Tar: =you only receive pocket money from your parents?  
 14 Morgan: (0.5) no just- I have to tell my frie:nd- the- tell my  
 15 f- tell my my my parents what what's (0.2) er my money  
 16 spend spend on what [what ]thing  
 17 Eldon: [he has- ] he have to::-  
 18 Tar: has to  
 19 Eldon: he oh- he has to:(.)exchanging his(.)evidence to next  
 20 month huhhuh  
 21 Tar: he has to prepare a financial report?  
 22 Eldon: [YA hehehe  
 23 Samuel: [heh heh he fin[an(h)cial re(h)port  
 24 Morgan: [like that  
 25 ((nodding// points to T))  
 26 Tar: >°for his paren(h)ts°< =

Morgan and Eldon were conducting a role play exercise prior to this extract. Eldon was persuading Morgan to give some money. He suggests to Morgan that it should not be a problem for him as he has rich parents. But Morgan refused. He wanted to explain that he does not own the money so he cannot use it without permission, but he did not know how to say it in English. He then code switched to L1 to request help. In line 1, Samuel translates what he wanted to say into English, which is then confirmed by Morgan subsequently. The confirmation indicates the resolution of the word search problems. In line 4, the teacher initiates a repair (“*you don't control your money?*”) to elicit Morgan's further clarification on what he has said. Morgan confirms his understanding and then starts to explain why he does not control his money in lines 5 through 7. However, in his explanation, he runs in to a word search as shown in the sound stretch “a:” and a frustration token “tch”. Following the delay, he explicitly requests Eldon to supply the searched-for-word with a L1 wh- question “*bàozhàng zěnmejiǎng?*”, in line 6. However Eldon is not able to provide the word. He then starts to engage in his own

search as displayed by a long silence and a turn holding device “(2.0) °erh::° “, as well as his gaze aversion. Note that although he is unable to offer any candidate word, Eldon displays his alignment with the word search through initiating his own. Such an action extends the on-going word search, making the word search activity more interactionally salient. In the next turn another recipient, the teacher, joins the word search activity, but not with a candidate word. Rather he initiates a repair on Morgan’s preceding talk to clarify his understanding. Triggered by the teacher’s repair initiation, Morgan starts to clarify the meaning of his trouble source by paraphrasing it in lines 14 through 16. Eldon also aligns with Morgan’s action to offer another circumlocution (lines 19-20), demonstrating that he is also a “knowing participant” (Goodwin 1987) of the content of the trouble source. Prompted by the further elaboration provided by Morgan and Eldon, the teacher is able to make a successful guess of what Morgan intends to say even though he does not recognize the Chinese phrase: *bàozhàng*, in line 21. His guess is subsequently accepted by Eldon and Morgan at the same time (line 21 and 23), indicating the trouble is successfully resolved.

In this instance, we see that a word search results in a further meaning negotiation process when the speaker’s initial talk does not successfully elicit the searched-for word. Thus the word search sequence is expanded into more turns where the participants continue to clarify the meaning of the trouble source in order to achieve mutual understanding.

I now present another example of extended word searches. It is the most elaborated one found in the data.

**Extract 12/ Tray /TJO/131107(1)**

This extract is taken from a teacher-led discussion activity where the class are talking about superstition in different countries. Christine is telling the class about a wedding tradition in Taiwan. Legend says that the bride is protected by the bridal god, giving her the highest status on the day. Hence, her head cannot be exposed to the sun. Therefore, when the bride leaves the house, the match maker must either use a bamboo sieve or black umbrella to cover the bride’s head while escorting her to the bridal car. When the bridal car arrives at the groom’s house, the match maker will do the same to assist the bride enter the groom’s house.

1 Christine: [umbrella- =black umbrella  
 2 → or some- u:m tch=  
 3 +draws a flat circle, +shifts gaze to Joyce

4 in the air displays a frustrating  
5 facial expression

6 Joyce: =yah.

7 Christine: I don't know how to say [that.  
8 +shifts gaze to teacher, maintains gaze at him  
9 most of the time through line 22

10 Tjo [o::r  
11 +looks at Christine

12 Christine: (0.2) u:h ((makes the gesture of holding  
13 something at two ends, moving it around))

14 Tjo: ((mimics Christine's gesture))

15 Christine: °someth[ing]°[ROU:::::ND]made of(0.2)bamboo  
16 +draws a big  
17 flat circle

18 Joyce: [a] [ROU:::::ND]  
19 +draws a big  
20 flat circle

21 Pearl [((laugh))

22 Tjo: ((thinking face))

23 Christine: and and with ↑hole small hole and sometime  
24 we::: (0.5)  
25 +shifts gaze to Joyce, display a frustrating  
26 facial expression

27 Joyce: we use to:: this u::h  
28 + makes the gesture of holding  
29 something at two ends, moving it around

30 Farah: ((laughs))

31 Tjo: ((gives a white board marker to Christine))

32 Christine: draw?((Christine takes it and walks to the  
33 white board))

34 Joyce: you never seen it?((talks to teacher))

35 Tjo: I-I-I might once I see the dra(hh)wing I hh  
36 kno(hh)w what it(hh)is hehe  
37 ((everyone laughs))

38 Christine: a↑round and(0.5)and very ↑very  
39 [small holes((talking and drawing at the same  
40 time))

41 Joyce: [small holes yes ((nodding))  
42 ((Christine keeps drawing, and everyone is  
43 looking at her drawing))

44 Farah ° ah ° ((nodding))

45 Tjo: like a basket?

46 Joyce [basket?

47 Christine: [not like but it's flat=  
48 =it's flat(.) like a <tray>

49 Joyce: ° like a [tray°

50 Farah: [yah yah=[yah=yah((noddinh))

51 Tjo: [like a tray [o::↑:h okay

52 Christine: [like a tray and they pu:t on- under their  
53 head to avoid the ↑sun (0.5) to see the bride

54 Tjo: oh okay all right

Christine wants to tell the class that the match maker will hold a black umbrella or “something” when the bride steps out of the car, but she has trouble naming this particular something. This is displayed through the cut-offs “some-” and a turn holding device “u::m”, in line 2. She also projects her word search by drawing a flat circle in the air, suggesting the trouble source is something round and flat. After the brief but visible

search, she displays her frustration through a frustration token “*tch*” and a frustrating looking. At the same time, she shifts her gaze to Joyce, the only married student in the class, to elicit some help. Joyce responds with a token “yah”, indicating her recognition of the object that Christine is trying to name. But she does not offer the searched-for word. Understanding that Joyce may not know how to say the word in English either even though she knows the notion of it, Christine turns to the teacher for help. She looks directly at the teacher, stating “I don’t know how to say that” (line 7). An expression such as this is observed as an explicit way for L2 speakers/learners to solicit help in a word search (cf. Brouwer 2003; Park 2007). The teacher takes the turn but he does not provide a candidate solution. Rather, he responds with a sound stretch “*o::r*”, eliciting Christine to give further elaboration. The word “*or*” is used in line 2 when Christine starts her word search. Prompted by the teacher’s elicitation, Christine provides some nonverbal description of the objective in lines 12 and 13. That is, she makes the miming gesture of using this object. But it does not successfully elicit the teacher’s recognition. The teacher responds by mimicking her actions, suggesting that he is attending to her enactment but is still unable to understanding what she means. Now in order to make the word identifiable, Christine needs to continue clarifying the item. As a result, she provides both verbal and non-verbal description of the object in line 15, 16, 17, 23, and 24. Through her talk, she makes clear that it is something round with small holes in it and it is made of bamboo. However, when she goes on to add more information she displays trouble in finishing it (line 24). She then turns her gaze to Joyce to ask for help. Subsequently, Joyce takes her turn and starts to give information about its function. Joyce’s collaboration in lines 18 and 27 is worth noting. She acts like a co-teller, suggesting she is also the “knowing participant” (Goodwin 1987). In line 18, she temperately joins Christine’s narrative, producing exactly the same verbal and non-verbal clues as Christine does (i.e., “round” and its accompanied gesture). Their resources even come at the same time as shown by the latch. When she is invited to take the turn by Christine in line 27, she does not initiate a new turn. She completes Christine’s unfinished turn with “*we use it to this*”. Such an co-completion is not easy as Christine leaves her turn unfinished at the beginning part of the TCU ( i.e. *and we ::*). It seems that Joyce can read Christine’s mind that she wants to describe the function of this object. Although her utterance “*we use it to this*” is not grammatically correct, it is clear that she is describing the function of the object as it is accompanied by her miming gesture (lines 28-29). So far, Christine and Joyce have provided various hints but unfortunately they still fail to bring the teacher’s recognition of the searched-for item.

Subsequently, the teacher gives Christine a marker, inviting her to draw this object, in line 31. Christine accepts it. She draws this object on the white board where everyone can see and at the same time describes her drawing verbally. In line 44, a student displays her recognition with “*oh*” and a head nod while looking at the drawing. Subsequently, the teacher also gives his first guess “like a basket?” in line 45, but it is turned down by Christine, in line 46. In her disconfirmation she also emphasizes that it is flat, which prompts the teacher to come up with another guess “*like a tray*”. It is interesting that it is Farah, who has not been the main participant in the word search, first confirms the teacher’s second candidate solution. She produces multiple affirmative tokens “*yah yah=[yah=yah*” and a head nod, indicating her strong agreement. Christine also displays her acceptance by repeating “*like a tray*” and continues her topical talk. The prolonged word search thus comes to an end. It is worth noting that “*tray*” is not exactly the right object that Christine has been trying to find. This is evident in the responses following the candidate word. In line 49, Joyce repeats “*like a tray*” in a soft voice, indicating her uncertainty about its correctness. Farah’s multiple tokens show her agreement but they do not indicate what exactly she agrees with. Does she agree with “*tray*” or “*like a tray*”? In line 52, the original searcher, Christine, repeats “*like a tray*”, suggesting what she agrees with is not “*tray*”. Even the teacher displays that it may not be the exact object by repeating “*like a tray*”, but not “*tray*”, when confirming his own candidate word (line 51). This demonstrates that in a word search the final outcome may not always be the correct one but a satisfactory one at the moment.

Overall, the two elaborated instances examined above show how the participants co-construct the further meaning negotiation and demonstrate its importance in achieving a successful outcome to the word search. In each example both the learners (the original searcher and another knowing recipient) and the teacher make different but relevant contributions to the successful clarification of the trouble source. For example, the original searcher solicits help and provides clues; another learner, who also knows the notion of the trouble source, help to clarify the meaning too; the teacher, who knows the language but not the content, elicits information from the learners and makes relevant guesses. Although the successful outcome in both examples is determined by the collaboration between the teacher and the learners, it is also observable in each case that the teacher plays a vital role in sustaining the further negotiation. Specifically, in both cases instead of passively waiting for the original searcher to give more information

about the searched-for-word, the teacher aligns with the word search by actively eliciting the learner's further clarification on the trouble source through different interactional techniques. For example, in extract 11, the teacher initiates a confirmation check on Morgan's trouble source turn, which prompts him and another learner, Eldon, to reformulate the trouble source by rephrasing. As a result the trouble source becomes more complete and clear, helping the teacher to identify the searched-for item (lines 13 through 16). In extract 12, the teacher invites Christine to draw the object she has been trying to describe. The drawing gives the teacher crucial information to formulate her guess. The clarification elicitation is also done implicitly. For example, in line 10 the teacher uses "o:r" to solicit further information. In line 14, he mimics Christine's gesture, displaying that he is attending to her new information. The crucial role played by the teacher, the more competent participant, in successful negotiation of meaning, is often emphasised by the EFL classroom researchers (e.g., Walsh 2006). The analysis above provides some evidence that is observed in the progress of resolving the learners' word search.

#### ***4.2.3 Delaying Acceptance of the Candidate Word***

The previous two sections discussed how the language learners in the data initiate collaborative word searches and how they cooperate with other participants to pursue the missing word. When a candidate word is proffered, it needs to be ratified by the original searchers. As current speakers, they are always the authoritative source of the knowledge (cf. Drew 1991) with respect to the content of what they are trying to say, even though they have requested linguistic help from the recipient. Similar to word searches observed in ordinary conversations, the learners in the EFL settings also ratify the candidate word provided by the recipient through rejection or confirmation. When they reject the word, a different candidate item is then offered by the same recipient or another participant. When they accept the word, the word search is then terminated.

However the present data also found two deviate cases in which the learners are unable to ratify the candidate word provided by the teacher, making salient of their role as a not-yet-competent speaker in the target language. An example is seen in Extract 13.

### Extract 13 Estimate /TED /131107

(audio recoding only)

The class are discussing a moral dilemma after reading a short story about a moral dilemma situation. A man has just started to work as a consultant for a well-known consultant firm in New York City. In his first assignment, he finds himself in a moral dilemma. He finds his firm is charging the client, a company which fails to make profit and seeks for help, too much for the service fee. He is wondering if he should resign immediately and tell the board of the firm what he feels. But he is also thinking he might just stay until he finds another job because he needs to earn money for his family. He then goes to a local minister to seek some advice. Tracy, the only student who came to the class on the day of the recoding, argues that there is no moral dilemma issue in this story. She thinks that the company which seeks for help should have been told how much it might cost and since they have agreed with it, there is no moral issue. Tracy was the only student who came to the class on the day of filming so there are only two participants, Tracy and the teacher, in this dialogue.

1 Tracy: no no if I am the[:(.)]compa[ny the-the company  
2 who hav- who has the problem  
3 Ted: [mm] [mm uhm]  
4 Ted: >oh< you are the company which is having the  
5 problem mm-[uhm  
6 Tracy: [yeah and a- ask hel[p ]from someone=  
7 Ted: [mm]  
8 Ted: ask for help from someone m-uhm  
9 Tracy: ask for help from someone  
10 Ted: m-uhm  
11 → Tracy: and they- they will give me:::::::::: the::::: uh-  
12 they will give me a:: a:- (0.3) not bill:: (0.5)  
13 °what-what is ↑that°  
14 Ted: ↑charge?  
15 Tracy: (0.6) °°u::m e:h°° (0.3) before <charge> they will  
16 give you a:::  
17 (1.5)  
18 Ted: or an estimate?  
19 Tracy: (1.5)°e[s-°  
20 Ted: [you mean they will give you an estimate? they  
21 will tell you how much it [will be  
22 [YAH that's right[estimate  
23 Ted: [give you  
24 an esti↑mate [ >and you-<  
25 Tracy [estimate]=  
26 Ted: =>m-uhm=m-uhm<  
27 Tracy: and if I agree,  
28 Ted: mm

From lines 1 through 13, Tracy is trying to say that if she is the company who needs help, she will be given an estimate before she agrees with the project; however, she lacks of the word “estimate” to complete her turn as displayed in line 11 and 12. Her word finding trouble is shown in the two long sound stretch (i.e., “me::::::::::, the:::::”), an “uh-“, the recycle of the turn beginning (“they will give me”), a repetition ( a:: a-), and pauses. She also explicitly marks her word search through a negation



8 Loran: yes and: and:: living with those dog(.)  
9 → and live in a::(0.3) um::out- outdoor (0.3) in the:: s-  
10 + makes the gesture of a round roof  
11 I don't know [how to-  
12 Tcr: [In the s↑n[ow in the-  
13 Loran: [Yeah=yeah all snow around  
14 Tcr: and living in like an(.)↑igloo?  
15 Loran: °igloo° [u:::[h  
16 Tcr: [the small houses?  
17 Loran: Es↑kimos s[mall house  
18 +makes the gesture of the shape of a round roof))  
19 Tcr: [YAH. Small- huh- it=it its called an  
20 igloo. I-g-l-o ig[loo  
21 ((T spells the word))  
22 Loran: [>I-g-l-o igloo< yes maybe (0.3) ya you can you can  
23 ((Loran spells the word))  
24 experience the-  
25 Tcr: I I have to be honest with you on this trip you can  
26 go on your own I don't think I will go with you. That  
27 Is not my style

Loran faces difficulties to produce the name of the particular place where he wants to live if he visits in Alaska. This is evident through his disfluencies in lines 9 through 12. He also gestures with his two hands to illustrate the shape of the item he is referring to (line 10). After the perturbations, he overtly announces that he does not know how to say the word. The teacher displays in his next turn that he knows what Loran has been trying to say. His understanding is shown through the multiple acknowledgement token “*yeah yeah*” and a reformulation of Loran’s trouble source turn. In his reformulation he frames the word “*igloo*” as the candidate word to the search by separating it from its preceding utterance with a micro pause. He also produces it with a rising intonation, inviting Loran’s confirmation. Subsequently, Loran repeats the word “*igloo*” in a soft voice. The repetition is not a confirmation of the candidate word but a sign of trouble to recognize or comprehend it. This is further evident in the subsequent talk. He starts to display hesitancy in continuing his talk, as indicated by “*u::h*”. The hesitancy is also oriented by the teacher as having trouble comprehending the word, as evident in his next relevant action: he replaces it with a simpler version “*the small houses*”, seeking Loran’s confirmation again (line 16). In the next turn, Loran agrees with it and also gives additional cues about the searched-for-word, i.e., he utters the word “*eskimos*” and makes an iconic gesture to represent a dome shaped roof. In line 19, the teacher confirms that they are talking about the same thing with an affirmative token: a loud “*YAH*”, indicating his excitement about the successful identification of the target word.

What follows is rare in ordinary conversations. In lines 19-20, the teacher initiates an explicitly pedagogical sequence: he explains that this kind of house is called igloo and then goes on to supply its spelling orally and also model the word (note: he spells it wrongly). Upon hearing the teacher's modelling, Loran immediately displays his uptake by repeating and spelling it out. He also produces a token "yes" to show his agreement with the word. Subsequently, he resumes his telling about his dream vacation, indicating the word search activity is terminated.

Similar to extract 13, this instance also illustrates the phenomenon where the learner is unable to ratify the proposed word. In both cases, the participants' linguistic identities surface when they are involved in dealing with the lack of confirmation problem. The learners portray themselves as being not-yet-competent by displaying that they cannot recognize or comprehend the proposed word. Being unable to confirm or disconfirm a candidate word offered by the recipient is highly unlikely in L1 talk, unless the word is some sort of terminology. This orientation to linguistic asymmetry is continued in the teachers' response. The fact that the teachers do not abandon the candidate word but continue pursuing the learners' uptake of it by paraphrasing reflects their linguistic position. Specifically, they treat the lack of confirmation as an indication of the learners' insufficient linguistic knowledge in perceiving the candidate word so that as experts in English they need to provide a simpler version in order to help them understand the word.

There is also some difference between these two instances. In extract 13, the word search does not lead to a pedagogical sequence. In contrast, in extract 14, the teacher and the learner co-construct a brief teaching and learning session (lines 19, 20, and 22). It seems that such a difference has a close link to the learner's response to the teacher's further clarification of the proposed word. In extract 13, Tracy quickly confirms the word after the teacher's clarification (line 22), indicating she can now identify and comprehend the word. This is probably why the teacher quickly shifts his role back to a conversational partner by attempting to resume to the main sequential action (lines 23 - 24). In other words, he interprets that Tracy now understands the word so there is no need to maintain the interactional focus on this word. In contrast, in extract 14, Loran still does not signal any recognition of the word "igloo" after the teacher's further clarification ("the small houses?"), which then leads the teacher to explicitly teach the word in order to pursue Loran's uptake.

### 4.3 Pedagogical Sequences Emerging from the Learner's Word Searches

One of the distinctive features in the word searches in the present data is that they are sometimes organized in ways that display the participants' orientation to L2 teaching and learning. Extract 13 in the previous section provided an example where the teacher conducts an explicit instruction before the completion of the word search. This section presents a few similar instances where pedagogical discourse emerges through a word search. Section 4.3.1 examines two examples where an explicit teaching and learning on the target word occurs after the word search is completed. Section 4.3.2 presents a deviate case where the teacher attempts to elicit the learner's self-repair of the word search trouble before its completion.

#### 4.3.1 Explicit Vocabulary Teaching and Learning Sequence Following the Resolution of the Word Searches

This sub-section looks at two examples in that the participants transform the word search into pedagogical talk following its completion. In the first example, it is the learner who initiates the pedagogical sequence; while in the second example, it is the teacher who initiates the sequence. Let's look at the first example now.

##### Extract 15 risk/TED/ 131107

The teacher and the student, Tracy, are having a casual chat before they formally start the lesson. They have been talking about the great amount of emails they receive every day.

1 Tracy: You- you never know what what would happen  
2 when you open it  
3 Ted: °mm°,  
4 Tracy: ya  
5 Ted: [that's true exactly  
6 Tracy: [((inaudible))] ↑and(.) I got ve- some very  
important  
7 file £in my computer£  
8 Ted: you have some ya[ exactly  
9 → Tracy: [I can't take this u:h (0.8)  
10 take this u:h (1.5) mm:[::=  
11 Ted: [you can't risk  
12 Tracy: oh- ya=  
13 Ted: =mhm,  
14 Tracy: risk  
15 Ted: you can't risk> losing them<. Do you have backups?=  
16 → Tracy: = can't take this ↑risk or ↑risk(.) to: (.) losing  
it?  
17 Ted: you can just say I can't take the risk of losing  
them.  
18 Tracy: m[hm,  
19 Ted: [or just I can't risk losing them.  
20 Tracy: okay [so both]

21 Ted: [I can't risk] [I can't take the risk  
22 Tracy: [so this is a ver::b  
23 Ted: mm-hmm,  
24 Tracy: one is verb  
25 Ted: mhm,  
26 Tracy: the other one i::s ne- uh: noun  
27 Ted: Exactly. I can't risk losing them or I can't take  
28 the risk of losing them. In the take the risk  
29 it is a compound verb I can't take the risk  
30 is a verb with a noun or I can't risk(.)  
31 OH RISK excuse me yes exactly in the take the risk  
32 of course risk is a noun or risk I can't take-  
33 I can't risk losing them there is a verb=  
34 Tracy: = °ya°  
35 Ted: mm-mhm,  
36 Tracy: which one is more:: more commonly?  
37 Ted: I can't risk losing them (.) it's simpler to say  
38 easier [ faster]. Ooh I can't risk losing them for  
39 example  
40 Tracy: [°>mm<°]  
41 Tracy: it's useful for me to learn something  
42 because we normally um the school will give <us>  
the:(.)  
43 more formal formal: (0.3) sentence?  
44 Ted: mm=hmm,  
45 Tracy: Ya but some of them are not suitable for  
today((laugh))  
46 Ted: mm=hmm. That is true I know when I was ya new  
foreign  
47 languages I have studied such as Japanese  
48 and Chinese and things I I- people would tell me  
49 now we don't really say that ((laugh)) That's too  
formal  
50 we know what you want to say but  
51 don't say that way ((laugh))  
52 Tracy: [mm  
53 Ted: So anything new for you?  
54 Tracy: (5.0)  
55 Ted: Just keep yourself busy?

Prior to this extract, Tracy told the teacher she would not open those emails with an unclear title even though they were from her friends. In lines 1 through 10, she explains the reason. Towards the end of her explanation, however, she encounters a trouble producing the next item due after she says “*I can't take this*”, as indicated by a turn holding device (*u:h*), a 0.8 second pause, a repetition (“*take this*”), another turn holding device (*u:h*), a long pause (1.5 second), and a lengthened “*mm:::*”. The long initial search indicates she is making a great effort trying to retrieve the missing item. Eventually, the teacher enters her word search (line 11). He displays his understanding of Tracy's intended meaning by uttering an interpretation “*you can't risk*”, which is identified and confirmed by Tracy with “*oh- ya*”. At this point, the mutual understanding towards the meaning of the trouble source is clearly established so the participants can now return to the original talk. But Tracy is not prepared to do so. She

goes on to repeat the main element of the teacher's contribution i.e., "risk" (line 14), possibly to show this is the exact word she intends to use to complete her original trouble source turn. (*take this::*). In the next turn, the teacher explicitly displays his understanding that the word search trouble is resolved by continuing to develop the topic (line 15). It is interesting to note that in his resumption action he also initiates an embedded correction i.e., *you can't risk losing them* (Jefferson 1987). That is, he offers a full and correct linguistic form of Tracy's trouble source turn but embedded it in a social action of confirmation the information in Tracy's previous talk. Such conversational repair is often observed in meaning-and-fluency contexts in classroom interactions (Seedhouse 2004). In the next turn, however, Tracy does not align with the teacher's action, that is, to continue developing the topical talk. Rather, she initiates a confirmation check to find out more about the linguistic form she intends to use (i.e., *take this risk*) and the one provided by the teacher (i.e. *I can't risk*). As a result, the word search sequence is expended into an explicit and long pedagogical sequence where the participants are engaged in teaching and learning the differences between "*take the risk*" and "*risk*" in respect to their form and usage (in lines 16 through 40). This pedagogical discourse is also further expanded into a sequence in which the participants share their negative language learning experience (in lines 41-52). It is worth pointing out that before Tracy starts to talk about her learning experience, she explicitly shows that she has learnt something, in line 41. Eventually, the participants resume their roles of conversational partners, in line 53, where the teacher invites Tracy to talk about her recent life (Tracy has been absent from class a few times).

Overall, the above extract shows how the participants co-construct a teaching and learning sequence following the resolution of a word search. This sequential development is unique, considering that people in ordinary conversations usually resume their topical talk once the word search is completed.

Extract 16 below shows an instance similar to extract 15 in that the word search is transformed into pedagogical talk, following its completion. However, in this extract, it is the teacher who initiates the pedagogical sequence.

#### **Extract 16 peg/TAR/161107(1)**

Morgan and Samuel have just performed a role play exercise in that Morgan offered Samuel a lift and Samuel politely rejected it. After the role play, the teacher played a joke on Morgan. (Morgan is still a teenager so the teacher assumes that he does not have

any vehicle). He asked Morgan how he was going to give Samuel a lift. Was it a car, a horse, or a motorcycle? Morgan said he was going to give him a lift on his bike but Samuel had to stand behind him.

1 Tar: stand behind you?  
2 Morgan: yah ju-because a bic[y-  
3 Tar: [stand?  
4 Morgan: stand(.)because the bicycle have no:: uh- no seat  
5 [for the-  
6 Samuel: [no[back seat.  
7 Tar: [↑o:[:::h.  
8 Eldon: [ya[ya  
9 → Morgan: [so=so some people will got a:a:  
10 +shifts gaze away  
11 from the  
12 teacher,  
13 frowns his  
14 eyebrows,  
15 produces the  
16 gesture  
17 of holding  
18 something  
19 at its two ends,  
20 looks at the  
21 gesture  
22 while making it  
23 > °how can I say?°<((continues to make the same  
24 iconic  
25 +eye contact with gesture while raising his  
26 bottom  
27 Samuel slightly from the chair  
28 Eldon: the young guy al[wa- always [stand on  
29 +copies Morgan's gesture while looking at the  
30 teacher  
31 Samuel: [bar]  
32 Tar: [<pegs>  
33 Morgan: [pegs]  
34 Samuel: [pegs]  
35 Tar: pegs.  
36 Morgan: ↑peg[s, and some people stand on that.  
37 Samuel: [°°pegs°°  
38 Eldon: yah.  
39 (1.0)  
40 → Tar: they put pegs on the bicycle so people can ride=.  
41 ((SS looks towards the white board))  
42 Eldon: =°pegs°((looks down and starts to write something  
43 down))  
44 Samuel: °°° pegs°°°((looks towards the white board))  
45 ((Morgan and Eldon continues making notes  
46 Tar: so he can give you a ride Samuel↑

Prior to this extract, Morgan told the teacher he was going to give Samuel a lift on his bike but Samuel had to stand behind him. But the teacher displays trouble to understand why Samuel has to stand behind Morgan (line 1 and 3). With the further clarification provided by Morgan and Samuel (in lines 4-6), the teacher finally displays his understanding with a stretched “o:::h” (Heritage 1984a). Although the teacher has

displayed his understanding, Morgan continues to clarify his meaning, in line 9. He attempts to conclude that in this way people can manage to do something (if their bike has no back seat), but due to lack of a word to name this particular object he is not able to finish his utterance. His word-finding difficulty is displayed by his repletion of “a:” with some sound stretch and an iconic gesture i.e., he makes a gesture of holding something at both ends with his hands to illustrate the item he is referring to (lines 9-17). At this point, he does not look at anyone. He looks at the gesture he is making, suggesting he is performing a solitary word search. But soon after the brief initial search, he shifts his gaze to Samuel and utters “*how can I say*”, explicitly requesting his help. He also continues to make the same iconic gesture while raising his bottom slightly from the chair, indicating his attempt to elicit Samuel’s recognition through gesturing. While Morgan is inviting Samuel’s assistance, Eldon also joins the word search. Although he does not offer the word, he helps to clarify its meaning by providing relevant verbal and non-verbal clues (lines 21-22). It is interesting to note that he looks towards the teacher while he is clarifying the meaning, suggesting he is eliciting the teacher’s recognition of the missing word. Thus it looks like there are two different lines of conversation if we look at their facial gestures, but in fact they are pursuing the same goal, that is, to resolve the word search.

In responding to Morgan’s request, Samuel offers a candidate word “bar”, in line 23. Shortly after that, the teacher provides another candidate word “pegs” articulately, which simultaneously rejects/corrects the candidate word proffered by Samuel. Subsequently, Morgan and Samuel display their uptake of the corrected word at the same time, by repeating it (lines 25 -26). Such repetition following teachers’ correction is often observed in foreign language classrooms (e.g. Ohta 2001). In the next turn, the teacher confirms their uptakes by repeating it again. In line 28, the original searcher, Morgan, more explicitly displays his acceptance of the word “pegs” by incorporating it when resuming his interrupted utterance, i.e., “*so people will got bars and some people stand on that*”. Now Morgan’s word search has been completed successfully as evident by his confirmation of the word and resumption of his original talk. However, it is interesting to note that following the resumption there are some additional turns which are directed to the searched-for-word. Recall in the beginning of this extract, it is the teacher who displays trouble in understanding Morgan’s utterance and initiates a repair. Now that Morgan has completed his clarification what follows is supposed to be the teacher’s response. But the teacher does not respond to the content of Morgan’s

completed utterance. He continues to draw the attention to the searched-for word by explaining the meaning of “*pegs*” in this particular context, in line 32, which is immediately followed by Eldon’s repetition of the word in a soft voice. It should be noted that while he repeats he also shifts his gaze away from the whiteboard to his note book and writes down something. It seems that he is copying down something the teacher has written on the whiteboard. Thus although we cannot see the teacher and the whiteboard because they are out of the camera’s range, there seems to be some evidence that the teacher also writes the word on the white board while he is explaining the word, according to Eldon’s verbal and non-verbal response in lines 34-35. This becomes more evident by Samuels’ turn in line 36 where he repeats the word while looking towards the whiteboard. It is also shown by the continuous note-taking action displayed by Morgan and Eldon, in line 37. Finally, following the brief engagement in the instructional session, the teacher resumes to the topical talk by saying that Morgan can give Samuel a ride.

The several repetitions of the searched-for word produced by the learners in this extract deserve special attention. They seem to perform different actions. Specifically, the repetition in lines 25 and 26 can be seen as part of the correct sequence, indicating the recipients’ uptake of the correct version; while the one in line 28, can be understood as an indicator of acceptance of the word to his word search. This is evident in his direct incorporation of the proffered item in resuming the original talk. Finally, in lines 34 and 36, the learners seem to repeat to practice the new vocabulary item as language learners sometimes do in drills. It is worth noting that these two repetitions are delivered in a different way, in comparison with the previous ones. That is, they are delivered in a soft voice, giving the impression that the speaker is talking to himself. Despite the various functions they perform, from the perspective of language learning, these repetitions can be a potentially useful tool for the acquisition of the new vocabulary item as they increase the learners’ “notice” (cf. Schmidt 1990) to the correct linguistic form. In short, extract 15 shows how the participants, following the resolution of the word search, become engaged in a teaching and learning session where the teacher teaches the new vocabulary item by explaining its meaning and writes down its form, and the students repeat the word and write it down.

Until now, we have seen three examples (extract 14, 15 and 16) in which an explicit teaching and learning activity on the target lexical item emerges, either before (i.e.,

extract 14) or after (i.e., extract 15 and 16) the word search is completed. These pedagogical sequences, no matter at which point in a word search they occur and by whom they are initiated, one thing in common is that they do not happen randomly, but are triggered by some actions in the previous talk. For example, in extract 14, it is triggered by the student's continuous display of lack of recognition of the correct candidate word. The lack of recognition suggests the target word is new to him, which then prompts the teacher to teach it explicitly. In extract 15, there is a mismatch between the linguistic form that the student, Tracy, intends to use (i.e., *I can't take the risk*) and the one provided by the teacher (i.e. *I can't risk*). And that leads her to go on to request the teacher to provide more knowledge about the two linguistic items. Similar to that in extract 14, the explicit instruction on the target item in extract 16 seems to also relate to the learners' response to the target word. In extract 16, the response is done through plain repeats (line 25 and 26). According to Svennevig (2004), this kind of repetition, in comparison to those framed by affirmative particles (e.g. yes, yah, yeah) is not clear in terms of whether the speaker has identified the referent or not. It is likely that the speaker merely repeats to indicate his/her receipt of the contribution (see Svennevig 2004 for detailed discussion on other repetitions as a display of hearing or understanding in NS/NNS conversations). Thus, although the learners in extract 16 repeat the word to respond, the lack of affirmative tokens may suggest to the teacher that the word is new or unfamiliar to the learners. It should be noted that even though when the original searcher, Morgan, displays his acceptance of the word by incorporating it in resuming the original talk (line 28), it remains unclear if he can identify the word or not. It is possible that the learner accepts it simply because it is given by the teacher, who has the authority in the target language (cf. Funayama 2002). Overall, the above discussion shows that it seems that the teachers make their choices to teach the target word through closely observing the learners' online display of their relevant linguistic knowledge of the target word.

#### **4.3.2 A Deviate Case: Withholding the Candidate Solution**

This section also presents an instance where pedagogical discourse emerges through a word search, but it is different from the previous ones in terms of the aim of the pedagogical sequence. More specifically, the pedagogical sequence presented in this section is not an explicit instruction on the target lexical item as described in the

previous three instances. Rather it is organized in a way to assist the learners to self/peer complete the word search, as shown in the following extract.

### Extract 17 You are not giving them face /TAR/

The teacher is about to start a role play activity. He is warming up the activity by asking the student a question as shown in lines 1-2.

39 Tar: is that polite in Taiwan to refuse uhm something  
 40 when someone offer you food or drink?  
 41 Morgan: u:h for some people will think that's okay but for  
 42 → some people will thin::k- will= will thi::nk (0.2)  
 43 +rolls his eyes +looks down  
 44 tch "bù gěi miànzi zěnme jiǎng a?"  
 45 +shifts gaze to Eldon  
 46 (( how to say not give someone face))  
 47 Eldon: (1.0) ((Morgan holds gaze at Eldon, Eldon's  
 48 face is out of camera but he is facing Morgan))  
 49 → Tar: translate it directly  
 50 ((Morgan shifts gaze towards the teacher))  
 51 (1.0) ((Morgan and Eldon look towards the teacher))  
 52 °"jiù shì" im- impolite or::°=  
 53 +shifts gaze +looks down, whirls his right hand  
 54 to Morgan  
 55 (( that is))  
 56 Samuel: =no face=  
 57 +shifts his gaze from Eldon to the teacher  
 58 Morgan: =°no fa[ce °  
 59 (( shifts gaze from Eldon to the teacher))  
 60 Tar: [yah= [some-  
 61 Samuel: [give- give no face=  
 62 Tar: =you're not giving them [fa[ce  
 63 Morgan: [fa[ce°  
 64 Eldon: [a::h((looks at the  
 teacher  
 and nods hid head))  
 65  
 66 Samuel: [°you're not  
 67 giving them face° ((looks at the teacher)  
 68 Tar: you got to- face is very important in Chinese  
 69 culture right?

In lines 1-2, the teacher asks the students if it is polite in Taiwan to refuse food or drink offered by other people. One of the students, Morgan, self-selects himself to answer this question. In responding to the teacher's question, however, he encounters problems with the production of a special lexical item. His trouble is initially indicated by multiple repetitions and sound stretches ("will thin::k- will= will thi::nk"), followed by a brief pause and a frustration token "tch" (Carroll 2006), and finally by overtly request help from another student, Eldon, when he shifts his gaze to him and initiates a question in Chinese, i.e., "bù gěi miànzi zěnme jiǎng a?" ( how to say "not give someone face"), in line 6. However, Eldon does not take the turn as shown by the 1.0 second pause that follows. During the silence, Morgan is still gazing at Eldon,

continuously making his response relevant. The silence suggests that Eldon may have trouble translating the word even though he now knows the notion of the target lexical item. This is at least treated by the teacher as such as he undertakes to help the word search activity in the next turn. However, the way he participates in the word search is unique in comparison with what recipients commonly do in a typical activity. That is, when facing Morgan's and Eldon's unsuccessful word search, he does not provide a candidate item or elicit more information about the target item. Rather, he gives a metalinguistic clue ("*translate it directly*") on how to translate the target item from Chinese into English, in line 11. It is evident through his utterance that he knows the answer but is withholding it and provides a hint to invite the students to complete the repair by themselves. Such practice matches well with the clueing sequence identified by McHoul (1990) in his study of L1 classroom repair. There is a one second silence following the teacher's hint and after that the students start to give their candidate words prompted by the teacher's hint.

Eldon first breaks the silence by giving a candidate translation "impolite", but his candidate is not delivered assertively as shown by the soft voice. Another indication of his doubt is the use of "*or*", suggesting there is another possibility. His enactment also displays that he is still looking for some other possibility as he does not fix his gaze at anyone but gradually lowers down his head while offering this candidate, suggesting he is still thinking. Immediately following Eldon's utterance, another student, Samuel, offers another candidate, which simultaneously rejects the one provided by Eldon. Samuel's candidate is immediately followed by Morgan's uptake. He repeats it in a soft voice, indicating his uncertainty about its correctness. It is noteworthy that when Samuel and Morgan utter the candidate item they both look at the teacher, orienting the teacher as the one who can confirm its correctness.

In the next turn, the teacher confirms the candidate item with a token "yah" and continues to talk, but his subsequent talk is interrupted by Samuel, who quickly modifies his previous candidate word by adding a verb, i.e., give no face, in overlap with the teacher's utterance. His second try is immediately followed by the teacher's corrective repeat (Svennevig 2004) in which the original item is revised to a more target like one (i.e. "*you are not giving them face*"). The corrected version is subsequently responded to by the three students, one in overlap with another. First, Morgan displays his understanding of the item by co-producing its final element with the teacher, in line

25. Lerner (1987) suggests one way for the recipient to show understanding is to collaboratively complete the speaker's utterance. Eldon also displays his understanding, in a more marked way (line 25). He nods his head and utters a token "a::h" that is similar to a change of the state token "oh" discussed by Heritage (1984a), indicating he now knows the correct translation that he has failed to obtain previously. Finally, Samuel displays his uptake of the teacher's correction by repeating it, as learners often do in a correct sequence initiated by the teacher. With the students' responses, the word search originally initiated by Morgan is terminated. In the next turn, the teacher resumes the topical talk by commenting on the importance of face in Chinese culture.

A distinct feature of this extract is the form of the teacher's participation in assisting the learner's word search. A word search needs to be resolved so that the topic talk that is halted can continue. Therefore offering a candidate solution becomes the primary task for the co-participants once a word search is open for participation. But the teacher here does not supply the candidate word immediately after the learner's unsuccessful word search even though he apparently knows the target word, rather, he withholds it and gives a metalinguistic hint to encourage the learners' self-repair. By attempting to guide the students to obtain the correct linguistic item, the teacher highlights his role of a language teacher at this particular moment.

Overall, this deviate case found in the data shows when the teacher knows the candidate word, it is possible for him/her to withhold it for certain pedagogical purpose, i.e., to give the learners an opportunity to self/peer repair. However, its rareness also suggests that most of the time the teachers choose not to disrupt the word search progress, orienting to their role as an interactional partner who needs to help to resolve the word search as soon as possible so that the interrupted talk can continue.

There is no evidence that withholding completion to a word search ever occurs in ordinary conversation. It is not reported in any of the CA works on word searches in ordinary conversations. It is also extremely rare in the entire corpus. I can only find one case where the collaborative solution is delayed purposely as shown in this instance. As far as I know, such practice was only reported in Seo's study (2008) on repair in one-one-one ESL tutoring. But the examples she provided are slightly different from the one in the present data with regard to the exact technique the teachers use to assist self-

repair. In both of her examples, the teachers produced the first sound of the target word with elongation to elicit the learner's self-completion of the word, however in my data the hint is done through meta-language. The different ways of hinting seem to relate to their sequential environment. For example, in this instance, the metalinguistic hint given by the teacher is built on the L1 linguistic resource that is already given by the original searcher. In one of the examples given by Seo (2008), the tutee displays she knows the target word to some extent by producing part of it, which prompts the teacher to assist her retrieval with a phonological hint.

The teacher's intervention at the point when the word search is still in progress deserves more attention. From an interactional viewpoint it could be argued that the teacher's action has the disadvantage of disrupting the flow of the conversation. However, this obtrusiveness could also be seen to be beneficial for L2 vocabulary learning from a pedagogical point of view as it draws further attention to the target linguistic form, which is considered to be crucial in L2 language acquisition (cf. Schmit 1990). For example, in extract 16, the hint provided by the teacher ("*translate it directly*") draws the learners' attention to the similarity between the target form in L1 and L2, which may help them to remember the word more easily. Some researchers working in the field of corrective feedback have provided evidence to support the argument that using prompts to elicit self-repair is effective in helping the learners to learn a new linguistic form (e.g. Lyster & Saito 2010). The discussion here makes no attempt to recommend whether or not the teachers should intervene the word search (if they know the candidate word) by giving clues to elicit self or peer repair. But the teachers need to be aware of its potential advantage and disadvantage. A final comment to note here is that using prompts to elicit self/peer repair in a word search may be difficult to achieve if the target word is not within the learners' Zone of Proximal Development (cf. Vygotsky 1978), that is, the word is completely new to the learners. Thus it seems that for the teachers another important issue is to judge (through online observation or according to their experience) whether or not there is any potential to achieve self/peer repair through hints. For example, the teacher in extract 15 may have thought that since each single word in the target phrase (not *giving them face*) is already known by the learners, a hint to prompt them to compare the two linguistic forms may effectively elicit a self-repair.

#### 4.4 Vocabulary Check in Word Searches

At times, the learners in the data manage to produce their own candidate solution to the word search; however, they utter it with rising intonation and look closely at the teacher in order to elicit confirmation on the correctness or appropriateness of the word they have just produced.

This section looks at this type of word search. They constitute a sub-dataset in the corpus as they are organized sequentially differently from the collaborative word search instances described in the previous sections. Now, let's look at an example from my data.

##### Extract 18/grab/TLY/311007(1)

In the prior part of the talk, Ping was telling the class she has a 26 year old daughter who is getting married soon. Daphne thought it was too young to get married at this age, but she also agreed that it would be fine if she could find a right husband. Daphne made a conclusion by saying “*the time is not issue*”, which is corrected by the teacher subsequently. She replaces it with a more proper linguistic form “*time isn't an issue*”.

1 Daphne: time isn't an issue ya if she find a good man.  
2 Ping: Mm=hm yes.(.) I- I- I have to say that ((laugh))  
3 Daphne: ((laugh)) if he is a- if he is a great man.  
4 and right- right man <|she> have  
5 → to:::(0.5)  
6 +moves gaze away from Ping and looks into the  
7 air while slightly raising her right palm, opening  
8 and closing it rapidly  
9 → grab? [catch  
10 +moves gaze towards Tly while making the same  
gesture  
11 Tly: [grab [him  
12 Daphne: [grab=  
13 Tly: =grab him  
14 Daphne: [ grab <him> u:h (0.8) immediately  
15 +Da shifts gaze back to Ping  
16 John: [grab  
17 ((everyone laughs))

In line 1, Daphne repeats the correct linguistic form offered by the teacher and addresses her conclusion to Ping. In an attempt to further elaborate this statement, she enters into a word search as shown in the sound stretch (“to:::”) and the 0.5 second silence (line 5). The silence is accompanied with Daphne's hand gesture which mimics the action of grabbing or catching something with a hand. She has been looking at Ping but she moves her gaze away from her and looks into the air while delaying her turn.

The gaze aversion and hand gesture makes her word search even more explicit. Following the delay, she produces a verb “grab” with upward intonation, suggesting she is unsure of the appropriateness of the word “grab”. There is additional evidence that can support her uncertainty of the word “grab”: she utters another candidate “catch” (line 9) following the first one, indicating she does not know which one is correct. The upward intonation functions as try-marking, which makes the recipient’s response confirm or disconfirm/correction relevant (Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1995). But who is the recipient at this particular moment? Daphne does not shift her gaze back to Ping, her main recipient, while uttering the candidate word. Instead, she shifts her gaze towards the teacher, indicating her confirmation request is directed at the teacher and not at anyone else in the classroom. This is projected by the teacher in her next turn. She confirms its correctness by repeating it. She also adds its object pronoun (*him*), thus simultaneously completing Daphne’s unfinished turn, i.e., *if he is a great man and a fine man she have to grab him* (line 11). In line 12, Daphne accepts the word “grab” by repeating it, which is immediately followed by the teacher’s second confirmation. In line 14, Daphne resumes her interrupted course of action both verbally and non-verbally. Specifically, she incorporates the term “grab him” into her remaining turn while shifting her gaze back to Ping, the main recipient of her talk.

The above analysis exemplifies the practice where the learners in the data elicit confirmation on their own word search solution from other participants. It should be noted that such “other” participant is always the teacher, even when another peer is the primary recipient at the time, as shown in the above example. This suggests the language learners orient to the teacher rather than other peers as someone who has the linguistic authority to confirm or correct the accuracy or appropriateness of their candidate solution to the word search.

This practice has been studied in various types of L2 interaction (e.g. Hosoda 2006 on L2 ordinary conversation in Japanese; Koshik & Seo 2012 on ESL tutoring; Lee 2004 on L2 book discussions in English; Park 2007 on L2 ordinary conversation in English; Willey 2001 on ESL conversation classes), and is considered as a way of making relevant the participants’ linguistic asymmetry in the interaction (Hosoda 2006 ; Koshik & Seo 2012; Park 2007). Hosoda (2006) refers to such a practice as one form of a request for confirmation and she calls it “vocabulary check” (p.32). She notes that “unlike a request for confirmation on a content matter and a response to it, a

“vocabulary check” and its response constitute a repair sequence in the sense that it addresses a problem of the speaker’s speech production” (ibid.p.32). In all the examples found in the present data, the learners do not elicit a confirmation on a content matter. These examples occur when they are talking about their personal experiences, feelings, or meanings, which is not within the “territory” of the recipient (Kamio 1994, 1997a,1997b, cited Hosoda 2006, p.32), and thus it is unlikely for them to ask the teacher to confirm the content of their talk. Therefore, these instances found in the present data can be seen as doing “vocabulary check” as proposed by Hosoda. Here is another example of doing vocabulary check in the course of word search.

### **Extract 19/sign/TED/131107**

(audio recording only)

In this extract, Tracy is in the middle of telling a story. She is telling the teacher a very unpleasant experience she has previously encountered. It was about how she and her husband were mistreated by a policeman who stopped their car on their way home at midnight. It should be noted that there are only two participants in this extract, the student, Tracy and the teacher.

- 1 Tracy: if you want to stop the car you should have you  
should  
2 have some identifi↑cation,  
3 Ted: Mm,  
4 → Tracy: or you- you should put u::m(2.5)some=some::  
5 → u:h ↑/saint/?  
6 ((she pronounces it as /saint/))  
7 (1.0)  
8 Ted: put a sign.  
9 Tracy ya=  
10 Ted: =mm,  
11 Tracy: nearby [or something  
12 [mm hm,  
13 Tracy: yeah you can't just- we have the law

In the beginning of this extract, Tracy is reproducing what she said to the police officer. She told the police officer he should show his identification or put a sign nearby if he wants to stop their car. The “you” in line 1, 2, 4, and 11 refers to the police offer. However, Tracy displays some trouble in retrieving the word “sign”. She stretches a sound ( “u::m”), pauses for 2.5 second pause and produces a determiner “some”. She then recycles the determiner with stretch, produces a “u:h” and finally she comes up with a word which she pronounces as “/saint /” with a rising intonation. Tracy’s gaze information is unavailable in the extract as this extract is from the lesson which was audio recorded only, thereby it is unknown to us if her gaze is fixed at the teacher or

not. Nevertheless, the teacher displays his orientation to Tracy's turn as a request for a confirmation in the subsequent turn, despite some delay. The delay has in fact made Tracy's action of making a confirmation request more salient. It shows that Tracy has completely stopped her turn and is waiting for some sort of response from the teacher. In line 8, the teacher repeats the candidate word, and in his repetition he corrects the pronunciation (Tracy pronounces the word with a t sound at the end) and the grammar ("some" is replaced with "a") of the candidate word. Tracy displays her agreement with the teacher's correction by giving an agreement token "ya". She then continues telling the story which is temporarily interrupted.

The above two extracts show when involving in a word search the learners may try-mark (Sacks and Schegloff 1979) their own candidate solution to elicit confirmation from their recipient on some aspect of their candidate solution. In extract 18 where video information is available, it can also be seen the candidate is accompanied with the learner's gaze shift towards the teacher. In the subsequent turn, the recipient orients it as a request for confirmation or correction by offering confirmation (extract 18) or correction (extract 19).

It should be noted when the learners propose a vocabulary check, what aspect of the vocabulary item needs to be checked can be ambiguous. It could be its pronunciation or linguistic form, or the word choice. In extract 18, by adding an alternative candidate with a different form but similar meaning (i.e., *grab* V.S. *catch*) the speaker makes it clear that she is asking confirmation on her word choice. However, in this case, the teacher's confirmation comes at the same time as the second candidate (*catch*), thereby it is possible that her response is directed to the first candidate word only. Thus in both cases, it is unclear for the recipient, as well as the analyst, what aspect of the candidate word needs to be confirmed/disconfirmed. Nevertheless, the problem of ambiguity seems to be resolved in the teachers' next relevant turn. In extract 18, when the teacher repeats the candidate word she simultaneously confirms the appropriateness of its word form, pronunciation, and word choice, regardless of what exactly the speaker is not sure about, and this is the same in extract 19. By supplying an alternative item, the teacher corrects the appropriateness of its word form, pronunciation, and word choice. Koshik and Seo (2012, p.178) present similar examples in their study. They point out that when the response is done by repetition or correction it "makes the ambiguity inherent in the candidate understanding interactionally insignificant".

However such substantial responses do not always follow the learners' vocabulary check. The teachers sometimes only utter a token such as mm hm as a response. It is observed in the data that when the learners only receive "mm hm" from the teacher they sometimes produce a syntactic question in the third turn to make their request more explicit. Willey (2001) and Koshik and Seo (2012) also found similar examples in their data. Consider the following two examples.

**Extract 20 fit/category/ Ed / 131107 (1)**

(audio recording only)

Tracy and the teacher have been having a casual chat. Tracy teaches at a nursing college. She complains to the teacher that her school has assigned too much work to her, along with other lecturers who have PhD degrees. In this extract she is explaining the reason. Note that there are only Tracy and the teacher in this extract.

1 Tracy: we don't have many PhD::[ in] in my s↑chool  
2 Ted: [mm hm]  
3 Ted: =mm hm=mm hm,  
4 → Tracy: so::(0.5) so- uhm uh in order to:: in order  
5 → to::(.) fit?  
6 → Ted: mm hm,  
7 → Tracy: can I use fit?=  
8 Ted: =mm hm=  
9 Tracy: =fit the requirement?=  
10 Ted: =mhm,  
11 Tracy: of u::h (1.0) education department?  
12 Ted: >fit the requirement of education  
13 department<[mhm,  
14 Tracy: [ah uh so: (0.5) they will  
15 put my nam[e: a]nd the other PhD's name  
16 Ted: [mm hm]  
17 Ted: mm hm,  
18 → Tracy: in some::: some::( 0.5) group↑?  
19 → Ted: mm hm=mm hm  
20 → Tracy: °can you say-° ↑group or or[::  
21 Td: [in some category  
22 Tracy: [in some category]  
23 Ted: [they'll put you] in a certain category.  
24 Tracy: Okay.  
25 Ted: mm hm, they will categorize you in a certain ↑way.  
26 Tracy: Oh  
27 Ted: mm hm,=  
28 Tracy: =<categorize>[(.) in- ]in a certain way  
29 Ted: [mm hm your-]  
30 Ted: your position are you an assistant ↑professor  
31 ,associate professor or::

Tracy is explaining why the teachers who have PhD degrees in her school are assigned a lot of work to do. In line 4, she encounters a problem continuing her talk. She repeats “*in order to*” twice, making a stretch on “*to: :*” each time. After a micro pause, she goes on producing a candidate solution “*fit*” with a rising intonation (line 5). There is no video information in this extract but as there are only two participants in the class, it is reasonable to assume the request is directed at the teacher. In the next turn the teacher responds to it with a token “*mm hm*”. An unmarked response such as this can be ambiguous in terms of what it responds to. No matter what it is, one thing we are sure about is that it at least tells the recipient there is no understanding problem at this moment. But Tracy does not seem satisfied with the response. She initiates a full syntactic question “*Can I use fit?*”( line 7) in the next turn, making explicit her previous action: I need to know whether “*fit*” is the right word to use or not. The teacher immediately responds with “*mm hm*”, indicated by a latch (line 8). Although it is the same response token as the previous one, there is no ambiguity now as the confirmation request is delivered in an explicit way: a syntactic question. A similar case is also observed in line 18. She displays trouble in producing the next turn item due in line 18. She stretches the word “*some:::*”, repeats it, and pauses for 0.5 second. After all these delays, she finally comes up with a candidate word, “*group*”, but she displays uncertainty and appeals for a vocabulary check by using rising intonation. In the next turn the teacher responds with “*mm hm=mm hm*”. Facing the unsubstantial response, Tracy initiates a syntactic question, “*can you say- group or or:::*” to explicitly show she wants to know if it is a right word choice. The teacher’s second response is different for the one in the previous example. He does not confirm it, but provides an alternative word “*category*”, suggesting it is a more appropriate word to use. Subsequently, Tracy repeats the item provided by the teacher. The following sequential development is distinctive in this example in comparison with that in the previous examples. In the previous cases, the participants resume the topical talk after the word search is completed, but in this example what follows the completion is the teacher’s instructional talk (lines 23 and 25). He reformulates what Tracy has just said by using the new lexical item (line 23). He also demonstrates another way of saying it by using the verb form of “*category*” (line 25). In line 26, Tracy responds with a change of the state token “*oh*” (Heritage 1984a), indicating her understanding of the alternative form provided by the teacher. She also demonstrates her uptake by repeating it. After the

inserted pedagogical sequence, the participants finally return to the topical talk, in line 30.

I now provide an example in my data which is different from the previously discussed examples in the literature in terms of the way the speaker initiates a vocabulary check.

### Extract 21 reply/TLY/311007

Ping's husband works for the Ministry of Transportation in Taiwan. She told the class that her husband received an interview on television the other day because he had to make a reply to some incorrect news about the Ministry of Transportation. In this extract, Ping continues explaining why her husband appeared on TV the other day. The "he" in line 1 refers to a journalist and the "he" in line 10 refers to her husband.

1 Ping: um- I-I maybe I would say he report the news  
 2 is not true  
 3 Tly: ↑a::h [oh okay  
 4 Daphne: [↑o::oh  
 5 Tly: [did  
 6 Ping: [and made the people misunderstand,  
 7 Tly: a::[:h  
 8 Ping: [the ministry  
 9 Tly: ↑a::[:ah  
 10 → Ping: [°yes° so he need to:::(0.5) he need to:::  
 11 → u::h change it.=[um-(.)he need to:::I- I- I  
 12 +waves her hands  
 13 Tly: [uh-huh,  
 14 → Ping: don't know how to say=correct [the news  
 15 +looks at the teacher  
 16 Daphne: [correct  
 17 John: [>correct<  
 18 Tly: ya= [ya ya correct the new[s  
 19 Ping: [yes [yes=  
 20 John: =°correct the [news°  
 21 Tly: [ya or re↑ply (0.5)make a re↑ply  
 22 on- [about the news] ya  
 23 Ping: [ reply yes reply]  
 24 Tly: ↑ooh [wow  
 25 Ping: [the report [yes  
 26 Tly: [↑ooh good that's interesting

In lines 1, 2, 6, and 8, Ping explains a journalist made a wrong report about the Ministry of Transportation, making the public misunderstand the Ministry of Transportation. Continuing her narrative Ping, in line 10, faces trouble producing the infinitive following "he need to", as indicated in a sound stretch (*to:::*), a half second pause, a repetition (*he need to:::*), and a turn holding device (*u::h*). After these delays, she produces a candidate solution (*change it*), which completes her delayed turn. However,

right after she completes her word search she immediately initiates a repair on her own candidate solution in lines 11 and 14: he utters “*he need to:.*” again with a sound stretch, projecting there might be a new candidate word coming. Subsequently she explicitly claims she does not know how to express what she wants to say (*I don’t know how to say*) and then goes on to produce a new candidate word “correct the news” without any delay, as shown by the latch (line 14). In the next turn, the teacher displays her agreement with Ping’s candidate word by producing multiple tokens “*ya=ya ya*” and repeating the word. Ping acknowledges the teacher’s confirmation with “*yes*” in line 19, indicating the word finding trouble is resolved. Similar to that in the second example in extract 20, the resumption of the original talk is delayed by a pedagogical sequence (in lines 21 through 25). More specifically, the teacher adds an alternative way of expressing the same concept and in the next turn Ping uptakes the alternative version by uttering “*yes*” and repeating it. Finally, the talk is resumed after the learning and teaching sequence.

In this extract we see a different way of signalling uncertainty and eliciting confirmation on the candidate word. The speaker does not try-mark the candidate word “*correct the news*” with upward intonation but prefaces it with a metalinguistic expression “*I don’t know how to say*” to explicitly announce her insufficient knowledge about the target word and thus marks the subsequent candidate word as possibly incorrect. This knowledge then implicitly invites the addressed recipient to confirm/disconfirm the appropriateness or correctness of the candidate word. The metalinguistic expression “*I don’t know how to say*” thus is used as an interactional device to invite the recipient’s confirmation.

Overall, the analysis in this section shows a word search can be expanded into a vocabulary check sequence when the language learners are uncertain about the correctness or appropriateness of the word they come up with. There are various resources they use to signal the need for a vocabulary check on their own solutions. They either indicate their need more implicitly through the prosodic resource (i.e., marking the word with rising intonation) or more explicitly through a lexical expression (e.g., “*I don’t know how to say*” “*can I use XX?*” “*can you say XX?*”). In general, the learners in the data prefer to use the rising intonation to elicit confirmation. The reason may be because it is less obtrusive in conversation in comparison with the lexical expressions. However when they receive an implicit response such as “*mm hm*” from

the teacher, they sometimes go on to explicitly request a confirmation through lexical expressions, displaying their persistence to get the word right.

Cases analysed in this section clearly reveal the speakers' orientation to the different L2 linguistic expertise among themselves and their recipients. That is, by asking the teachers to check the correctness or appropriateness of the word they have already produced to complete their word searches, the learners make relevant their limited L2 expertise while treating their teachers as an L2 expert. In some cases, this orientation to asymmetric positions is further sustained in the subsequent talk. For example in extract 20 and 21, the vocabulary check sequence is expanded into a short teaching and learning session. Koshik & Seo (2012) provided similar examples where the learners initiate a vocabulary check in their word search and they concluded that in the process of vocabulary check the learners display "doing being language learner".

#### **4.5 Conclusion**

In this chapter, 21 word search examples derived from the corpus have been presented to illustrate how "word search" is sequentially organized and interactionally managed by participants in teacher-fronted EFL classrooms in Taiwan.

The analysis in 4.2 revealed that a prototypical word search is organized as follows. First, the speaker initiated a word search in another course of action and made it relevant for co-participation. Subsequently, the invited recipient or another participant provided the target word. This was then followed by the speaker's display of acceptance. Finally, the participants resume to the original course of action. The prototypical word searches were illustrated in section 4.2.1. The analysis carried out in 4.2 also revealed that a prototypical word search may become extended due to (1) the speaker's initiation turn does not successfully elicit the target word (See extract 11 and 12); and (2) the speaker is not able to confirm whether the candidate word provided is the target word or not (see extract 13 and 14). The former type, where the participants need to continue negotiating in order to identify the intended meaning, is not unusual in ordinary conversation; however, the latter has not been reported in the literature. It can be argued that such extended sequence reflects the linguistic asymmetry between the person who initiates the word search and the recipient who offers the target word. It also suggests that the target word is very likely be a complete new one to the learner who initiates the word search.

In terms of the various ways used by the learners to initiate a word search and invite collaboration, the analysis has shown that the learners in the data use both verbal and non-verbal resources to achieve this. These resources found in the data includes gaze, iconic gestures, non-lexical speech perturbations, wh-question, L1, syllabic word cues, and circumlocution. It should be noted that these resources are not mutually excluded. It is common in the data that the learners use multiple resources to initiate their word searches. The analysis has also revealed that the combination of non-lexical speech perturbations and L1 being the most common way of initiating a word search in the data.

The analysis in the final section showed another unique sequential feature of the word searches in the data, in comparison with word searches in other context. More specifically, a pedagogical sequence, aiming at teaching the target word, was sometimes found in a word search in the data. This section has also presented a deviate case where the teacher withholds the candidate word in order to scaffold the learner to self-repair.

In short the analysis in this section has shown that a word search, which is originally initiated to facilitate talk, may result in an explicit teaching or learning activity. Section 4.4 presented a type of word search which is organized differently from a typical collaborative word search described in section 4.2 and 4.3. That is, although the learners are able to provide the candidate word, they marked it as uncertainty, usually through rising intonation, to elicit a confirmation from the recipient. By inviting the recipient to check the correctness or appropriateness of the candidate word, the learner displays an orientation to the recipient's linguistic expertise.

The following chapter will summarize the findings and discuss their implications for the field of SLA. Pedagogical implications of the findings will also be addressed.

## Chapter 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Introduction

In this discussion chapter I will present a summary and discussion of the main findings in line with the research questions, and will consider the potential learning opportunities in word searches.

### 5.2 Sequential Organization and Interactional Management of Word Searches

In this section, I will illustrate the more frequent sequential formats for managing the word searches, which will answer the first research: *How are the learners' word searches sequentially developed and jointly accomplished in EFL classrooms?*

In terms of the organization of the word searches, a prototypical word search (as those shown in section 4.2.1) is developed as follows: (1) In turn one, the speaker interrupts his/her ongoing talk to initiate a word search; (2) In turn two, the recipient supplies a candidate word, either with certainty or uncertainty; (3) In the following turn, the speaker confirms the proffered word. The confirmation were observed to take place in a number of ways, such as producing an acknowledgement token, repeating the word, or integrating the word into a larger constituent; (4) Subsequently, the participants resume to the main sequential action. The basic sequential pattern typically consists of three turns. This can be generalized as follows:

- a. Turn 1—Learner A initiates a word search**
- b. Turn 2—Teacher or learner B provides the candidate word**
- c. Turn 3—Learner A confirms the candidate word**

However, not all of the word searches were resolved so efficiently. When the speaker's initial search turn did not successfully elicit the target word, a word search sequence became elaborated due to the need for the participants to further clarify the searched-for-item (e.g. extracts 11 and 12 in section 4.2.2, and extracts 13 and 14 in section 4.2.3). These extended word searches therefore consist of more than three turns.

Nevertheless, the three basic parts, i.e. initiation, supplying a candidate lexical item, and confirmation, are still observed in the sequence.

Although the data for his study were collected in the setting of teacher fronted-classroom interactions, it was found that many of the word searches did not involve the teacher's direct participation. However, nearly all the elaborated word search instances in the data collection are characterised by the teacher's direct participation. More specifically, the further negotiation of meaning in a word search always occurred between the teacher and learner(s), but never among learners. Further research is needed to consider whether or not it is a feature of word searches in the context of teacher fronted- classroom interactions.

The extended word searches, although resulting in a longer disruption to the talk, are arguably beneficial to learning because they push the learners to become more aware of the various features of the searched-for-word in the target language. For example, in extract 12, Christine used the words, such as "round", "bamboo", "holes", and "flat" to further describe the object she was refereeing. In extract 13, Tracy's circumlocution (*before charge they will give you a ::*) provides a clue for the teacher to formulate his alternative guess. In extract 14, Loran produced "Eskimos" and "small house" to further illustrate the target item.

The teacher's active role in eliciting more information and making alternative guess about the target word, as shown in the extended word search examples, is worthy of discussion too. The crucial role played by the teacher in successfully managing classroom interaction is often emphasised by the EFL classroom researchers (e.g., Walsh 2006). As the analysis in 4.2.2 showed, the teacher were observed to use various verbal and nonverbal resources and strategies to further align with the word searches. For example, in extract 11, the teacher initiated a confirmation check on Morgan's trouble source turn, which promoted Morgan and another peer to clarify the intended meaning through paraphrasing. In extract 12, it was observed that the teacher used a "designedly incomplete utterance", or DIU (Koshik 2002), gestures, the white board and a marker to solicit more clues from Christine. These resources prove to be useful resources in resolving the learner's word searches in this specific context, as shown in the extracts in that they contribute to enhance mutual understanding. It can be suggested that such successful elicitation skills displayed by the teachers is relevant to teacher's

Classroom Interactional Competence, or CIC (Walsh 2006) as they encourage further student participation in talk and help to maintain the progress of the talk. This study has shown some initial observation on teacher's CIC within the context of word search. More research is needed in order to find out different interactional skills used by the teacher to facilitate word searches.

In sum, the close analysis of the sequential development of the word search examples has shown that the accomplishment of a word search is through the participants' coordination with each other's action, demonstrating that a word search is a social activity and is collaborative in nature. For example, for collaboration in a word search to happen, an opportunity to participate had to be proffered. When the learners initiated a word search and extended invitation to their recipients (teachers or fellow learners), they paved the way for their recipients' participation. On the other hand, when the recipients accepted the invitation and offered a word, the learners accepted or rejected it. When the target word is rejected, the participants continue pursuing the target word by further negotiation. Thus, the resolution of communication breakdown caused by a word search is not achieved through any individual party's skills or abilities. Rather, it is accomplished collaboratively. This observation adds to the existing literature in CA that describes how word searches are co-constructed through the participants' mutual monitoring of each other's action (e.g. Carroll 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Hayashi 2003; Park 2007), but further suggests that similar collaboration also occurs in the environment where the participants are engaged in pedagogical activities.

### **5.3 The Resources Utilised in Projecting Word Searches and Inviting Co-participation**

This section will address the second research question: *What are the resources the learners employ to mark their word finding difficulty and extend an invitation for co-participation?*

Overall, the learners in this study were found to use a wide range of resources to signal a word search is underway; in fact, all word search indicators that typically appear in native speakers of English were also found in the present data. It should be noted that these resources are not mutually excluded. It was observed that the learners often combine these resources. Typical ways of initiating a word search included sound stretches, turn holding devices (e.g., uh or um), pauses, cut-offs, and repetitions. Carroll

(2006), observing word search instances in the literature and his data, argued that the first hitch in the initiation turn was typically a sound stretch. The present study confirms Carroll's finding. A close observation of the instances in the data revealed that the EFL learners often marked the onset of their word search with a sound stretch. In addition to verbal resources, the EFL learners in this study were also found to use embodied cues to organize relevant action for collaboration. When they tried to retrieve the word on their own, they shifted their gaze away from recipients, assuming a thinking face. Receiving such an embodied message, their recipients (teacher or fellow students), typically did not intervene to take the turn. Learners in the data also occasionally displayed their involvement in a word search by producing lexical expressions such as "what is it?". They were typically uttered in a soft voice and accompanied by a gaze aversion, indicating they were self-directed questions which did not invite an answer from their recipient. Self-directed questions often occurred at a later stage to indicate speaker's commitment to retrieve the word, according to Carroll (2006), and this holds true for the instances in the data. Finally, the EFL learners occasionally displayed their engagement in a self-directed search through hand gestures, i.e. whirling their hands or gesturing the lexical item they were looking for.

When the learners were unable to produce the target word they extended an invitation for co-participation, thus turning the word search into a multiple party activity. An invitation was often done explicitly by looking at the invited recipient while producing a wh-question in Chinese (see extracts 7 and 11) or in English (see extract 6) to request the target word, or through directly claiming they do not know the word (e.g. *I don't know how to say*, see extracts 12 and 14). Another common way of requesting collaboration was through targeting the trouble source by filling it with its Chinese equivalent (see extracts 8 and 9). It was demonstrated that the recipients all oriented to it as a request for the target word by translating it into English. Sometimes, an invitation was extended less explicitly through an eye contact (see extracts 3 and 10). Finally, it was observed that a collaboration could occur when the original searcher failed to retrieve the word after a prolonged self-attempt (see extract 5).

Park (2007), comparing L2 word searches in casual conversations and tutoring sessions, suggested that the NNS tutee in the tutoring session requests the help of the NS tutor more explicitly, i.e., through asking a direct question, "how to say?", or acknowledges his uncertainty in a straightforward way, "I don't know"; while the NNS participants

in social gatherings are more likely to request help less explicitly through a gaze shift, which results in a collaborative sentence completion with the sought-for word. His finding seems to imply that such a difference is related to the settings. While, in this study, it was found that lower level learners were more likely to request the target word explicitly. Further research is needed to identify whether it is determined by settings or proficiency levels or other reasons.

In this study it was also observed that the EFL learners often solicited help soon after a word search was initiated. It created an impression that they did not make an attempt to retrieve the target word by themselves. For example in extract 3, there was no self-directed search as Farah's gaze was fixed at the teacher throughout her initiation turn. In extract 6, Morgan requested for the target word soon after a brief sound stretch and gaze aversion. Such a fleeting self-directed search or even lack of it may indicate that the target word is not something retrievable. This implies that the speakers might have limited or even no knowledge of the searched-for-word. From an interactional point of view, however, the short or absence of solitary search seems to display an orientation to a quick resolution. That is, the original searchers' priority at this particular moment was not to demonstrate that they were capable of finding the word but to move the conversation forward as soon as possible.

Although gaze and wh-questions were observed as important interactional techniques to determine the recipient's co-participation (also see Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Kurhila 2006; Oelschlaeger 1999; Park 2007), the present data suggest that they did not occur in a vacuum but were typically attended by resources that helped the recipients to identify the missing lexical item. Two main types of clues were identified in the learners' initial search turn:

(1) Code-switching: it was the most frequently used resource in the present data. The EFL learners either simply produced the L1 equivalent of the searched-for-word or framed it as a direct wh-question in L1. Occasionally, the L1 equivalent was uttered right after a formulaic expression (e.g. how can I say?). The use of L1 as a means of signalling the beginning of the repair sequence have been reported in the literature. There are many other instances in the literature showing learner's switch to L1 for repair or other types of metalinguistic talk (e.g., Mori, 2004). A number of interesting observations emerged when the EFL learners in the data used L1 to elicit the target

word. First of all, it was typically uttered in a low volume, suggesting the speaker was aware that it was not an “official” language in the classroom. Secondly, when a L1 equivalent was uttered, it immediately changed the participation framework, that is, all the students became the knowing recipients of the content of the target word (c.f. Park 2007). The use of L1 thus seems to be an efficient strategy. On one hand, other learners can now offer the target word if they know its English equivalent. There is no further clarification needed. On the other hand, even if none of them can translate the word, they can contribute to clarify its meaning to the teacher, the only participant who did not know the content but knew the language (e.g. extract 11). A final interesting observation is that teachers occasionally were able to provide the target word when L1 was used (e.g., extract 6), but it was often unclear whether or not they did know the L1 phrase or they simply made a guess based on the context. However, in one case, the teacher clearly displayed his knowledge of the L1 phrase through prompting the learners to find the target word by directly translating the L1 phrase into English (see extract 16).

(2) Iconic gestures: when the EFL learners attempted to elicit the searched-for-word, they sometimes initiated an iconic gesture. They tried to attract their recipients’ attention to the gesture either through maintaining an eye contact (e.g. extracts 3 and 14), or producing a formulaic expression (e.g. how can I say) before they provide the iconic gesture (e.g. extract 16). These gestures contributed to the semantic information of the search-for-word and were demonstrated in the data to be vital resources to achieve mutual understanding in a word search. It is worth noting that gestures were also produced while the EFL learners were trying to retrieve the word (e.g. extracts 4, 12 and 18). That is, they were not used to elicit the candidate word but simply to display their mental process. Thus, in these cases they seemed to be more cognitively –oriented than interactionally-oriented. Nevertheless, even though they were not directed to the recipients, once they were produced they became public resources available for all the participants to formulate their collaborative solution.

L1 and iconic gesture were observed to be typically used as the first clue by the EFL learners to clarify the search-for-word. In the cases where the search-for-item was an object, an iconic gesture was typically used as the first resource to communicate the meaning of the target word (e.g. extracts 3,4, 12, 14, and 16); while in the cases where the search-for-item was not an object, the first hint was often the L1 equivalent of the

target word (e.g. extracts 6,7,8,9, and11). Linguistic resources in English, for example paraphrasing, explanation, etc., were observed to occur at the later stage of the word search, that is, when the first clue did not successfully elicit the target word (e.g., extracts 12, and 14,). To be more specific, they were used for further negotiation on the searched-for-word. We cannot make any analytic claims about why they chose L1 or iconic gestures to start with. It might be simply because they were more accessible than the linguistic resources in the target language. But what we can see from the data is that they were effective resources, at least in that particular context, which often resulted in a successful outcome with no need to further clarify the searched-for-word.

#### **5.4 Pedagogical Discourse and Vocabulary Check in Word Searches**

This section will discuss some distinctive characteristics of the word searches in terms of the sequential development, which will answer the third research question: *Are there any sequentially distinctive features in the learners' word searches in EFL classrooms, compared to those in ordinary conversations?*

Some distinctive features, in comparison with word searches in ordinary conversations, were found in the present data. They are discussed as follows.

- (1) Most of the time the EFL learners were able to confirm whether the candidate word provided by other recipients was acceptable or not, suggesting the word might not be completely new to them. That is, although they could not produce it, they at least could recognize it to some extent. However, occasionally, they were unable to confirm whether the candidate word was acceptable or not as shown in extracts 13 and 14, suggesting they might not recognize the word at all or had very limited knowledge about it. Faced with this, the teachers always positioned themselves as language experts by paraphrasing the word to pursue the learners' understanding of it. Instances like these are less likely to happen between NS/NS conversations and therefore it highlights the linguistic asymmetry between the participants at the particular moment.
- (2) When the learners completed their own searches, unlike native speakers, they sometimes elicited a vocabulary check from the teacher in order to make sure their candidate solutions were correct or appropriate, as demonstrated by the examples analysed in section 4.4. Through this practice, they displayed their orientation to

themselves as language learners while positioning their teachers as language experts. A prototypical word search of this type is shown as follows:

- a. Turn 1—Learner A initiates a word search/Leaner A provides a candidate word**
- b. Turn 2—Teacher confirms the candidate or gives an alternative**
- c. Turn 3—Learner A acknowledges the confirmed word or the alternative**

A vocabulary check found in the data was typically done through producing the candidate solution with rising intonation. Lexical resources, such as “how can I say” or “can I say ...?” were observed to be used only when the teacher’s response to their request of confirmation was ambiguous (i.e. by producing tokens such as mm or uhm-mm). This observation confirms Willey’s (2001) and Koshik and Seo’s (2012) findings. Koshik and Seo (2012, p.185) argue that when learners are pursuing confirmation of the accuracy of their utterance, and they receive an “uh huh” or similar response, they can initiate repair to “disambiguate” the import of that response. It is interesting to note that minimal response tokens such as “uh huh”, “mm” or “uhm-mm”, despite their ambiguity as a response to the request of a vocabulary check, do not suggest any understanding problem on the part of the teacher. That is, the mutual understanding has not been shaken. Thus, the EFL learners’ explicit request for a vocabulary check following the teacher’s ambiguous response highlights their orientations to the language code at this particular moment.

- (3) In one of the instances in the data (extract 17), it was found that the teacher, faced with the learners’ unsuccessful word search, did not provide the search-for-item in a way that L1 speakers commonly do in ordinary conversation. Rather, he withheld the searched-for-word and gave a pedagogical prompt to elicit a self/peer repair. By doing so, he transformed the learner-initiated word search into a teacher-initiated clueing sequence which is often observed in teacher- led classroom activities (c.f. McHoul 1990). Through this practice, the teacher invokes his identity of a language teacher at this moment.
- (4) The EFL learners’ word searches in the data sometimes developed into explicit pedagogical discourse where the teachers and the learners were engaged in teaching and learning the search-for-word (see extracts 14, 15, 16, and 20), displaying their

orientation to their institutional roles as learners and teachers. These instances also show that a repair practice, i.e. word search, which is initiated for resolving communication breakdown, can provide the teacher with an “interactionally-motivated opportunity” (Seo 2008, p.117) to give vocabulary instruction that suits the learner’s linguistic needs. In other words, a word search resolution process can become an interactional resource which the teacher can use to detect the learners’ lexical problem and to extract linguistic material for teaching. Or even the learners themselves can become aware of their lexical problem through the interaction and initiate a teaching and learning sequence on the searched-for-word as shown in extract 15. Teaching and learning vocabulary in a meaningful context has been highly recommended in recent years by SLA researchers (e.g. Doughty and William 1998; Long and Robinson 1998), and how to incorporate vocabulary teaching into more meaning-oriented interaction has been the main focus in research on teaching methodologies (see e.g. Larsen-Freeman 2000; Richards and Rodgers 2001). However, how exactly this can be achieved interactionally? A few examples presented in this study (see extracts 14, 15, 16 and 20) have shown, by means of transcripts of recorded naturally occurring classroom interaction, how a vocabulary item is extracted from the on-going course of action, i.e. word search, and becomes subject for explicit teaching and learning. Explicit pedagogical activities resulting from word searches were not reported in previous L2 word search studies in ordinary conversations, but were observed to occur frequently in a study on repair in one-on-one ESL tutoring (Seo 2008). It seems that in a pedagogical setting where there exists an institution-specific goal of language learning and teaching, word searches are more likely to result in pedagogical activities.

### **5.5 Word Search and Second Language Learning**

In chapter 2, arguments surrounding the inclusion of “extraneous” theories (such as sociocultural theory) in CA studies were discussed. Two key constructs in sociocultural theory (ZPD and scaffolding), which are of relevance as interpretative frameworks, were also reviewed. This section sets out to discuss how word search practices may contribute to L2 language development, drawing on the perspective of sociocultural theory.

The analysis in Chapter 4 has shown how the EFL learners used word search as an interactional resource to resolve conversation breakdown. Through the linguistic

support of a more capable peer or the teacher the learner is able to better express his/her idea. Such a practice, this study suggests, apart from facilitating communication flow, also potentially contributes to second language acquisition because it involves the scaffolding of linguistic production of a less competent language learner by a more capable other (the teacher or a peer). From a Vygotskian perspective, such an interactive dialogue among novice and expert facilitates individual cognitive development.

It is important to note that “scaffolded performance” is not evidence of acquisition; rather it is a key step in moving towards internalization of the target language”, as Donato puts it, “scaffolded performance is a dialogically constituted interpsychological mechanism that promotes the novice’s internalization of knowledge constructed in shared activity” (1994, p.41). In line with this vein, the uptake or acceptance of the candidate word observed in the word searches in the data should not be interpreted as the acquisition of the target word. In Vygotsky’s words it should be considered as the “buds” or “flowers” of development rather than the “fruits” of development (1978, pp.86-87). The developmental interpretation of the word search practices proposed here is in line with the sociocultural theory’s notion of learning in that learning is portrayed as a process but not a product.

The opportunity for L2 language development arising in a word search can further be illuminated by the notion of Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), the distance between what an individual can perform on his or her own and what he or she can perform with assistance. Otha (2001) points out that ZPDs are evident wherever one learner is enabled to do something by the assistance of another that he or she would not have been able to do otherwise. She further suggests that language is acquired when learners interact in the ZPD. In line with her view, evidence of ZPDs can also be found in the word search examples illustrated in chapter 4. More specifically, ZPDs are evident in the successful outcome in that the learners are enabled to express what they want to say, which they would not have been able to do alone with the assistance of others.

In short, the discussion suggests that a word search has the great potential to enact the learner’s ZPD and hence facilitate learning. More specially, word searches provide a site for learners to practice forming utterances when they need them to communicate their ideas, and of important is that this is accomplished through collaboration with

others. Through opportunities such as these, learners gradually build up their language skills and proficiency, as Otha (2000, p10) puts it, “This accomplishment constitutes a building block that works towards growing independence”.

A few examples presented in chapter 4, where the word searches are resolved with the help of other peers, have implications for peer learning. It demonstrates peers are also importance resources to enact the ZPD even with the presence of the teacher. What is more important is that when they are assisting the word searches, they are also provided an opportunity to “learn”. For example, they need to search through the vocabulary list they have already built up to find the right word. They thus benefit from matching and analysing the language. When they cannot help, it shows that they also have the same linguistic gap, and hence an opportunity for them to learn a new word emerges. Some of the examples presented in chapter 4 have shown that an opportunity to learn the searched for word is also available for those who are not directly participate in the search. They are observed to show their uptake of the target word too, through for example repetition or tokens such as “*ya*”, “*oh*”, and “*ah*”. In short, the learning opportunities arising in a word search is not just for the learner who initiate the word search but also open for other peers. That is to say, word searches in the classroom not only enact the ZPD of the leaner who initiates the search but also potentially enact other learners’ ZPD.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has summarised and discussed the findings of the analysis carried out in chapter 4. In section 5.2, basic and extended word searches have been illustrated in terms of their sequential organization and interactional management. These instances have demonstrated word search is a strong indication of intersubjectivity since it is co-constructed by the participants’ close monitoring of each other’s action. This section also discussed the role of the teacher in the extended word searches and argued that successful management of word searches by the teachers is a feature of L2 Classroom Interactional Competence. Section 5.3 discussed how the learners in the data initiated a word search and invited collaboration. They were observed to mark their word search in an arguably conventional way. Specifically, they used various lexical speech perturbations to initiate a word search. In terms of eliciting the searched-for –word in their initial search turn , code-switch and iconic gestures were found to be the most effective resources to elicit the target word, which often resulted in a satisfactory outcome with no need to further clarify the searched-for-word. Section 5.4 discussed the word search instances which are organized differently from those in ordinary conversation. The findings suggested that the participants in these word searches displayed an orientation to their roles as L2 language expert

and L2 language learner. Finally the last section discussed the relevance of the findings to L2 language learning from the perspective of sociocultural theory of learning. It was argued that a collaborative word search has the potential to create a ZPD for language learning, despite being initially used as a resource to facilitate the conversation.

## Chapter 6. Conclusion

In this study, I have investigated a type of interactional practice, i.e. “word search”, which is characterised by speakers’ display of difficulties in finding the linguistic item to express their intended meaning and recipients’ assistance to find the item. Specifically, I have examined how word searches are interactionally resolved with participants’ various resources and techniques in the context of teacher- fronted classroom interactions. A discussion of these findings has also be presented. This type of practice was chosen not only because of its crucial role in establishing mutual understanding in conversation, but also because of its potential role in SLA, where it has the possibility to drive interlanguage forward. In addition, as these instances occur in classrooms, it is potentially interesting to see how the teachers may participate in the EFL learners’ word research resolution. In this final chapter, I will conclude this study by considering implications for CA-SLA and EFL pedagogy. I will also discuss the limitations of the study as well as possible directions for future research.

### 6.1 Implications for CA-SLA

Although, it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed account of the relationship between the EFL learners’ word search practices and SLA, a number of observations that may shed light on the issue of language learning can be offered.

First, in line with CA’s view on language learning, this study provides some instances to look at the EFL learners’ learning behaviours that are emerging through the interaction. Conversation Analysis was not originally designed for studying second language learning; however, recently CA has increased in popularity as a methodology for investigating second language acquisition (e.g., Markee 2000; 2008). In the examples where the word search is expanded into a vocabulary teaching and learning session, the learners’ learning behaviours are more explicit. For example, in extract 14, the original searcher repeats the target word and its spelling following the teacher’s modelling. In extract 15, the original searcher has an extensive discussion about the usage of the target linguistic item with the teacher. In extract 16, it is observed that the original searcher as well as other students all repeat and/or note down the word. In some examples, the learning is displayed in a more subtle way. For example, in line 25 in extract 13, Tracy’s repeat of the target word after she has confirmed it can be seen as

her attempt to practice it although there is no explicit pedagogical sequence. In extract 7, Eldon responds to the target word with a change-of-state token, “*oh*” (Heritage 1984a), indicating he has undergone some kind of change in his current state of knowledge. In extract 4, we see that Samuel is able to incorporate the proffered word into his own context so he could continue the talk. However, it should be noted that these observable learning behaviours do not equal long-term acquisition of these linguistic items, but a demonstration of different stages of learning in the interaction. For example in extract 7 and 13, the learners’ response to the target words can be seen as an indicator of emergence of a new linguistic knowledge. In extract 16, the learners demonstrate they can produce the target word but only in a controlled environment, that is, they produce it as a full turn itself but not in a meaning context. In extract 4, the learner demonstrates he is able to use the proffered word in a meaningful environment, that is, to incorporate it to continue his talk. Incorporation of the proffered word into the context, according to Brouwer (2003), can be seen as a demonstration of language learning “at least locally” (p. 542). However, he also argues that it cannot be guaranteed that the speaker will be able to use the word correctly either in the same context or in a different context in the future. Seedhouse (2010) suggests that learning can be defined as a change in a socially-displayed cognitive state. From this view of learning, the learning behaviours observed in the examples, although not guaranteeing a long-term acquisition, should be regarded as important steps towards acquisition.

Second, the analysis of the word search activities contributes to our understanding of EFL learners’ interactional competence (IC). Wong (2000a, 2000b) suggests that CA has a great potential for noticing features in L2 interactions ignored by researchers applying traditional SLA and this study has demonstrated the point she made. The EFL learners in the study demonstrate through the interaction that, despite their possible limited linguistic competence, they are social and interactional competent individuals who are able to make use of various interactional strategies and resources to co-resolve the communication breakdown with their teacher or fellow learners. This also suggests that particular features in a word search, such as hesitation markers and disfluencies, are not markers of deficient competence in the second language, but are important interactional resources for EFL or L2 learners to deal with a trouble source and keep the floor while attempting to solve the search (Carroll 2006). In traditional SLA, non-linguistic resources such as gestures, body movements, eyegazes, and hesitation markers such as repetitions, fillers, sound stretches, cut-offs, and pauses, are not

considered important in achieving successful communication. However, through the lens of CA methodology, it is shown that these are crucial resources for resolving troubles in talk. More specifically, the EFL learners can use them to organize their word search and to achieve a successful outcome.

## **6.2 Implications for EFL pedagogy**

This study offers important pedagogical implications. By providing a detailed description of the teachers' involvement in resolving their students' language production problems, it contributes to raising EFL teachers' awareness of their pedagogical practices. Thus the examples provided in this study may be useful for the purpose of EFL teacher training. SLA research is often criticised by language classroom teachers for its lack of relevance to classroom practice. Therefore providing examples of what teachers actually do but not what they think they can do will help them to be more aware of their own practice. In other words, investigation of the current practices can be essential for teachers who wish to improve their pedagogical practices.

A few examples in this study have shown various resources and techniques used by the teachers in assisting the learners' word searches. In terms of the ways they offer the candidate word, for example, they were sometimes observed to repeat the target word one more time following its acceptance by the learner who initiates the search, as shown in extracts 5, 13, and 16. What is interesting is that, in all the examples, following the teacher's additional confirmation, the original searchers also repeat the word again. It is not clear whether or not the teachers in the examples do this intentionally to elicit the learners' repetition and it is not our intention here to judge whether it is a good practice or not, but the close analysis of that data has shown its interactional consequences. Thus, if the teachers wish to promote the learner's linguistic competence, it might be a good idea for them to repeat the target word again following the resolution of the word searcher because it will attract the learners' attention to its form, as shown in their follow-up repetitions. Similarly, in the example where the teacher withholds the candidate word to elicit self-repair (extract 17), the inserted teacher-initiated clueing sequence seems to be beneficial to the learners from the viewpoint of raising learners' attention on the form of the target word, however, it can interrupt the flow of the communication. Thus the teacher needs to be aware of its potential disadvantage. Furthermore, consideration needs to be taken in relation to whether or not the target

word can be easily elicited through hints and what kind of hint is more efficient in the given sequential environment.

A few examples in this study also shed light on teachers' practice in assisting the learners to clarify their intended meaning. SLA research on teachers' repair practices tends to focus on how teachers deal with what has been produced in the learners' talk, i.e. corrective feedback (e.g. Lyster 1998; Panova & Lyster 2002) but not with what has not been produced. This study, on the contrary, provides detailed description of how teachers deal with sources of unclear meaning. In addition to clarification request (see extract 11), a common strategy in interaction to elicit the speakers to clarify their intended meaning, the study also found some other interesting interactional strategies and resources used by the teachers to assist the learners' word search. For example, in extract 12, the teacher used an incomplete utterance to encourage the learner to continue her clarification. In addition, he invited her to draw the object she wanted to say on the white board, turning the white board into an important local source in assisting the word search. Finally, he also displayed his close attendance to the learner's clarification by mimicking her iconic gesture while initiating his own word search by assuming a thinking face. Such attentive embodiment can sustain the word search activity, giving the speaker more interactional space to learners' word searches. These more subtle resources teachers deploy to assist learners to express themselves fully have not been well explored. Thus a close examination of teacher's participation in a word search can contribute to our understanding of teachers' online interactional strategy use, including both verbal and non-verbal strategies.

### **6.3 Limitations and Further Research Considerations**

This study has described EFL learners' word search practices in teacher-fronted classroom interactions, focusing on how they are interactionally accomplished. However, this study deals with a particular classroom context- conversation and discussion lessons. Further research could investigate word searches in more conventional classroom contexts where the learners are typically given less opportunity to talk so that we can gain a more complete view of word search practices in classroom interaction. This study has also made some preliminary observation and discussion on how teachers assist with learners' word searches. The role of teacher in learner's word search has not been an analytic focus in the literature; further research will thereby be

able to contribute more word search instances in teacher-fronted classroom interaction in order to make a thorough description of teacher's participation in learners' word searches.

The relationship between word search practice and teacher's linguistic background, i.e. native English teacher V.S. Taiwanese English teacher, could also be explored. In this study all the participating teachers are native speakers of English who do not know or have limited knowledge about the learners' shared L1: Chinese. By examining classroom interaction where all the participants share the same first language and culture, there is some potential to see how this character may or may not shape the organization and development of a word search practice. For example, we have seen in this study that the EFL learners often use L1 to request a translation from their peers, typically before they request any help from the teacher. It would be potential interesting to observe how they employ L1 when it is in a "complete" monolingual classroom.

Finally, a longitudinal study could be conducted to track how EFL learners later use the lexical items which they have "momentarily learnt" through a word search activity, in their spontaneous talk in interaction. As discussed above, this study can only show how "short-term learning" occurs in situ. Thus, to investigate the further development of these linguistic items, a longitudinal study can be considered. In recent years, there has been an increasing number of CA-informed studies which attempt to document learning from a longitudinal perspective (e.g., Hellermann,2007; Markee 2008; Pekarek Doehler 2010), however, much more research is still needed in order to see how CA can actually contribute to our understanding of the relationship between language use and acquisition.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allwright, R. L. (1984). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. *Applied linguistics*, 5(2), 156-171.
- Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. London: Longman.
- Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second Llanguage acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 525-545.
- Atkinson, M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (Vol. 48, pp. 187-213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence . *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479-507.
- Betz, E. (2008). *Grammar and Interaction: Pivots in German conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bialystock, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Færch, G. Kasper, C. Færch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 100-118). London: Longman.
- Bialystock, E. (1990). *Communication strategies* . Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 534-545.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2004). Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In R. Gardner, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 96-113). London: Continuum.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner., J. (2004). 2004. Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 29-47.
- Bruner, J. S. (1975). From communication to language: A psychological perspective. *Cognition*, 3, 255-287.
- Bryman, A. (2001). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversation. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 67-110.
- 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.
- Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 214-234). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Carroll, D. (2006). *Co-constructing Competence: Turn Construction and Repair in Novice-to-Novice Second Language Interaction*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of York, Communication Studies Program.
- Cekaite, A. (2009). Soliciting teacher attention in an L2 classroom: Affect displays, classroom artefacts, and embodied action. *Applied linguistics*, 30(1), 26-48.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 29-48).
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. B. (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System*, 30(4), 419-432.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.
- Firth, A. (1996). 'The discursive accomplishment of normality. On "lingua franca" English and conversation analysis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-59.
- Firth, A. W. (2007). Second/Foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 800-819.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied linguistics*, 26(3), 402-430.
- Funayama, I. (2002). Word-searches in cross-linguistic Settings: Teaching-learning collaboration between native and non-native speakers. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction and Culture*, 4, 33-57.
- Gardner, J., & Wagner, R. (2004). Introduction. In J. Gardner, & R. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 1-17). London: Continuum.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. John Benjamins Publishing.

- Gardner, R. (2007). 'Broken' Starts: Bricolage in Turn Starts in Second Language Talk" . In P. S. Z. Hua, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-Action*. (pp. 58-71). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gardner, R. (2008). Conversation Analysis and orientation to Learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 1-16.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley MA: Newbury House.
- Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 272-302.
- Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(2), 115-131.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1981). Searching for a word as an interactive activity. In J. Deely, & M. D. Lenhart (Eds.), *Semiotics* (pp. 129-138). New York: Plenum.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62(1/2), 51-57.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION AND LANGUAGE LEARNING. 22(1), 186-203. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 186-203.
- Hancock, M. (1997). Behind Classroom Code Switching:. *Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction*, 31(2), 217-235.
- Have, P. t. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36(2), 109-141.
- He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 568-582.
- He, A. W., & Young., R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach . In A. W. He, & R. Young. (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1-24). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Heath, C. (2004). Analysing face-to-face interaction: Video, the visual and material. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 266-82.). London: Sage.
- Helasvuo, M. L., Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M. (2004). Searching for words: Syntactic and sequential construction of word search in conversation of Finnish speakers with aphasia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(1), 1-37.

- Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 377-404.
- Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 377-404.
- Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 83-96.
- Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for Evidence of Language Learning in Practices for Repair: A Case Study of Self-Initiated Self-Repair by an Adult Learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113-132.
- Hellermann, J., & Doehler, S. P. (2010). On the contingent nature of language-learning tasks. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(1), 25-45.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In D. Silvermann (Ed.), *Qualitative research, theory, method and practice* (pp. 222-245). London: Sage.
- Hertigate, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 39-65.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 25-50.
- Hutchby, I., & Woofitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 181-199.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On Exposed and Embedded Error Correction. In G. Button., & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jenks, C. (2010). Adaptation in Online Voice-based Chat Rooms. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 147-162). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jung, K. (2004). L2 vocabulary development through conversation: A conversation analysis. *Second Language Studies*, 23(1), 27-66.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 200-215.

- Kasper, G. (2004). Participation orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 551-576.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83-99.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 11-36.
- Kasper, G., & Kellerman, E. (1997). Introduction: approaches to communication strategies. In G. Kasper, & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic perspective* (pp. 1-13). New York: Longman.
- Keith, R. (2003). *Qualitative inquire in TESOL*. New York: PALGAVE MACMILLAN.
- Klippi, A. (2006). Nonverbal Behavior as Turn Constructional Units in Aphasic. *Texas Linguistic Forum*, 49, 58-169.
- Ko, S. (2005). *Multiple-response sequences in adult Korean TESOL classrooms* (Vol. 32). (Doctoral dissertation, University of New South Wales.
- Koshik, I., & Seo, M. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text and Talk*, 32(2), 167-189.
- Kupetz, M. (2011). Multimodal resources in students' explanations in CLIL. *interactionNovitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language) [online]. Available from [http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol\\_5\\_1/kupetz.pdf](http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/kupetz.pdf) [Accessed 15 April 2012].*, 5(1), 121-142.
- Kurhila, S. (2004). *Second Language Interaction* (John Benjamins ed.). (G. R., & W. J., Eds.) London: Amsterdam/Philadlphia.
- Laakso, M., & Klippi, A. (1999). A closer look at the 'hint and guess' sequences in aphasic conversation. *Aphasiology*, 13(4/5), 345-363.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of L2 development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 79-117.
- Lee, D. S. (2004). *Conversational analytic approach to communication strategies: appeals in language learners' word searches*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana.

- Lee, Y. (2006). Towards Respecification of Communicative Competence: Condition of L2 Instruction or its Objective? *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 349-376.
- Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(6), 180-206.
- Lehti-Eklund, H. (2013). Code-switching to first language in repair—A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2), 132-152.
- Lerner, G. H. (1987). *Collaborative turn sequences: Sentence construction and social action* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine).
- Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 111-131.
- 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. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. *The language of turn and sequenc*, 225-256.
- Levelt, W. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liebscher, G., & DAILEY–O'CAIN. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), 234-247.
- Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(3), 361.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in classroom SLA*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265-302.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33, 703-736.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *The Modern Language*, 88(4), 583-596.

- Markee, N. (2005). The organization of off-task talk in second language classrooms. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 197-213). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Markee, N. (2008). 'Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA'. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 404-427.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talk: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491-5000.
- McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in society*, 19(3), 349-377.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 501-518.
- Mori, J. &. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 195-219.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 536-550.
- Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 849-862.
- Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 65-94.
- Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-Analytic Perspectives* (pp. 135-162). Honolulu: NFLRC.
- Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how repair displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 265-283.
- Nguyen, H. (2011). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Pallotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-Analytic Perspectives* (pp. 17-44.). Honolulu: NFLRC.
- Oelschlaeger, M. L. (1999). Participation of a conversation partner in the word searches of a person with aphasia. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*.
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom : learning Japanese*. Mahwah, N.J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Okamoto, S. (2009). Orientation To The Languages Of The Moment: Opportunities For Learning Two Target Languages In A Multilingual Foreign Language Classroom. *Second Language Studies*, 27(2), 71-121.

- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken. In R. Gardner, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second Language Conversations* (pp. 221-245). London: Continuum.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second Language Conversations* (Vol. Continuum, pp. 221-245). London: Continuum.
- Pallotti, G. (2007). Conversation Analysis: Methodology, Machinery and Application to Specific Settings. In H. Bowles, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language for specific purposes* (pp. 37-68). Oxford, UK : Peter Lang.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Park, I. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. *Teachers College, Columbia University, Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 1-23.
- Park, J. E. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 339-360.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 105-127). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 201-220). London: Sage.
- Peräkylä, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 283-304). London: Sage.
- Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL*, 21, 737-758.
- Poullisse, N. (1990). *The use of compensatory Strategies by Dutch learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Poullisse, N. (1997). Compensatory strategies and the principles of clarity and economy. In G. Kasper, & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic perspective* (pp. 49-64). New York: Longman.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis. The study of talk-in-interaction*. London: Sage.
- Radford, J. (2009). Word searches: on the use of verbal and non-verbal resources during classroom talk . *Clinical linguistics & phonetics*, 23(8), 598-610.
- Radford, J. (2010). Adult participation in children's word searches: on the use of prompting, hinting, and supplying a model. *Clinical linguistics & phonetics*, 24(2), 83-100.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* . Oxford: Blackwell .

- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference topersons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Discourse and Syntax: Vol. 12. Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 261-286). New York: 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. (1995). Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(3), 185-211.
- 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.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Schwartz, L. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1997). Combining form and meaning. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 51(4), 336-344.
- Seedhouse, P. (1998). CA and the analysis of foreign language interaction: A reply to Wagner. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(1), 85-102.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165-187.
- Seedhouse, P. (2007). "On ethnomethodological CA and "linguistic CA": A reply to Hall." . *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 527-533.
- Seedhouse, P. (2008). Learning to Talk the Talk: Conversation Analysis as a Tool for Induction of Trainee Teachers. In S. Garton, K. Richards, G. S., & R. K (Eds.), *Professional Encounters in TESOL: Discourses of Teachers in Teaching*. (pp. 42-45). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seedhouse, P., & Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a Second Language through Classroom Room Interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'Learning@ in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 127-146). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Seo, M. (2008). *A conversation-analytic study of repair practices in one-on-one ESL tutoring*. A conversational-analytic study of repair practices in one-on-one ESL tutoring.: (Publication No. AAT 3314887).
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Streeck, J. (2009). Forward-Gesturing. *Discourse Processes*, *46*(2), 161-179.
- Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(4), 489-516.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the learner*. . London: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society : the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press .
- Wagner, J. &. (1997). Communication strategies at work. In G. Kasper, & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 323-344). New York: Longman.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *6*(1), 3-23.
- Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom. *Language Awareness*, *12*, 124-142.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London : Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom . *ELT Journal* , *60*(2), 133-141.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse : language in action*. London : Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising Classroom Interactional Competence . *Novitas-ROYAL*[online] [http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol\\_6\\_1/Walsh.pdf](http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_6_1/Walsh.pdf). [Accessed 2 May 2013]., *6*(1), 1-13.
- Willey, B. T. (2001). *Examining a " Communication Strategy" from a Conversation Analytic Perspective: Eliciting Help from Native Speakers Inside and Outside of Word Search Sequences*. Unpublished Master's thesis: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Wong, J. (2000a). Repetition in Conversation: A Look at " First and Second Sayings". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(4), 407-424.
- Wong, J. (2000b). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English Conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(1), 244-267.
- Wong, J. (2004). Some preliminary thoughts on delay as an interactional resource. In R. Gardner, & J. Wanger (Eds.), *Second language conversation* (pp. 114-131). London: Continuum.
- Wu, B. (1998). Towards an understanding of the dynamic process of L2 classroom interaction. *System*, *26*(4), 525-540.

- Young, R. (2007). Language Learning and Teaching as Discursive Practice. In P. S. ZHua, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as discursive practice. Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 251-271). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 519-535.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 426-443). London & New York: Routledge.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Transcription Conventions

Adopted Atkinson & Heritage (1984)

[ ]	Overlapping utterances
=	Latching: this is used when there is no interval between adjacent utterances
(1.8)	Interval between utterances (in seconds)
(.)	Very short pause (less than 0.2 second)
-	An abrupt cutting off of sound, where the speaker stops speaking suddenly
( )	Unclear or unintelligible stretch of talk
(( ))	Transcriber's remark or comment
:	A colon indicates an extension of the sound
:::	Multiple colons indicate a longer extension of the sound
.	A period indicates falling(final) intonation
,	A comma indicates continuing intonation
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation
.hh	Audible inbreath
.hh	Audible inbreath
hh	Audible outbreath
<u>underline</u>	Stressed sound
WORD	Capital letters indicate higher volume, louder than surrounding talk
°word°	Passage of talk noticeably quieter than surrounding talk
↑ ↓	Marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance following the arrow
(hh)	Laughter within a word
< >	Utterance delivered at slower speed than surrounding talk
> <	Utterance delivered at quicker speed than surrounding talk
→	Mark feature of special interest
£ £	Sterling signs are used to indicate a smiley or jokey voice.

- + marks the onset of a non-verbal action (e.g. shift of gaze, pointing)
- italics* English translation
- [æ] Phonetic transcriptions of sounds are given in square brackets
- LL Several or all learners simultaneously

## Appendix B



### **Title of Study: Word Searches in EFL Classrooms**

#### **Letter of Consent**

**Dear students,**

My name is Fen-Lan Lin. I am currently studying a PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics at Newcastle University, UK. You are being invited to take part in a research study that investigates second language conversations of English. The overall aim is to increase understanding of what happens interactionally between conversational partners when facing the problem of searching for a lexical item. I will video-tape (with audio) the spoken interaction between you and your teacher or other students in your English class. The video taping equipment will be made as unobtrusive as possible. These recordings will be used only for educational and research purposes. Sometimes, excerpts of the recordings may need to be presented for the benefits of listeners at a professional conference. However, in any use of these recordings, names will not be identified.

Your recordings are valuable and important to this research, but you are free to withdraw at any time. By signing this form, you are giving your consent for being videotaped (with audio) of your voice and face and for the use of your recordings for educational and research purposes.

Your kind cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Fen-Lan Lin

PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics

School of Education, Communication and language sciences

E-mail address: [Fen-Lan.Lin@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:Fen-Lan.Lin@ncl.ac.uk)

I have read the above description and give my consent for the use of the recordings as indicated above.

Date : \_\_\_\_\_.

Signature : \_\_\_\_\_.



## Title of Study: Word Searches in EFL Classrooms

### Letter of Consent

**Dear teachers,**

My name is Fen-Lan Lin. I am currently studying a PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics at Newcastle University, UK. Your class are being invited to take part in a research study that investigates EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom discourse. The overall aim is to increase understanding of what happens interactionally when students facing the problem of searching for a word in their ongoing talk. As part of this project I need to collect spoken data of classroom interaction and therefore I will video-tape (with audio) your English class while you are having a lesson. You do not need to do any special preparation; rather I hope to see what typically occurs in the classroom interaction. The video taping equipment will be made as unobtrusive as possible. These recordings will be used only for educational and research purposes. Sometimes, excerpts of the recordings may need to be presented for the benefits of listeners at a professional conference. However, in any use of these recordings, names will not be identified.

Your recordings are valuable and important to this research, but you are free to withdraw at any time. By signing this form, you are giving your consent for being videotaped (with audio) of your voice and face and for the use of your recordings for educational and research purposes.

Your kind cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Fen-Lan Lin

PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics

School of Education, Communication and language sciences

E-mail address: [Fen-Lan.Lin@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:Fen-Lan.Lin@ncl.ac.uk)

I have read the above description and give my consent for the use of the recordings as indicated above.

Date : \_\_\_\_\_ .

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ .