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This study investigates 'corrective recasts' and other-correction of language form during interaction among native and non-native speakers meeting at a conversation club at an English language school. Several problems were found with the use of 'corrective recast' as an analytic category. However, at times, participants were found to orient to certain turns as performing other-correction of language form. Analysis of sequential and turn-internal organization illustrated how other-correction of language form can be understood to be a collaborative accomplishment of the participants. Analysis of what occurred following other-correction of language form indicated that participants' orientation to language form is somewhat limited. In addition, accounting for a language error and/or a correction could become interactional business for the participants. Finally, this study explored the potential, problems, and limitations associated with the application of straight conversation analysis in the study of second language acquisition. A basic limitation of such application is that there is no learning theory within conversation analysis, making it impossible to investigate language learning.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ........................................................................................................ iii
Section I: Background ................................................................................. 1
   Chapter 1: A CA Approach to the Study of Corrective Recasts .......... 2
      Methodology ....................................................................................... 5
   Outline of Dissertation ....................................................................... 16
Chapter 2: Nature of the Data: The Conversation Club
   Language Game ....................................................................................... 19
      The Conversation Club as an Institutional Activity ......................... 20
      The Conversation Club as Scheduled Event .................................... 20
      Participants as an Institutionally-ordained Group ......................... 25
   Role Orientation and Constitution ......................................................... 28
      Interrogation ..................................................................................... 29
      Language Instruction ....................................................................... 36
      Resorting to the L1 ......................................................................... 40
      Participant Role Categorization ....................................................... 42
      Summary .......................................................................................... 45
   Being an Interactional Pivot ................................................................... 47
      Schisming ........................................................................................ 48
      Pivoting ............................................................................................ 52
   The Valentine Story ................................................................................ 58
   Conclusion ............................................................................................. 80
Chapter 3: Other-repair and Other-correction in CA ............................. 82
   Organization and Realization of Repair ................................................ 83
      Basic Distinctions ........................................................................... 83
      Third and Fourth Position Repair ..................................................... 86
      Repair Resources ........................................................................... 88
      Interactive Nature of Repair ............................................................ 90
   Constraints on Other-repair and Other-correction ............................. 92
   Other-correction and Asymmetrical Access to Knowledge .................. 97
   Repair and Intersubjectivity ................................................................. 103
   Conclusion .......................................................................................... 105
Chapter 4: Other-repair and Other-correction in the
   Conversation Club .................................................................................. 108
   Other-initiated Repair .......................................................................... 109
      Sequential Organization .................................................................. 109
      Omnipotence of NNS Status in Targeting the Trouble Source .......... 117
   Other-correction ................................................................................ 130
      Two Components of Correction ....................................................... 131
      Inviting Correction ......................................................................... 132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inviting Correction .................................................................. 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting it Pass ........................................................................... 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Being an NNS .................................................................... 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Organization of Other-correction of Language Form ........ 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction Invitation ................................................................. 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic Comprehension of NNS Forms .................................... 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-correction of Perception ................................................ 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Humor in a Non-target-like Form ..................................... 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction of Form or Content? .................................................. 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Occurrence and Relative Frequency of Other-correction ....... 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Being an NNS .................................................................... 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Correction Turns ................................................... 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Item ........................................................................ 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing Contrast ................................................................... 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Content ................................................................ 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of Recognition .................................................................. 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of Tentativeness ........................................................... 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter ...................................................................................... 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary ...................................................................................... 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-correction of Language Form as an Interactive Accomplishment 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with 'Corrective Recasts' as Input ................................. 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting Non-target-like Forms ............................................. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary ...................................................................................... 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion ................................................................................... 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9: Interaction after Other-correction of Language Form ....... 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation .............................................................................. 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of 'Corrective Recasts' .......................................... 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of Other-correction of Language Form ...................... 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Orientation to Form ....................................................... 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary ...................................................................................... 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for an Error ................................................................ 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Recall as a Source of Accounts ................................. 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness as an Account ................................................................ 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Lexical Knowledge as an Account .................................... 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating as Something Else .......................................................... 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary ...................................................................................... 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion ................................................................................... 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10: Conclusion ................................................................ 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CA Approach to SLA .................................................................. 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters Six to Nine, Summary .................................................... 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of CA Approach to SLA ............................................. 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA and SLA, Problems, Limitations, and Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst’s and Participants’ Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Language Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion: Unexplored Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change-of-state Tokens in Interaction with NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of NNS Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying Metalinguistic Knowledge as a Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Transcription Conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Conversation Club Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Additional Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION I. BACKGROUND

CHAPTER 1
A CA APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF CORRECTIVE RECASTS

That interaction plays a necessary role or roles in the process of language acquisition, first or second, is uncontroversial. Within one of the major research traditions in second language acquisition (SLA), a tradition that may be labeled the interactionist paradigm and which will be critiqued in chapter five, the primary role of interaction is as a source of input. Some of this input may be in the form of corrective input. If a language learner produces a non-target-like form and an interlocutor then reformulates the language learner’s utterance, in such a way as to preserve its meaning while making it target-like, it is possible that the interlocutor’s reformulation will function as correction and that the language learner will learn something about the language from the correction. This kind of potentially corrective reformulation has been discussed extensively in the field of language acquisition, both first and second, and has been labeled as a type of expansion in first language acquisition (e.g., Cross, 1977)\textsuperscript{i}, corrective feedback in SLA (e.g., Crookes & Rulon, 1985)\textsuperscript{ii} and, most commonly and in both first and second language acquisition, corrective recast or simply recast (e.g., Baker & Nelson, 1984)\textsuperscript{iii}.

The idea that language learners can benefit from correction of language form, though, is not uncontroversial. In particular, the controversy is over whether correction provides language learners with a particular type of input that has been labeled negative evidence. In one conceptualization of language acquisition, a language is viewed as an infinite, but still well-defined, set of possible, grammatical sequences, that is, sentences generated by the grammar of that language, with the language learner’s task being to learn the grammar, thus allowing him or her to distinguish possible,
grammatical sequences from impossible, ungrammatical sequences. In this conceptualization, the learner must induce the grammar on the basis of the evidence that he or she encounters. This evidence can be categorized into two broad types, evidence of what is possible in the language, known as positive evidence, which may simply consist of samples of language use which the learner encounters, and evidence of what is not possible in the language, or negative evidence. A logical problem that follows from this conceptualization of language acquisition is how learners are able to retreat from a certain class of overgeneralizations. If a language learner overgeneralized in such a way that his or her grammar allowed the entire set of possible sentences, but also allowed some impossible sentences, then it would be impossible on the basis of positive evidence alone to retreat from the overgeneralization, as none of the language samples the learner heard would contradict his or her overgeneral grammar. Negative evidence would thus appear to be necessary to inform the learner that sequences allowed by his or her grammar were in fact impossible (see, e.g., Baker, 1979). The controversy arises over whether learners encounter sufficient negative evidence to retreat from such overgeneralizations. One side in this controversy claims that they do, in the form of such things as corrective recasts (e.g., Bohannon, et al., 1990; Moerk, 1989; Nelson, 1987; Post, 1994; Saxton, 1997), while the other side claims that they do not (e.g., Bowerman, 1987, 1988; Brown & Hanlon, 1970; Gordon, 1990; Grimshaw & Pinker, 1989; Gropen, et al., 1989; Marcus, 1993; Morgan & Travis, 1989; Morgan, et al., 1995; Pinker, 1989), which entails that they must have recourse to something else, such as innate language learning principles that preempt such overgeneralization (e.g., Baker, 1979) and/or innate knowledge of possible grammars of human languages (e.g., Pinker, 1989).
However, the question of whether corrective recasts play a role in language acquisition is distinct from the question of whether they provide negative evidence. There are several possible functions of corrective recasts other than the provision of negative evidence, such as attracting learner attention to certain aspects of form, helping learners gain control over forms they are in the process of acquiring, and possibly even indexing roles or identities such as native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS). As the question of whether corrective recasts can function as negative evidence is not a concern of this study, I will remain agnostic in this regard and the relationship between corrective recasts and negative evidence will not be discussed further.

Rather, the primary concern of this study is the relationship between corrective recasts, or what may also be called other-correction of language form (see chapters eight and nine), and interaction. Within a particular research tradition in SLA, mentioned above as the interactionist paradigm and discussed and criticized in more detail in chapter five, interaction is an interesting object of study primarily as a source of input to learner internal acquisition processes and/or mechanisms. The majority of SLA research on corrective recasts has been conducted within this paradigm, with recasts being viewed as a particular type of input. The kinds of questions that have been of interest are, for example, the likelihood of a recast following the production of a non-target-like form by an NNS (e.g., Izumi, 1998), the frequency of recasts relative to other types of response and/or input (e.g., Braidi, 2002), the likelihood of a recast following particular types of error (e.g., Morris, 2002a), the response of NNSs to recasts, especially whether NNSs respond by attempting to incorporate the correction (e.g., Oliver, 1995), and the relationship between input containing recasts and successful learning, as measured by some independent metric and usually in
comparison to other types of input (e.g., Long, et al., 1998). One kind of question that has not been of interest within the interactionist paradigm has been the relationship between turns which appear to have a corrective function, that is, corrective recasts or other-correction of language form, and the local sequential organization of interaction. In other words, while researchers have been interested in such things as the frequency of recasts, particularly following different types of errors, as well as whether learners respond to recasts by attempting to incorporate the correction, they have not generally been interested with how such correction may fit into the structure of interaction.

Adopting the micro-analytic approach to the study of interaction that has come to be known as conversation analysis (CA), and rejecting the approach and assumptions of the interactionist paradigm, this study investigates this latter type of question. More specifically, this study investigates 1) how individual turns which can possibly be labeled as ‘corrective recasts’ are constructed and 2) how such turns are placed sequentially within interaction. In addition, this study explores the potential of a CA approach to a particular phenomenon that is of interest within the field of SLA. This involves an exploration of how such a non-mentalistic approach can be applied in a field in which language learning has traditionally been conceptualized in mentalist terms.

Such are the goals of this study as a whole. The remainder of this first chapter, though, is devoted to two more specific objectives: 1) discussing the methodology, conversation analysis (CA), and the specifics of how it is applied in this study, and 2) briefly outlining the remaining chapters.
Methodology

It may be somewhat unusual to discuss the methodology of a dissertation in the first chapter. This is being done in this case primarily because the issues to be discussed starting in the second chapter will be illustrated through the presentation and analysis of data collected for this study. In addition, the practice of using a literature review to frame the object of research prior to presenting research questions, hypotheses, and methodology, common in SLA and other fields, is not common in CA, or in the related, and possibly encompassing, field of ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 2002).

The data were collected from small mixed groups of NS and NNS participants in a conversation club at an English language school in Honolulu. Over the course of a few months, over sixteen hours of audiorecordings\textsuperscript{vii} were made of individual groups. Participants in the recorded groups knew that the recordings were being made and gave oral consent to being recorded for research purposes. Two aspects of the data collection had a negative impact on the quality of the data. First, there were always several groups meeting simultaneously in the conversation club, resulting in a great deal of background noise which sometimes rendered the recordings incomprehensible. Second, in order to limit the obtrusiveness of the recording, videorecordings were not collected. This limits the extent to which what was going on in the meetings could be recovered from the data preserved in the recordings. (The data and the conversation club are discussed in greater detail in chapter two.)

While the data from the conversation club form the primary dataset for this study, other data are occasionally introduced for purposes of comparison and/or contrast. These sources of data include conversations between the author and NNSs of English and telephone conversations between NSs of English. When such data are
introduced, the data source is described in more detail. Transcripts of these additional data can be found in Appendix D.

The data were approached as outlined in ten Have (1999). As a first step following collection of the data, rough transcripts were made which provided a visual record of what participants said. These transcripts are rough in that details of overlap, pausing, intonation, and so on, were not included. While the rough transcripts were being made, potential instances of other-correction of language form were noted. In addition, other instances which appeared interesting were also noted, such as other types of correction or repair and instances in which an interlocutor repeated or reformulated something that an NNS said, but in a way that did not involve correction of language form. Occasionally, high levels of background noise made the production of even rough transcripts impossible, so not all of the data were transcribed.

In the second step, a total of 60 instances which were marked as potentially interesting from approximately four hours of the highest quality audiotapes were transcribed in detail, resulting in an initial set of 60 highly detailed transcripts of segments of varying lengths. The initial focus was on these 60 segments, while the rest of the data remained available for further analysis. As the detailed transcripts were being produced, notes were kept on initial observations of each segment. When in the course of producing and initially analyzing these detailed transcripts, interesting features of the data were discovered, a search was made of the rough transcripts for similar and/or contrastive instances. The eventual result was a set of 94 segments of varying length drawn from approximately seven hours of rough transcripts. It should be emphasized that it is the recordings, not the transcripts, which constitute the primary data. The transcripts do not replace the recordings as data. Rather, the rough transcripts and the highly detailed transcripts should be seen as analytic tools. The
initial visual record provided by the rough transcripts aids in the identification of instances of potential interest for analysis. The process of producing the more detailed transcripts, as well at the detailed visual record provided in these transcripts, aids the analyst in grasping what participants are doing at particular points in the interaction. They also provide a visual record of the sequential organization of the interaction which allows for the presentation of a rendering of the data to readers. However, all analyses are based primarily on repeated listenings to the recordings themselves.

Following the production of detailed transcripts, the third step was to continue the analysis beyond the notes of initial observations. However, as CA-style transcripts can be difficult to read for those who are unfamiliar with them, this discussion of methodology will first deal with transcription conventions before moving on to issues of analysis. The conventions used in this study were adopted (and slightly adapted) from those described in various sources of CA methodology, specifically, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), Psathas (1995), and ten Have (1999). Transcription conventions are displayed in the table below. They can also be found in Appendix A.
The use of different transcription conventions can be seen in the following segments.

(1.1)  
[tape 8, 92; M, NS, male; G, NNS, female; L, NNS, female]  
1  M: so you guys gonna have u:h (0.3)  
2  Japanese food? (0.7) Korean food?  
3  G: n(h)ote Japanese food.  
4  L: mm[:  
5  G: [beef  
6  (0.9)
The second and third lines, in brackets, give information about the complete segment and the participants. This segment is from tape 8, and begins at 92 of the counter of my transcriber. Segments on the reverse side of a tape are labeled as B plus the counter number. The participants are then listed, by the first letter of their pseudonyms, in the order in which they appear in the segment. This includes information about whether they are NS or NNS participants and about gender. A list of participants can be found in Appendix B.

Line numbers, such as at (1), are listed on the left. Complete segments are often quite long, and only the portion of a given segment that is interesting for the current discussion is displayed in the text. For this reason, segments in the text do not necessarily begin at line 1. The complete segments can be found in Appendix C.

There is not a one-to-one correspondence between line numbers and turns. A long turn may extend across two or more lines. Also, pauses in which no participant can be heard taking a turn are displayed on their own line, as in line 6 of this transcript.

The speaker is listed by letter to the right of the line number, as at (2). Sound elongation is displayed with a colon, as at (3). Longer elongations are displayed through multiple colons. Pauses of over two tenths of a second, timed by stopwatch,
are displayed in parentheses as at (4). The number indicates the timed length of the pause. Rising (questioning) intonation is displayed by a question mark, as at (5). The breathiness of laughter co-articulated with a word is displayed by “(h),” as at (6). Several NNS participants epenthized reduced vowels word-finally. This is displayed with a schwa, as at (7). In general, symbols from the International Phonetic Alphabet, such as schwa, are not used in CA, but this was found to be necessary for this study. Falling, declarative intonation is displayed by a period, as at (8). Beginning of overlap is marked by two (or possibly more) left brackets, as at (9). The brackets are lined up vertically to visually display the overlapping speech. In this case, G begins to say “beef” while L is still saying “mm.” Extra quiet talk is marked by degree signs, as at (10). The first degree sign marks where the extra quiet talk begins, while the following one marks where it ends. Word cut-off with audible glottallization is marked with a hyphen, as at (11). Micropauses, hearable within turn pauses of less than two tenths of a second, are marked by a period within parentheses, as at (12). When it is unclear who is speaking, a question mark is used instead of an initial, as at (13). At this point in this segment, there are only three participants in this group. The NS is a male with a deep voice. Both NNSs are females with relatively high voices. It is clear in this instance that the speaker of line 13 is one of the two NNSs. Latching is marked by pairs of equal signs, as at (14). When turns produced by different speakers are so marked, the equal signs display that there is absolutely no hearable pause or overlap between the turns, in this case between the end of line 13 and the beginning of line 14. In other cases, the equal signs are used to show that a single speaker’s turn continues without pause across to non-contiguous lines. As with brackets marking overlap, equal signs almost always come in pairs, though it is also possible to have more than two in a set.
Segment (1.2) illustrates some of the other conventions.

(1.2) [tape 5, 43; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]

1  S: uh kink h (1.6) kink hh said (0.3) (17)

2  don't marriage ha

3  M: wow

4  (1.0) (18)

5  S: m because uh (1.2) there a lot of w

6  wah? (0.9) but=

7  M: =a lot of war?

8  S: wah [uh (19)

9  M: [(because)

10 (1.6)

11 S: uh (nan to yuu) (0.8) uh s sorry I (20)

12 forgot the- (0.7) (xxxxx) (. ) army

Audible outbreaths are marked by "h," as at (15). Longer outbreaths are marked by an increased number of letters. Nonstandard orthography is used to render the way that a particular word is articulated, as at (16). However, an attempt was made not to overuse this in the interests of keeping the transcripts readable. Laughter tokens are marked by "ha," as at (17). The number of hearable laughter tokens is marked by the number of "ha" tokens. This convention for displaying laughter does not take into account the fact that different individuals produce characteristically different sounding laughter tokens. Non-lexical sounds are rendered by letters that approximate the sound, as at (18). A word in parentheses indicates a best guess at mostly incomprehensible speech, as at (19). One or more letters "x" in parentheses display incomprehensible speech, as at (20). The number of letters represents the best guess at the number of syllables.
Segment (1.3) illustrates the use of the remaining conventions.

(1.3)  
[tape 5, 19; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]  
(21)  
1 M: so easily ((smilely voice))  
(22)  
2 ?: .hh  
3 (1.1)  
4 M: okay  
5 (2.5)  
6 M: let me find some paper:  
7 (1.4)  
(23)  
(24)  
8 H: Setsuko we ca:n research for (1.2)  
9 for for

Transcriber's comments about something in the transcript are marked by double parentheses, as at (21). Audible inbreaths are marked by "h" preceded by a period, as at (22). As with outbreaths, the relative length is marked iconically by the number of letters. When participants' names appear in the transcripts, they are changed to pseudonyms which preserve the number of syllables in the original name, as at (23). Finally, words or parts of words which receive greater than the amount of stress that would normally be expected are underlined, as at (24).

Following the production of the detailed transcripts, the third step was the analysis. In CA, a high degree of inference is avoided. Rather, analysis is based on what participants can be heard to be doing in interaction. That is, what they can be heard to be doing by, primarily, the participants themselves, as well as, incidentally, the analyst. The first phase of analysis of a particular segment, after the segment has been transcribed in detail and initial observations have been noted, involves listening to the segment with the transcript in hand and making notes about what participants can be heard to be doing, turn-by-turn. (This is a technique described by Pomerantz and
Fehr (1997), and may not be used by all practitioners of CA. However, it was used in this study.) These notes provide one foundation for more in-depth analysis and for comparison with other segments. This turn-by-turn analysis is demonstrated for segment (1.4).

(1.4) [tape 11, 76; A, NS, female; N, NNS, female; D, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
1 A: how come you didn't go
2 (0.9)
3 N: what=
4 D: =m==
5 A: =why didn't you go ((deliberate articulation))
6
7 (0.4)
8 N: why (0.3) mm (0.2) because I'm not a (. ) early bird ha ha s(h)o (. )
9 [not an early b1(h)rd so
10 T: [oh::

In line 1, A asks somebody a question. There is no immediate answer to this question, resulting in a fairly long, 0.9 second pause in line 2. N initiates repair in line 3, indicating some kind of problem with A’s question in line 1. It is unclear what D is doing in line 4. A completes the repair in line 5 by reformulating her original question. No one answers immediately, resulting in a 0.4 second pause in line 7. N answers the question in lines 8-10. At first, she displays that she is searching for an answer by repeating “why,” pausing briefly, producing a filled pause, “mm,” and pausing again. She then provides an answer to the question in lines 8-9, ending her answer with laughter. Following a micropause at the end of line 9, she repeats “not an early bird” in line 10, changing “a” to “an.” In line 11, T responds to N’s answer to A’s question by producing an elongated “oh” in overlap with N’s repetition of “not an early bird.”

This kind of turn-by-turn description/analysis forms the basis for a more in-depth analysis focusing on some particular aspect of the segment. An in-depth
analysis of what is happening in this segment could go something like the following. A’s question in line 1 is a first pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair. As a first pair part, it makes a second pair part, an answer, conditionally relevant in the following turn. However, rather than being followed by an answer, the question is followed by silence, a silence during which the conditionally relevant second pair part answer is noticeably absent. N initiates repair with an open class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) in line 3. This is something which indicates trouble with another’s previous turn, without explicitly locating the source of the trouble. It is clear, here and elsewhere, that N treats A’s question as being directed to her. She is the one who initiates repair, as well as the one who eventually answers the question. In addition, there are a total of four NNS participants in this group. All but N attended a school-sponsored hike at Diamond Head the previous Saturday. A’s question is about why N, and only N, did not participate. After N initiates repair, A completes the repair by reformulating her question. In its sequential organization, this is a very typical case of other-initiated self-repair (Drew, 1997; Schegloff, et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2000; Selting, 1988). (However, see the further analysis of this segment as segments (4.5) and (4.34) in chapter four.)

Following the completion of repair, the second pair part answer is still conditionally relevant. Still, though, N has trouble answering the question. She does not answer immediately, and when she does begin to talk, she first goes through a word search, which further delays the answer. Eventually, though, N answers the question, providing a second pair part that completes the adjacency pair. With this answer, the sequence begun with A’s question in line 1 can be heard as complete.

It is also interesting to see how T, another NS, is orienting to his role as a participant in this interaction. In the sequence of the first pair part question, followed
by other-initiated self-repair culminating in a reformulation of the first pair part question, and finally a second pair part answer, T has said nothing which is audible on the tape. After N gives her answer in lines 8-9, though, T produces the change-of-state token "oh" (Heritage, 1984), displaying both receipt of the answer and that this information that N gives about herself is new information for T. In doing this, T indexes his role as a legitimate participant in the exchange between A and N. Along with D’s rather ambiguous turn in line 4, this demonstrates that this is multi-party, not dyadic, interaction, in spite of the fact that A’s question is directed to N as recipient.

A few things should be noted at this point. First, each segment is a rich source of data, which means that a particular segment may be analyzed in a variety of ways, depending on the analytic focus. (See, for example, the analysis of this segment as segments (4.5) and (4.34) in chapter four.) Second, all analyses are based on the recordings, with the transcripts serving as tools to aid the analysis and presentation of the data. Finally, transcripts are perhaps infinitely revisable. Transcripts were often subject to revision during the process of analysis as new details were noticed.

This rather lengthy explanation and demonstration of how the data were collected, analyzed, and displayed is not typical of CA work (see though, Goodwin, 1990). It was included in this study for a number of reasons. Primarily, it was provided for readers who may be unfamiliar with CA conventions and with the procedures of CA analysis. It was also provided to make as transparent as possible the analytic procedures that were actually followed in conducting this study. Finally, it was included as an illustration of the grounding of CA in the details of actually occurring interaction.
Outline of Dissertation

The dissertation is divided into two sections. Section I, "Background," covers aspects of the data and reviews certain lines of research in CA and SLA that provide important background for the second section. Section II itself focuses on corrective recasts or other-correction of language form.

Section I consists of chapters one through five. Chapter two goes into detail about the nature of the primary data collected for this study. The goal of the chapter is to characterize the nature of the interaction in the conversation club through an empirical analysis of multiple segments. This characterization is important as the interaction in some ways seems particular to the context of the conversation club. The themes developed in chapter two are revisited several times in the following chapters. Chapter three is a review chapter, reviewing the large body of work in CA on other-repair and, more specifically, other-correction. Chapter four then analyzes cases of other-repair and cases of other-correction which do not appear to be related to language form that were found in the data. As other-correction of language form is closely related to other-repair and non-form related other-correction, these two chapters provide important background for Section II. Chapter five is another review chapter. It discusses the research tradition in SLA mentioned earlier that, in this study, is labeled the interactionist paradigm. The focus is on two assumptions of this paradigm that have had a strong influence on what research questions are considered interesting, how research results are interpreted, and the research methodologies that are considered valid. This is, though, a critical discussion, the purpose of which is to argue that certain assumptions of the interactionist paradigm are extremely problematic and should be abandoned.
Section II consists of chapters six through ten. The first two chapters of this section continue the critical discussion of the interactionist paradigm from chapter five, focusing on research on corrective recasts. In chapter six, the criticism focuses on the use of 'corrective recast' as a coding category, demonstrating that turns which could be coded as 'corrective recasts' may have various interactive functions other than, or even instead of, correction of language form. Even in cases where a turn that could be coded as a 'corrective recast' does appear to have a corrective function, it can have other interactive functions as well. Chapter seven extends the criticism to the notions of meaning and error in research on recasts within the interactionist paradigm. Because of problems with the concept of corrective recast, in this study the term other-correction of language form is used to distinguish turns that participants orient to as having a corrective function from turns that may be coded as 'corrective recast' through the use of predetermined coding criteria.

Chapters eight and nine then look more specifically at cases of other-correction of language form that were found in the data. Chapter eight analyzes how other-correction of language form is organized, both sequentially and turn-internally. It is argued that other-correction of language form is an interactive accomplishment. Chapter nine focuses on what follows other-correction of language form. While the fact that participants treat certain turns as being corrective of language, along with other types of behavior on the part of participants, indicates that participants are often oriented to language form, the way they typically respond to other-correction of language form indicates that the strength of this orientation is limited. In addition, in some cases, accounting for an error and/or a correction becomes the interactional business of the participants.
Chapter ten is the conclusion. After briefly reviewing the second section, the success of this study at applying CA to the study of something that has been of interest in SLA is reviewed. Problems with the application of CA are also discussed. In particular, within CA there is no theory of learning, which limits the extent that straight CA can be applied to the study of SLA. It is argued that the adoption of a learning theory which is compatible with the emic perspective and non-mentalist orientation of CA, such as sociocultural theory, can to some extent compensate for this limitation. Finally, it is argued that the scope of SLA research on the relationship between acquisition and interaction can be greatly enriched and expanded through the adoption of CA.
CHAPTER 2
NATURE OF THE DATA: THE CONVERSATION CLUB LANGUAGE GAME

The data for this study all come from audiorecordings made at a conversation club at an English language school in Honolulu. The ostensible purpose of the conversation club was to provide students at the school with opportunities to practice English conversation. As far as the NSs, called conversation partners, were concerned, the conversation club also provided them with a source of income. The interaction that took place in the conversation club can be considered to constitute a particular language activity type, as discussed by Levinson (1992), or a Wittgensteinian language game (Wittgenstein, 1953). The nature of this conversation club interaction can be distinguished both from interaction typically found in language classrooms, including communicative classrooms, and other types of interaction in which the school’s students, as well as the conversation partners, participate outside the classroom. 

Rather than make generalizations about the nature of the interaction that can be found in the conversation club, or about the roles of participants as NNSs, or language learners or novice English speakers, and NSs, or language teachers or expert English speakers, this chapter will characterize the interaction by looking at 1) how the participants orient to the institutional constraints of the conversation club, 2) how the participants orient to roles as NNS and NS, and in turn how such roles are constituted through their behavior, and 3) more specifically at how the NS role within the participation framework (Goffman, 1981) involves acting as what will be called an interactional pivot. Finally, several segments from an extended discussion among participants during one conversation club meeting will be analyzed as an illustration of a specific period of play of the conversation club language game.
The Conversation Club as an Institutional Activity

The conversation club met for four hours each Friday afternoon, a day on which there were no regularly scheduled classes, but there were a few different school activities in which students could participate, of which the conversation club was one. Participation by students was voluntary and they could stay for as much, or as little, time as they liked. For the NS conversation partners, participation in the club was a part-time job. They were recruited from among undergraduate students at the university to which the language school was attached.

The students and the conversation partners met in groups in the lounge of the language school, a rather large room with several good-sized tables and several chairs at each table. It is unclear whether there were explicit institutional guidelines for the composition of groups, but the groups generally consisted of between two and four students and one or two conversation partners. To some extent, it seems that the composition of the groups followed from the numbers of students, conversation partners, available tables, and chairs at each table. It was not unusual for there to be three or four groups meeting in the lounge at one time, though it did appear that fewer students attended the conversation club towards the end of a school term than at the beginning.

The conversation club as scheduled event. That the participants, both students and conversation partners, were oriented to their meetings as operating within institutional constraints can be seen in their orientation to the conversation club as a scheduled event. This can be seen quite clearly in two cases in which the adjournment of the club was recorded.

In segment (2.1), different participants orient to the time as a factor in bringing their meeting to a close.
Prior to this segment, the talk has been about the problems H has been having with one of her housemates, specifically, about how the constant presence of her housemate’s boyfriend makes her uncomfortable. Talk related to this topic can be seen in lines 1 and 3-5. In line 8, there is a burst of laughter from multiple individuals from what sounds like a different conversation club group. This is followed by, in line 9, E stating the time, at first softly and then, after a brief pause, a second time. The particular time that she states, “four o’clock,” is the time that the conversation club is scheduled to end. M, the NS, confirms the time by repeating it and saying “yeah” in line 10 and S also appears to display recognition that it is time for the meeting to end in line 11. In lines 12-17, there is a sequence of expressions of gratitude to the NS, the NS’s response in lines 14-15, and then the NS’s own expression of gratitude to the students. There are also sounds of people moving about, as if getting ready to leave. In line 19 the recording cuts off. (One minidisk, on which the recordings were initially made, holds approximately 74 minutes of sound. The disc on which this
particular meeting was recorded contains a total of approximately 56 minutes, so it appears that, rather than the disc becoming full, one of the participants turned the recorder off at this point.)

It appears, then, that for these participants, reaching the time when the conversation club is scheduled to end is an adequate reason for the group to adjourn. They are evidently oriented to the time constraints imposed by the school on the conversation club. Further analysis of this segment reveals, though, that the participants can use this institutional constraint as a strategic resource. Even though the meeting is scheduled to end at four o’clock, there is no timed signal, such as a school bell, which tells the participants that it is time to end. No one from the school comes into the lounge to announce that the conversation club is over for the day. There is no precise time when the meeting has to be brought to a close, such as when the hands of the clock in the lounge indicate that it is exactly four o’clock. Also, the NS, whose payment for his services as conversation partner ends a four o’clock, does not take the initiative to point out the time. Rather, while it is possible that there are indications from other groups that their meetings are ending, which is what the laughter at line 8 may be related to, one of the students, E, takes the initiative to point out the time, an act which initiates the sequence that brings the meeting to a close. Why does she do this?

A possibility is that the talk has reached a point in its topical development at which ending the meeting can be easily accomplished. As mentioned above, the talk prior to this segment focused on the problems that H has been having with one of her housemates. In lines 1 and 4-5, S provides her assessment of the possible ultimate source of these problems, by saying that the troublesome housemate and her boyfriend are younger than H, of a different generation. Following such things as
stories or troubles talk, assessments are often topic-closing implicative (Goodwin, 1986; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), so this particular point in the interaction may be a felicitous place for talk related to H’s problems with her housemate to be brought to an end. Without another topic having been introduced, this becomes a felicitous place for the conversation club meeting itself to be brought to an end. However, it should also be noted that S’s assessment of the source of the problems is not all that flattering to H, implying that H is too old to understand or accept the behavior of this young couple. This could be a rather volatile point in the interaction, a point at which conflict could erupt between different students. E’s mention of the time avoids any potential conflict by bringing the meeting to a close.

Segment (2.2) shows the other adjournment of the conversation club that was caught by the recorder.

(2.2) [tape 4, B107; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 M: okay (.) think it’s [four o’clock.=
2 ?: [(yeah::)
3 M: =I think we’ll finish.
4 (0.4)
5 Y: yeah [(x)
6 M: [so next week is not
7 ?: [(xxx)
8 Y: [not (0.3) [not not not. yeah.
9 ?: [(xxx)?
10 M: so maybe the (0.8) [the next two=
11 R: [two weeks
12 M: =weeks yeah=
13 Y: =mm
14 M: bring some pictures?
15 (0.5)
16 R: hm? (0.4) [oh okay
17 C: [yeah?
18 (0.5)
19 M: I don’t know (0.3) how it’s working
20 but I think maybe (.) also we kind
21 of can switch with (.) with pe
22 ((recording ends))
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In this segment, mentioning the time, which is also the scheduled ending time, is again used to initiate the closing sequence, but this time it is M, the NS, who does this. That mentioning the time can be used to initiate the closing again shows the participants' orientation to the institutional constraints of the meeting. In addition, the participants can also be seen to be orienting to the conversation club as a recurrent event normally scheduled every week. In line 6, M begins to remind the others that there will be no conversation club next week. Y responds to this in line 8, saying "not" multiple times, the final time with falling intonation, and then saying "yeah," also with falling intonation. This response indicates that this is information which she, and possibly the others, already have. M makes it more explicit that the next meeting will be in two weeks in lines 10 and 12. R's overlapped response in line 11, following a rather long 0.8 second pause and before M actually says "two weeks," also indicates that this is already known information. In line 14, M makes the suggestion that the students bring some pictures to the next meeting, presumably so that they can share them with the others in their group. This is not responded to immediately, but R and C give somewhat tentative responses in lines 16 and 17. (In the two hours of recorded conversation in this group prior to this segment, there was no mention of bringing pictures to the next conversation club meeting, or of anything about the next meeting, so this suggestion may seem to the students to be rather sudden.) Following a 0.5 second pause in line 18, M seems to be having second thoughts about his suggestion, and appears to be alluding to the possibility that they will not be in the same groups at the next meeting. In addition to orienting to the scheduled ending time imposed by the school on the conversation club meetings, as in segment (2.1), in this discussion of the next conversation club, the participants can also be heard to be orienting to the conversation club as a regularly scheduled, recurrent event.
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Participants as an institutionally-ordained group. The language school did not set up the conversation club along a kind of cocktail party format, where students and conversation partners can come and mingle, moving around and talking to various others. Rather, the school set it up as consisting of several small groups, in which there would be at least one NS and in which each student could have ample opportunities to talk.

From the school’s perspective, it is the responsibility of each of these groups to produce conversation. This can be seen in segment (2.3), in which a school administrator, J, makes a comment on the interaction occurring in the group being recorded.

(2.3)
[Tape 6, 45; M, NS, male; J, NS, male]
1 M: let me see your calculator.
2  (8.8)
3 M: what’s going on (0.3) I’m doing
4 some math.
5  (0.7)
6 ?: oh hey
7 J: it’s a very quiet conversation from
8 your
9 ((multiple laughter))

Prior to this segment, the participants have been talking about the price that one student paid in Japan for her electronic dictionary and trying to convert the price into the units of U.S. currency. As M, the NS, apparently using a calculator, tries to do this conversion, there is a rather long 8.8 second period of silence in line 2. It is not clear who M is talking to in lines 3-4, but he gives an account for this silence by saying “I’m doing some math.” Then, in lines 7-8, J, who is not a member of this group, or even a conversation partner, but a school administrator, one of whose responsibilities is to coordinate the conversation club, comments on the lack of conversation being produced by this group. This shows the orientation of J to the
responsibility of the group to produce conversation, with the lack of conversation
being something that can be commented on. The actual members of the group can
also be heard to share this orientation, as M provides an account for the silence in lines
3-4 and some of the students produce laughter in response to J’s comment.

J again briefly makes an appearance in segment (2.4).

(2.4)
[tape 6 355; M, NS, male; J, NS, male]
1 M: oh: I see.
2 J: °excuse me, (. ) can I interrupt for
3 a minute? (0.8) you know the
4 question I asked you earlier? (. )
5 about the: proctoring;;;
6 M: right right right
7 J: °are you interes[ted]?
8 ?: [ah:
9 M: uh: yeah I’ll do it.

In line 1, M is responding to something that a student has said. Starting in line 2, J, in
what can be heard as a deliberately hushed voice, uses the conventional expression
“excuse me” to call attention to himself as an interrupter and asks for permission to
interrupt. This interruption appears timed to follow the end of M’s turn in line 1, in
that it does not interrupt this turn and there is no perceptible pause between lines 1 and
2. From line 3 to 9, these two NSs, one a member of the group and the other not,
produce a sequence of two question-answer adjacency pairs, with J producing both
first pair part questions and M producing both second pair part answers. The first
question, in lines 3-5, is a pre-request, asking whether M remembers an earlier
question. M answers by indicating knowledge of what J is talking about. The second
question, in line 7, is an indirect request, which inquires whether M is “interested” in
doing what they talked about earlier. M responds in line 9 by acquiescing. In asking
these questions, J continues to use what can be heard as a deliberately hushed voice.

In making his appearance in the interaction, J does not become a member of this
group. Rather, he induces M to temporarily move out of the group. In doing this, though, J is orienting to the conversation club group as a group conducting legitimate business which renders his appearance an interruption, prompting him to ask for permission to interrupt and to speak in a hushed voice throughout his interaction with M.

Segments (2.3) and (2.4) show the orientation of both group members and a representative of the school administration to the conversation club group as an institutionally-ordained group with certain responsibilities and legitimate business. They also show, though, that the group boundaries are somewhat permeable, in that J could briefly join the interaction in segment (2.3), eliciting laughter from group members with his comment, and M could briefly move out of the group interaction in segment (2.4). Segment (2.5), the final segment in this section, also illustrates the somewhat permeable nature of the group.

(2.5)
[tape 4, 144; Y, NNS, female; C, NNS, male; M, NS, male; R, NNS, female]
1 Y: hi:
2 ?: (anyon)
3 (0.4)
4 Y: (anyon) (.) oh: ha ha ha
5 C: oh ho ha ha
6 (0.6)
7 Y: .hh (1.0) is a he’s not (xx) (0.4)
8 mm
9 M: but he’s Japanese?
10 Y: yes.
11 M: oh but he can speak a little (.)
12 Korean?
13 Y: little Korean just (anyon) ha
14 C: ha ha [ha ha ha just (anyon) ha=
15 R: [(xx)
16 C: =ha ha ha ha

The permeability can be heard in lines 1 and 2 as Y, an NNS member of this group, and an male speaker who is not a member of this group, produce a greeting-greeting
adjacency pair. Both Y and C display that they find the second pair part humorous in lines 4 and 5, by producing laughter and, on Y's part, by repeating the humorous element, "anyon." As is clear in the transcript, the humor comes from the fact that the speaker in line 2 produces a Korean greeting even though he is not Korean, while both Y and C are Korean NSs. The interaction with the outsider is extremely brief, consisting of only one adjacency pair, and by line 7, if not earlier, the interaction has clearly reverted to being within the group as Y makes a comment to M about the speaker of line 2, perhaps providing an explanation for why both Y and C find his greeting to be humorous. Even though the group is permeable, its cohesion is maintained, with the outsider's use of Korean providing something to be talked about.

To briefly summarize this section, certain characteristics of the conversation club as established by the school, specifically the conversation club as a scheduled, recurrent event and the structure of small groups responsible for producing conversation, can be heard to be relevant for the participants, both students and conversation partners. From this, it can be argued that the institutional context of the conversation club is, to some extent at least, relevant to the participants and to the nature of the interaction as a particular language game.

Role Orientation and Constitution

In research on interaction in the field of SLA, such roles as NS and NNS are generally assumed, rather than empirically demonstrated, to be relevant and important variables (Firth & Wagner, 1997). Whether such roles are relevant to the participants, and if so how such roles are constituted through participants' behavior, are topics that are not usually investigated within the field of SLA. Up to this point, this study has been no exception to this general trend, with labels such as "student," "NNS,"
“conversation partner,” and “NS” (as well as “school administrator”) being used to characterize participants without regard for the relevance or irrelevance of these labels to the participants themselves or to the nature of the interaction. This section presents empirical evidence of the relevance, perhaps omnirelevance (Sacks, 1992), of these roles, as well as how these roles are constituted through the behavior of the participants.

**Interrogation.** At times the interaction takes on the quality of an interrogation, as can be seen in segment (2.6)

(2.6)  
[tape 1, 313; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female]  
1 T: do you live alone?  
2 (0.8)  
3 F: no  
4 (1.3)  
5 T: host family?  
6 F: no I- I have (..) roommate  
7 T: oh you have roommates  
8 F: [right  
9 T: [an’ you- (..) knew them from (0.4)  
10 Japan?  
11 (1.8)  
12 F: my roommate?  
13 T: mm-hm  
14 F: she’s local girl (0.4) she’s Chinese  
15 though.  
16 (2.0)  
17 F: [and  
18 T: [so how’d you know her  
19 (2.8)  
20 F: uh:: (..) no- (..) we’re we are not  
21 friend.  
22 (0.9)  

A major part of the sequential structure of segment (2.6) consists of four question-answer adjacency pairs, in lines 1-3, 5-6, 9-15, and 18-21. In the first adjacency pair, T asks a question and F provides a minimal answer. She does not answer immediately, resulting in a 0.8 second pause in line 2. The pair is followed by a longer 1.3 second pause in line 4, during which F has the opportunity, though untaken,
to provide more information in response to the question. In the second adjacency pair, in lines 5-6, T seeks additional information by asking a follow-up question. In her answer this time, F provides more than just a minimal response. She answers the question and then provides additional information by saying "I- I have (.) roommate."

T’s questions in each of these adjacency pairs can be categorized as yes/no questions, with the one in line 5 being elliptical. With such a categorization, they would seem to call for a "yes" or a "no" as an answer. F provides such answers in lines 3 and 6, with the important difference that in line 3 the "no" is her complete answer, while in line 6 the "no" is followed by extra information. And yet, even though F provides the type of answer that a yes/no question would seem to call for in line 3, her answer appears inadequate, resulting in a long pause in line 4 and a follow-up question in line 5, while the extra information in her answer in line 6 appears in no way to be out-of-place, with T immediately producing a newsmarked answer receipt (Antaki, et al., 2000), consisting of "oh,” a change-of-state token or indicator that what F has said is new information for him (Heritage, 1984), and a repeat of the answer, in line 7. Such an answer receipt produced without an interturn pause indicates that this is the type of answer that T was seeking. Given this, it seems that the categorization of T’s questions as yes/no questions, though not inaccurate, is inadequate. Besides being such questions, T’s turns in lines 1 and 5 can also be categorized as correction-invitation devices (Sacks, 1992), in that they propose a certain information which, if incorrect, should be corrected by the question recipient.** T’s turn in line 1 not only asks for a “yes” or “no” answer, it also proposes the information that F does live alone. F is invited to correct this proposed information if it is inaccurate, as indeed it is, but she does not do so. After the long pause in line 4, T
produces another correction-invitation device, this one proposing that F lives with a
host family. This time, F does provide the invited correction in her answer. (This
segment is analyzed along these same lines in chapter four, as segment (4.55).
Chapter four also goes into detail about different ways that correction is invited.)

The information thus provided is then used by T as he produces the first pair
part of the third question-answer adjacency pair in lines 9 and 10. This question can
also be categorized as both (intonationally, not syntactically) a yes/no question and a
correction-invitation device. The second pair part answer is produced in lines 14 and
15, separated from the first pair part question by a brief insertion sequence as F
initiates and T completes repair on the referent of the question in lines 12-13. In her
answer, F does not even bother to provide a “yes” or “no,” but goes straight to
correcting the proposal that she knew her roommate from Japan. (Note also that there
is an implicit correction related to the number of roommates that F has, but no
evidence that the participants are orienting to this.)

This third adjacency pair is followed by a rather long 2.0 second pause in line
16, which is then followed by both F and T starting to talk simultaneously in lines 17
and 18, with F stopping after producing just one word, possibly a continuation of her
previous turn, and T producing the first pair part question of the fourth adjacency pair
in this segment. Asking how, if she did not know her roommate from Japan, F did
know her roommate, this question can be seen as connected to the previous adjacency
pair. This question is of a different type than T’s previous three questions, in that it
can be categorized as an information question rather than a yes/no question. This
question, “so how’d you know her,” presupposes that F knew her roommate before
coming to share a place of residence with her, and it is this presupposition that is
corrected, after a 2.8 second pause in line 19 and a filled pause ("uh") at the start of line 20.

Overall, then, T initiates and F completes a series of question-answer adjacency pairs, with each question, other than the first one, in some way connected to the previous adjacency pair. It is the clear differentiation between who asks and who answers the questions that gives this series its interrogation-like quality. Note also that it is T, the NS, who asks the questions and F, the NNS who answers the questions. Even though, as will be seen below, NNSs do ask questions, in an interrogation-like series such as this one, it is the NS who is the interrogator.

This interrogation-like quality can also be seen, somewhat less dramatically perhaps, in segment (2.7).

(2.7)
[tape 5, 15; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]

1 M: an’ what’s your name?
2 E: my name is Emiko.
3 M: Emiko.
4 (0.4)
5 M: okay
6 E: I’m from in Japan,
7 M: from Japan
8 (0.4)
9 M: okay?
10 (1.0)
11 M: and?
12 S: my name is Setsuko and I’m from
13 (Japan)=
14 M: =Setsuko
15 S: yes:=
16 M: =okay

In this segment, it is again the NS, M this time, who asks the questions and the NNSs who answer them. In addition, in the way they ask and answer the questions, the participants can be seen to be orienting to this role division. Lines 1 and 2 form a question-answer adjacency pair. In line 3, M uses repetition as an answer receipt. What is interesting is what happens in line 6, in which E states that she is from Japan.
This is not a response to a question, or a correction of information proposed in M’s question in line 1. Perhaps it is, though, a typical piece of information that language learners provide when introducing themselves in their second language in a context where their country of origin is not obvious. To put it another way, perhaps it is E’s answer to a typical question that she expects NSs to ask her. In this turn, E is answering a question which M has not asked, but could be expected to ask in his role as NS. Finally, evidence that such a question is expected is provided by M’s use of repetition as an information receipt in line 7, produced with no indications of trouble, such as pauses or rising intonation, with E’s prior turn.

There is a second question-answer adjacency pair in lines 11-13, with M’s question being extremely elliptical, consisting of only the word “and” with rising intonation. Here, M can be heard relying on his role as NS questioner, along with the immediately prior interaction with E, to indicate what he is asking. For her part, S does not display any difficulty with the question, providing both her name and her country of origin. Again, the participants can be heard to be orienting to roles in which the NS asks certain typical questions (“What is your name?” “Where are you from?”) of language learners, while the NNSs provide the answers. The typicality or normality of such an exchange seems to allow M to ask the questions not only in an extremely elliptical form, but even without articulating the question at all.

In segment (2.8), the same NS, M, again asks what can be considered typical NS-to-NNS questions, at least for this speaker.

(2.8)
[tape 6, 216; M, NS, male; K, NS, female; E, NNS, female]
1 M: it’s interesting [though yeah?=
2 K: [yeah
3 M: =(I think it’s) fun
4 (1.5)
5 M: .n yeah good.
6 (0.6)
7 M: .h so do you have any children?
8 (0.5)
9 E: no: [ha ha
10 M: [no children
11 E: ha ha ha
12 M: "hm:"
13 (0.7)
14 M: will you have in the future? or.
15 (1.3)
16 E: mm::: be- (0.4) before: (0.4) uh:
17 (0.7) I don't want to: ha:ve
18 children, [ha ha (.) ha ha ha=
19 M: [uhn
20 E: = (but) now a little bit.
21 M: now yah: [oh yeah ((mumbled))
22 E: [(xxxxx)?
23 (0.4)

There are two question-answer adjacency pairs in this segment, in lines 7-9 and 14-20, with M producing the first pair part question in each case. As in segment (2.6) above, the second question can be seen as connected with the previous adjacency pair, resulting in another, though brief, interrogation-like series. There is something especially interesting, though, about the first question, in line 7, something which this segment shares with segments (2.9) and (2.10)

(2.9)
[tape 4, 181; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 M: there's only (cer-) I think there's
2 (0.6) other people their problem is
3 they can not [(1.0) understand uh=
4 Y: [mm mm:
5 M: =(1.0) any foreign accent.
6 (0.8)
7 M: yeah
8 (2.8)
9 ?: mm
10 (0.8)
11 Y: good ha ha ha
12 R: (but)
13 (0.6)
14 M: you have any children?
15 (1.3)
16 C: one?
In each of these segments, the NS asks a question which is topically unrelated to the talk which has come before. Although stepwise topic shift is quite common in conversation, and is found throughout the recordings made for this study, in each of these three cases the shift is to a completely different topic, without even an attempt made to tie the new topic to prior talk. However, it would be inaccurate to characterize these shifts as sudden. Rather, in each case the previous topic has, for lack of a better term, fizzled out. In segment (2.8), M, one of the NSs, produces a series of assessments related to the prior talk in lines 1-5. Such assessments are generally implicative of closing down a topic (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The second such assessment in the series, in line 3, is followed by a long 1.5 second pause, and then the third assessment, in line 5, and another pause. Without anyone else introducing something to talk about, or returning to the topic of the prior talk, M uses his question in line 7, directed to an NNS, to introduce a new topic. Similarly, in segment (2.9), the topic of the prior talk appears to be fizzling out in lines 6-13. After M has hearably completed his turn in line 5, one indication of which is the clear falling intonation, there is a 0.8 second pause in line 6, followed by M saying “yeah” in line 7, which is then followed by a long 2.8 second pause in line 8. Finally, after another pause, Y, an NNS, provides an assessment, again implicative of closing down a topic, and laughs in line 11. R starts to say something in line 12, but stops, resulting in another, 0.6 second, pause in line 13. M then introduces a new topic by asking an NNS, C, a
question, which happens to be the same question that he asks in segment (2.8), in a different group and on a different day. And in segment (2.10), the prior talk has been about the name of one of the NSs in the group (not T). In line 26 there is a long pause, followed by D, who had originally asked for the name, stating the name, which is then followed by another pause. Another NNS then quietly repeats the name, which is followed by another pause. With no one introducing any further talk related to this topic, T, an NS, then uses a question to introduce a new topic. (See segments (5.9) and (5.17) in chapter five for further analysis of what T is doing with this question.)

To characterize each of these cases somewhat overdramatically, the interaction seems to be in danger of dying. The topic that the group members have been talking about has fizzled out and they are left with awkward silences. In their roles as NSs, M and T take responsibility for keeping the interaction going by using their possibly role-bound ability to interrogate NNS participants as a means of introducing a new topic. In taking this responsibility, they can be seen not only to be orienting to their role as NS, but also constituting this role, or more specifically the role of conversation partner, as involving a specific right and a specific responsibility, the right to ask seemingly irrelevant questions and the responsibility to ensure that the group produces conversation. (Orientation to this responsibility can also be seen in segment (2.3) above.)

**Language instruction.** A clear orientation to roles as NS and NNS, or even to roles as language teacher and language learner, can be seen in spontaneous episodes of language instruction found in the data, typically episodes of vocabulary instruction. This is illustrated in segments (2.11) and (2.12).

(2.11)
[tape 6, 90; M, NS, male; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female]
1  M: I wanna go for the water park.
2  K: oh yeah [yeah yeah
3 S: [water park?  
4 M: yeah (.) [like water slide?  
5 K: [(that)  
6 S: oh::

(2.12)  
[tape 11, 82; N, NNS, female; D, NNS, female; T, NS, male]  
14 N: i- ins ins [(in) indoor?  
15 D: [insi:de yeah  
16 N: in[door sports?  
17 T: [so it’s like tennis? (.) [but=  
18 ?: [mm  
19 T: =with a rubber ball?  
20 ?: . mm

Prior to segment (2.11), the participants have been talking about things to do in Las Vegas, which K has recently visited. M introduces the term “water park” in line 1, about which S indicates uncertainty by repeating it with rising intonation, in line 3. In response, M does some definitional work by providing a related term, “water slide,” something typically found at a water park. Note that in introducing this term, M uses rising intonation, simultaneously offering it as a term that can help S understand what a water park is and asking whether it is a term which S is familiar with. S produces an answer receipt in line 6. The talk prior to segment (2.12) has been about tennis and racquetball, with one of the NNSs having played tennis when she was in college and the NS, T, considering racquetball to be one of his hobbies. In lines 14 and 16, one of the NNSs, N, produces a question about racquetball, asking whether it is an “indoor sport.” The question itself can be taken as showing that N is not altogether unfamiliar with the sport. T takes her question as indicating that definitional work is needed here, and in overlap with N provides it in lines 17 and 19, stating first that it is similar to tennis (“so it’s like tennis”), and then that there is an important difference (“but with a rubber ball”).

In each of these segments, the participants can be heard orienting to their own and others’ vocabulary knowledge as NSs and NNSs. In eliciting help with the items
"water park" and "racquetball," the NNSs are appealing for assistance from the NSs, who can be assumed to have more elaborate knowledge of a greater number of lexical items. In doing definitional work, the NSs treat the problems with these items as being problems of lexical knowledge, and in providing a related term, as in segment (2.11), or an explanation in terms of something similar, as in segment (2.12), their use of rising intonation indicates their orientation to the possibility that the NNSs' limited vocabulary may cause further difficulties.

A more extended episode of vocabulary instruction can be seen in segment (2.13).

(2.13)
[tape 5, 455; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male; K, NS, female]
20 H: I didn't understand (yes)
21 M: [oh
22 H: [I did not
23 (0.4)
24 K: I live in Mililani?
25 (0.8)
26 M: she's a (.) freshman?
27 (0.4)
28 K: oh oh (0.4) I'm a freshman?
29 ?: [freshman (xxxx)
30 M: [she's a first year
31 (1.0)
32 H: ah first
33 (0.4)
34 K: [yeah
35 M: [first year=
36 H: =first [year
37 ?: [year
38 M: [for
39 M: for college=
40 H: =ah: college first year . h [ah=
41 M: [mm
42 H: =and [a (.) freshman?
43 ?: [(xxxx)
44 M: freshman.
45 H: yes

In lines 20 and 22, H indicates that she is having problems with something, with this indication being more explicit than in segments (2.11) or (2.12) that the problem is
one of comprehension. However, it is not clear exactly what the source of the problem is. One of the NSs, K, suggests a possible trouble source in line 24 which is not responded to. The other NS, M, suggests another possible trouble source in line 26. H does not immediately respond verbally, though it may be H who is responding in line 29, but both M and K can be heard to be focusing on M's suggestion of the trouble source, the term "freshman," as accurate. (M and K used this term, in talking about K herself, three times and one time, respectively, a few turns before the start of segment (2.13).) M then provides a definition of this term in line 30, which H eventually responds to, after a 1.0 second pause, in line 32. M then reformulates the definition in lines 35 and 38-39, in overlap with other participants, by saying "first year for college." H then indicates understanding of this definition by again reformulating it in line 40, also indicating that this is new knowledge for her by saying "ah," both before and after producing her own reformulation of the definition. Finally, she then practices production of the new word in line 42, which is confirmed by M in line 44.

The same types of orientation to roles as NNS and NS can be found here as in segments (2.11) and (2.12). In the role of NNS, H is able to appeal for help when she does not understand something and, after receiving help, is able to treat the source of the trouble as a new vocabulary item. In the role of NS, M, and to some extent K, but mostly M, respond to H's appeal by identifying the trouble source, providing a definition, and confirming H's eventual try at production. Alternatively, the participants' behavior can be seen as constituting the roles of NNS and NS, with the NNS as a language learner with a limited vocabulary who can be expected to encounter, ask for help with, and learn previously unknown vocabulary, and the NS as
a language teacher who is capable of providing definitions for and confirmation of such vocabulary.

**Resorting to the L1.** The fact that some NNS participants share a first language (L1) provides a resource for seeking and providing assistance among NNSs when they face difficulties using English with the NSs. The use of this resource can be seen in segments (2.14) and (2.15).

(2.14)
[tape 6. 471; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; E, NNS, female]
1 M: oh: so you want to improve (0.7)
2 your English?
3 (1.8)
4 S: impo improve wa nani?
5 E: joutatsu suru.
6 (1.1)
7 S: uh-huh.

(2.15)
[tape 6. 30; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
8 E: not dollar is a mm (0.4) yen?
9 M: mm-hm
10 (0.7)
11 E: ss (°san man san man°) (. ) °san
12 byaku°)?
13 E: [thirty]: (0.4) thousand?
14 S: [thirty] (0.5) [thousand]

The use of a shared L1 as a resource for understanding an English vocabulary word is illustrated especially clearly in segment (2.14). The L1 of both E and S is Japanese. M, the NS, asks a question in lines 1-2, which is followed by a 1.8 second pause. In line 4, S identifies a vocabulary item in the question as both unknown and necessary for her to comprehend the question. She does this, though, in Japanese, a language which M does not speak. E responds by saying “joutatsu suru,” a translation of “improve.” Following another pause, this one of 1.1 seconds, S then answers M’s original question. In segment (2.15), involving the same participants, E resorts to her L1, though it is not clear that she is seeking help. In this segment, the participants are
discussing the price of something that was purchased in Japan. Before giving the price in yen in English, E says the price in Japanese twice in line 11, quietly so as to make this hearably E talking to herself. ("San" means "three" and "man" is a unit of ten thousand, so "san man" means three units of ten thousand, or thirty thousand.) She is not hearably appealing for help, but S provides help nevertheless, saying "thirty thousand" in overlap with E. Though they both start to say "thirty" at the same time, S begins to say "thousand" before E, who can be heard as having been prompted by S.

Segment (2.16) shows a more extended instance of resorting to the L1.

(2.16) [tape 4, 88; M, NS, male; C, NNS, male; Y, NNS, female]
1 (multiple laughter)
2 M: how often do you [go out drinking
3 C: [ha ha .h ha ha ha
4 ((continuation of previous laughter; others laughing also, but more quietly))
5 7 C: yeah yeah?
6 M: how often.
9 (0.5)
10 Y: how often=
11 C: =uh:m (2.5) soju: [ha ha
12 Y: [no no no
13 (xxxxxxx) ((Korean, 1.0 seconds))
14 (1.0)
15 C: mm
16 Y: is a- [{x)
17 C: [{one week yes)
18 (0.7)
19 Y: once a [week?
20 C: [{a day)?
21 (1.0)
22 M: (in) (.) one week?
23 C: one week (. ) yes
24 Y: is a once a week [{two times)
25 C: [yes
26 M: two times twice a week.
27 C: yes.
28 (0.5)
29 M: two times per week.
In line 11, in response to a question about how often he goes out drinking, C, an NS of Korean, having previously displayed difficulty with the question and elicited repair (see chapter four for an analysis of the repair sequence), again displays difficulty by saying "uhm" and then pausing for 2.5 seconds. He then answers by saying "soju," a Korean alcoholic beverage, and laughing. Then, in lines 12-13, Y, also an NS of Korean, takes his answer to be inappropriate and says, in English, "no" three times before saying something in Korean, a language which M does not understand. Following this, C and Y enter an extended negotiation sequence related to the answer of the question, a sequence which M joins in line 22, following the 1.0 second pause in line 21. Then, in line 24, it is Y, who had earlier provided the help, who provides a candidate answer. C confirms this in line 25. M reformulates it in line 26, with C again confirming the reformulation. Finally, M reformulates it once more in line 29.

In these segments, the NNS participants can be heard to be orienting to having a shared L1 with some other participants, a shared language that can be used as a resource for overcoming trouble in English related to both comprehension, in segments (2.14) and (2.16), and production, in segment (2.15). As with NNS behavior in the segments related to language/vocabulary instruction, their behavior constitutes the NNS role as involving limited knowledge of the language and requiring assistance from others. In addition, the NNS role involves the ability to provide assistance to other NNSs who share their L1.

**Participant role categorization.** Finally, there are cases in which the participants themselves use roles such as language learner to categorize themselves and others. In segment (2.17), an NNS participant can be heard categorizing herself into the role of a language learner who has come to a place where the language she is learning is spoken. In addition, both NNS participants are categorized as people who
have to make language choices. (The name in line 20 has been changed to a pseudonym.)

(2.17)
[tape 2, 166; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male; B, NNS, female]
1 F: if I- (0.4) just spea- (.) speak
2 Japanese here. (1.0) not (1.6)
3 no::-
4 (1.2)
5 T: point=
6 F: =same as- no point.
7 T: yeah
8 (0.5)
9 F: just same as (. ) Japan.
10 T: yeah yeah
11 F: °(so)° (0.5) why: why did I come
12 here.
13 T: yeah (0.6) especially like in
14 Hawaii it's really easy to do that.
15 (. ) [cuz there's a lot of Japanese=
16 F: [right
17 T: ={people.
18 F: [°(yeah)°
19 (1.0)
20 T: how bout you (. ) Boram (0.7) you
21 speak Korean and stuff? outside?
22 (1.0)
23 B: °(yep)° (2.0) uh (0.7) but (0.9)
24 (at scone) my classmate. (0.4)
25 (is). (. ) Japanese. (0.3) so I have
26 to (0.4) I have to speak English.
27 (0.3) but (0.5) good for me

In lines 1-3, 6, 9, and 11-12, F, an NS of Japanese, explains why she does not want to speak Japanese "here." The deictic term "here," of course, could refer at various levels of specificity, such as "here in the U.S.," "here in Hawai'i," "here at the language school," or even "here at the conversation club." In line 9, though, she contrasts her "here" with "Japan," making "here in Hawai'i" or "here in the U.S." seem more appropriate interpretations than "here at the language school" or "here at the conversation club." In describing her own reasons for coming "here" and for not wanting to speak Japanese "here," she categorizes herself as a language learner,
specifically as a second language learner who has come to a place where her second language is spoken in order to have opportunities to speak it. In response to T's question in lines 20-21, the other NNS participant, B, categorizes her classmates as people of a nationality who do not speak her L1. In saying, in line 26, "I have to speak English," B is implicitly categorizing both herself and her classmates as people with different L1 backgrounds who use their second language, English, for communication. Finally, in line 27, B categorizes herself as someone who benefits from the necessity to speak English ("good for me"), that is, as a language learner who can improve through practice.

In segment (2.18), an NS participant can be heard categorizing NNSs living in a second language environment.

(2.18)
[tape 1, 120; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]
27 T: I got this job just cuz (0.7) I
don't know I sorta: know: how you
guys feel
30 ?: [mm]
31 T: [just because (.) you know like I
have f:our older brothers and
they're all (0.7) really old yeah,
( .) [so
35 ?: [mm
36 T: when they came here they they were
37 like you guys
38 ?: yeah
39 ?: [mm
40 T: 'n' so I like trying to help (.)
41 people out (.) I guess (.) to (0.4)
(you know) to try to speak better
43 English (or whatever) [so
44 P: [ye:s
45 T: that's why I'm [her:e
46 P: [(that's) nice

T places his older brothers, NNSs of English, in the same category as the students in his group, "you guys" in lines 28-29 and 37. The members of this category are people that T can empathize with ("I sorta know how you guys feel"), though he does
not place himself in the category, people who are NNSs in a second language environment (people who “came here,” presumably from another country), and people who can use help “to try to speak better English.” Though he does not provide a label for this category, one such as “old learners of English as a second language” would seem appropriate, if “old” is taken to be too old to learn English as an NS and “second language” is understood in contrast to “foreign language.”

What is quite interesting is how T categorizes himself not as a member of this category but as someone whose personal experience gives him the ability to empathize with members. In this study, I as the author have categorized, and will continue to categorize, T as an NS. There is nothing in the way he talks that would indicate that he is anything other than an NS of English. However, at one point in the recordings, he tells the students in his group that he was born in Japan and immigrated to the U.S. mainland with his family when he was six years old. If so-called “objective” criteria were used to categorize participants as NSs, such as having been exposed to English from birth, or not having learned another language prior to English, then T could not be categorized as an NS. In not placing himself in the same category in which he places his brothers and the students, and in accounting for his ability to empathize with members of this category through his connection to his “four older brothers,” rather than through himself being a member, T implies that he cannot be appropriately categorized as an NNS of English. I would therefore argue that, from T’s perspective, my categorization of him as an NS is perfectly appropriate.

**Summary.** In the interaction that takes place in the conversation club, roles such as NNS and NS are not only convenient analytical labels, but roles that participants orient to and constitute through their behavior. As conversation partners, the NSs have the ability to interrogate the NNSs, and use this ability to fulfill their
responsibility to keep the conversation going. Part of what it means to be a conversation partner would seem to be acceptance of this responsibility. As language learners, the NNSs elicit assistance with unknown vocabulary from the NSs and also seek and provide assistance from and to other NNSs in their L1. To be an NNS is to have limited proficiency in the language and to, at least occasionally, require assistance in order to use the language, both for comprehension and production. Part of what it means to be an NNS in a second language environment is to live where the language is spoken and to benefit from opportunities, or even the necessity, to use the language.

Within the interaction that occurs in the conversation club, such roles as NS and NNS may be omnirelevant (Sacks, 1992). This does not mean that they are always relevant, but that they are always available to be oriented to. For example, the role of NNS with limited proficiency seeking help with a particular vocabulary item is always available to the NNS participants, should unknown vocabulary be encountered. Such roles are different from, for example, being a professional nurse, as one of the NNS participants is, the relevance of which may be occasioned through the talk, but is not constantly in the background always available for deployment in the conversation club interaction, as it could be in, for example, interaction in a hospital. It can be argued that the omnirelevance of these roles is something which the interaction in the conversation club shares with interaction typical of language classrooms. On the other hand, outside the language school, the NNS participants are much more likely to be involved in interaction in which such roles, though they may be made relevant, are not omnirelevant. Though the talk in the conversation club does not involve any preplanned lessons or topics, or any content that should be covered, or any official teacher assessment of the NNSs or official student evaluation of the NSs, the omnirelevance of roles such as NNS and NS would appear to provide an important
point of similarity between interaction in the conversation club and in the language classroom.

Finally, the basis of the omnirelevance of these roles appears to be the purpose of the interaction in the conversation club, which is to provide the NNSs with opportunities to practice English conversation. In interaction outside the language school, while NNSs may find opportunities to practice, it seems less likely that the primary purpose of the interaction is to provide such opportunities. It is for this reason that I have adopted the term *language game* (Wittgenstein, 1953) to describe the interaction, as a major part of Wittgenstein’s argument is that understanding language use requires an understanding of the purpose(s) of using language in particular contexts.

**Being an Interactional Pivot**

In the previous section, particularly in the discussion of the NS participants as interrogators, the impression may have been given that the NSs exert control over the conversation. Such a description, though, would be an over-simplification and, as are all over-simplifications, a distortion of the NS’s role in the interaction of the conversation club. While NS participants can be seen to use questions in an interrogation-like manner and for the purpose of introducing new topics to keep the talk going when it seems in danger of fizzling out, the NNS participants ask plenty of their own questions and topic management and development is best characterized as a collaborative activity, as discussed in chapter five. In this section, the role of the NS in the conversation club interaction will be characterized more precisely as being an *interactional pivot*, as someone who does not control the interaction, but whose presence exerts a powerful influence on the structure of interaction, or the participation
framework (Goffman, 1981). While the NNS participants move back and forth between being primary participants and being peripheral participants, the NS participants maintain a position as primary participants in the interaction.

**Schisming.** At times, there are two NS participants in one group. This can result in temporary schisming (Egbert, 1997) of the interaction as one large conversation splits into two smaller conversations, each with one NS. When schisming occurred, it seemed to be the presence of two NSs that allowed it to happen. There were two clear instances of such schisming in the data, one of which is shown in segment (2.19). (In the transcript, two columns are used to show that there are two competing conversations. Words in the same line are produced more or less simultaneously by both speakers. Periods of silence in only one conversation are displayed in parentheses in the column of that conversation. Periods of silence in both conversations are displayed in parentheses between columns. The fact that the transcript displays one conversation on the left and one on the right is not intended to indicate anything about one conversation being primary and the other secondary.)

(2.19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape 6, 228; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 M: so he doesn’t know how long he will stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 E: yes my (.) ah no ha ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 M: oh [::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 E: [he doesn’t know. [ha ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 M: [he doesn’t know. (0.9) [ah: (0.9) ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 E: [mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 E: maybe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 K: did you move here by yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 E: two more years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 M: oh two more years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 E: mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 M: oh that’s a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 K: (xxx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 E: my visa: by yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 S: myself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48
19 M: oh: okay
20 E: ha ha
21 (0.8)
22 M: (oh: great)
23 (0.4) K: yeah you came by yourself.
24 (0.9) or: you have
25 M: oh (0.5) and what is (1.8)
26 your husband's
27 company?
28 E: insurance company?
29 (0.7) K: your: family? (0.5)
30 M: insurance company.
31 E: yes ha ha (0.8)
32 ha ha
33 (3.2) K: are in
34 Okinawa?
35 S: mm:
36 (3.5) K: or: (0.6) in Hawaii.
37 (3.0)
38 S: Okinawa
39 K: oh:: so you’re here by
40 yourself?
41 (1.7)
42 (1.2) K: you:: came on the plane?
43 (0.9)
44 (1.6) S: ah I’m came myself=
45 K: =yeah
46 (0.8)
47 M: [oh:
48 K: [(wow)
49 S: buto mm: (1.5) Hawaii in: (1.4)
50 Hawaii (0.4) an (Hawaiian?) (0.3)
51 friendo (0.4) ando (0.5) my: friend
52 is a (0.9) one: years ago? (1.4)
53 lived.
54 (0.7)
55 K: oh (0.4) your friend lived here
56 before?
57 (0.6)
58 S: yes [and
59 K: [oh
60 (1.1)
61 S: Okinawan (. ) (xx)?
62 (0.5)
63 M: to Hawaii (0.4) [oh:
64 S: [yes
65 M: so your friend is here now?
66 S: yes
67 M: oh::
At the start of this segment, M, an NS, and E, an NNS, are discussing why E has come to Hawai'i. It turns out that she has come with her husband, who was transferred to Hawai'i from Japan. In lines 1 and 2, M makes a statement about E's husband which, in Labov's (1972) terms, is a statement about a B-event, calling for confirmation or disconfirmation on the part of E. Though she displays trouble with exactly how to produce a confirmation, E confirms that her husband does not know how long he will stay in Hawai'i in lines 3 and 5. M responds by indicating that this is new information for him through the change-of-state token in line 4, through repetition of "he doesn't know" in lines 6 and 7, and by saying "ah" twice in line 7. Note that there are two 0.9 second pauses in line 7 and another pause of 0.8 seconds in line 9. At this point, the topic of how long E's husband will stay in Hawai'i is hearably closed. However, in line 10, E says "maybe," producing further talk which may, though not necessarily, be a continuation of the previous topic. Immediately after she says this one word, K, the other NS, asks S, the other NNS, a question. The question consists of six words, the first three of which, in line 11, are produced in the clear, not in competition with E's talk. During the second half of K's question, though, E says "two more years," indicating that she is indeed producing further talk on the same topic which, it turns out, has not been closed. A schism in the group has occurred, with E and M continuing to produce talk related to the previous topic, opting not to allow it to close, and K starting up a new topic, though one which can be heard as related to what E and M have been talking about, by asking S a question about how she came to Hawai'i.

In lines 16-22, E and M talk about the length of E's visa, which would indicate the maximum amount of time that E can expect to stay in Hawai'i. She states how long her visa is good for in lines 16-17. M produces an answer receipt in line 19. E then laughs in line 20. Finally, M produces an assessment in line 22. At this point,
with opportunities to develop talk about E’s visa having been passed and M having produced an assessment, implicative of topic closing, the talk on this topic is hearably complete. Meanwhile, K’s initial question in lines 11-12, the first pair part of an adjacency pair, has not yet received an answer. Rather, K and S have been engaged in extended repair. By the time she finishes her talk in line 23, K’s question has still not been answered. The topic of their talk, therefore, is in no way hearably complete. Nevertheless, S does not attempt to answer or initiate further repair immediately. This, together with the talk between E and M apparently having been completed, results in a 0.9 second silence in both conversations. Following this silence, E and M continue to produce talk as M asks E a question related to her husband’s job. As he finishes his question, S initiates repair again in line 27. With the talk between E and M hearably complete at line 22, but the talk between S and K hearably incomplete, it seems possible that the schism could have ended here. However, this has not turned out to be the case.

In lines 25-32, E and M produce talk on the topic of E’s husband’s company. E answers M’s question in line 28. M receipts the answer through other-repetition in line 30. And E confirms the answer and laughs in lines 31-32. At this point, again, their talk is hearably complete. Meanwhile, S and K are continuing their extended repair of K’s initial question, with a second pair part answer still not having been produced. As this repair sequence continues in lines 33-42, E and M refrain from producing any further talk. The answer to K’s initial question, the second pair part which the long repair sequence can be heard to have been pursuing, finally makes its appearance in line 45, when S says “ah I’m came myself,” which is followed by K producing an answer receipt. Following a 0.8 second pause, M also produces an answer receipt, a change-of-state token, in line 47, in overlap with K’s “wow.” It is
ambiguous exactly when the schism is closed, with the talk between K and S being produced without competition from line 33, but by line 47, it has definitely been closed, with M responding to S’s answer to K’s question. It is unclear what exactly E’s role in the interaction now is. From this point through the end of segment (2.19), there is a three-way conversation as S, K, and M talk about the friend that S brings up in lines 49-53, after the schism has been closed.

The relevance of segment (2.19) is that it can show what can happen when there are two NS participants, two interactional pivots, in one group. While NNS participants can and do talk to one another, such talk, at least in the data of this study, never results in a schism into two competing conversations. In all of the groups that were recorded, there were at least two NNSs, but this did not result in schismning. With two NS participants, though, one group could split, even if only temporarily, into two. Finally, note that it is M’s action in line 47 of joining the other conversation that unambiguously indicates that the schism has been closed. The role of the NS is such that each conversation club group must have at least one, with only one being the norm. The role of the NNS participants is such that the presence multiple NNSs is perfectly normal. The result is that with excess NSs, and a normal number of NNSs, the conditions exist for the formation of two conversation club groups.

Pivoting. In saying that the NS participants function as interactional pivots, what is meant is that the interaction at any given time involves an NS and one or more others as primary participants, with changes in the participation framework involving changes in who the NS is conversing with. That is, if X is the NS and A, B, and C are the other group members, the conversation will (tend to) involve the following groupings of primary participants: XA, XB, XC, XAB, XAC, XBC, and XABC. Any
combination is possible, as long as it includes the NS, X. Segments (2.20) and (2.21) illustrate such changes in the participation framework.

(2.20)
[tape 2, 166; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; B, NNS, female]
13 T: yeah (0.6) especially like in
14 Hawaii it’s really easy to do that.
15 (. ) [cuz there’s a lot of Japanese=
16 F: [right
17 T: = [people.
18 F: [°(yeah)°
19 (1.0)
20 T: how bout you (. ) Boram (0.7) you
21 speak Korean and stuff? outside?
22 (1.0)
23 B: °(yep)° (2.0) uh (0.7) but (0.9)
24 (at scone) my classmate. (0.4)
25 (is). ( . ) Japanese. (0.3) so I have
26 to (0.4) I have to speak English.
27 (0.3) but (0.5) good for me (2.2)
28 now (0.6) I (won’t/want) make (0.7)
29 local people or, (. ) UH
30 studen[ts=but I am .h=
31 T: [yeah
32 B: =but- (. ) I don’t know how to make
33 T: yeah it’s really hard huh.
34 F: yeah:

(2.21)
[tape 2, 42; T, NS, male; B, NNS, female; F, NNS female]
1 T: will the Korean government give you
2 a scholarship or something?
3 (2.1)
4 B: yes (. ) some (0.3) can but (1.0) I
5 don’t know (0.8) how to get a
6 scholarship.
7 (0.5)
8 T: yeah: (0.5) I don’t know how to get
9 a scholarship too. but=
10 B: =ha ha .hh [ha
11 F: [I wanna I wanna get
12 scholarship (xx) (1.6) I want to.
13 T: yeah (2.6) where would you get a
14 scholarship from the Japanese
15 government?
16 (0.5)
17 F: hm?
18 T: if you got a scholarship, it would
19 be from Japan right?
In lines 13-15 and 17 of segment (2.20), the NS, is responding to what F has said about the importance of her trying to use English rather than Japanese. F responds with agreement tokens in lines 16 and 18. Then, after a 1.0 second pause, T asks B a question related the topic he and F have been discussing. The conversation has shifted from being between T and F to being between T and B. However, though F does not participate in the adjacency pair of T’s question and B’s answer, when B shifts the topic of the talk to the difficulty of making local friends and T expresses agreement in line 33, F shows that she is still a peripheral participant, a legitimate if not primary recipient of B’s talk, by producing her own agreement token in line 34. This progression of active participants in the interaction could be schematized as TF --> TB(F) --> TBF. First there is talk between T and F, which then switches to talk, in the form of a question answer adjacency pair, between T and B, which then switches to B expressing an opinion and T and F both producing agreement tokens, which could be taken as retroactively showing that F was a peripheral participant earlier.

In segment (2.21), the conversation shifts from talk between T and B to talk between T and F. Here again, though, F shows herself to have been a peripheral participant in the talk between T and B. In lines 1-10, T and B have been talking about the possibility, or impossibility, of getting a scholarship. The conversation shifts to talk between T and F when F says, starting in line 11, that she would also like to get a scholarship. This is followed by T asking F a question on this topic. The talk shifts from TB to TF with F’s first contribution in this segment, but by topically tying what she says to the TB talk, F demonstrates that she has been a participant all along.
The pivotal role of the NS is strikingly illustrated in cases which, superficially, seem to contradict the above assertion that the NS is always a member of any grouping of primary participants, as in segments (2.22), (2.23), and (2.24).

(2.22)
[tape 5, 19; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
8 H: Setsuko we can research for (1.2)
9 for for
10 M: oh [for your class?
11 ?: [(xx)?
12 S: ah-
13 H: mm
14 S: yeah
15 M: it's for your (. ) for your class?
16 ?: (but)=
17 H: =yes [oh-
18 M: [yeah no problem.

(2.23)
[tape 4, 103; R, NNS, female; Y, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 ((multiple laughter))
2 R: uh: (.) do you like drink?
3 (0.7)
4 Y: y: eah: is a when I: wa:s a (.) a college student? (0.8) (it was) (.) al:most every day::
5 al:most every day:
6 R: wow
7 Y: mm
8 M: wow
9 Y: yeah almost every day.
10 M: alcoholic
11 (1.1)
12 Y: it's not alcoholic is a (just) ha
13 ha ha
14 ((multiple laughter))

(2.24)
[tape 6, B40; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
1 E: ex expensive?
2 (0.6)
3 M: not [expensive.
4 S: [not too expensive.
5 M: ten dollars?
6 S: mm
7 E: oh:
8 S: mm
In line 8 of segment (2.22) H explicitly directs her statement to another NNS participant, S (Setsuko). However, S does not immediately respond, and after the 1.2 second pause in H's turn at line 8 and her repetition of “for” in line 9, M, the conversation partner, responds by producing the change-of-state token “oh” and initiating repair with a clarification question. In performing these actions, M positions himself as the recipient of H's talk. With S finally producing a response, marking recognition of what H is talking about, in line 12, this involves three participants, H, M, and S. M initiates repair again in line 15, by again asking for clarification, which H completes in line 17. Finally, in line 18, M says “yeah no problem,” apparently acquiescing to a request. What H initially produced in a manner to make it appear to be directed at another NNS has, through the repair initiations and the acquiescence produced by M, become a request for M to participate in a class assignment.

There is a question-answer adjacency pair at the beginning of segment (2.23) in which one NNS, R, produces the first pair part question and another NNS, Y, produces the second pair part answer. This would seem to indicate an interactional structure without an NS. However, in lines 9 and 11, M shows himself to also be an active participant in the current talk by producing assessments of what Y has said in her answer, the first one being a morally ambiguous “wow,” soon after R has said the same thing, and the second one being a more judgmental assessment of what Y has said. Following the 1.1 second pause in line 12, it is this judgmental assessment that Y responds to defensively in lines 13-14. Though there is an adjacency pair produced by two NNS participants, the NS shows that he cannot be left out of the talk. Y ratifies M's participation in the talk by responding to his judgmental assessment.

In segment (2.24), the prior talk has been about a restaurant that S has gone to. Both M and S have been talking about this restaurant, so E's elliptical question in line
however, given that it is S who has introduced her experience of going to this restaurant, she would seem to have the more legitimate claim to be the recipient of this question. As it turns out, neither M nor S answers immediately, resulting in a 0.6 second pause. Both then answer in overlap in lines 3 and 4. M then goes on to give additional information, which, if E's question is taken to be an correction-invitation device, is called for by the negative answers given in lines 3 and 4. In line 6, S produces an agreement token, agreeing with the additional information about the price produced by M. In line 7, E produces an answer receipt. And in line 8, S produces another agreement token. In this case also, while the question could be heard, though somewhat ambiguously, as directed from one NNS to another NNS, the NS shows that he cannot be left out.

In contrast, segment (2.25) shows interaction between two NS participants, with one NNS being a peripheral participant.

(2.25) [tape 6, 95; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 K: I guess they like to gamble.
2 (0.5)
3 S: mm: :?
4 K: =because a lot of people win like millions of dollar:s: =
5 M: =not a [lot of people [ha ha ha= 7 S: [oh::
6 K: [I know= 9 M: =.h ha 10 (others laughing too))
11 K: =I know ha ha .hh (I mean) some 12 people who win like million:s 13 S: mm: :=
14 M: =everybody's hoping to win lot of 15 money.

In this segment, K states her opinion in lines 1 and 4-5, which M responds to with a contradiction and laughter in lines 6 and 9. K then responds to the contradiction by modifying her claim in lines 11-12. M produces a more affiliative response to this
lines 14-15. S shows herself to be participant, but her contributions are minimal. It is also possible that other NNSs are participating in the multiple laughter noted in line 10. The primary participants in this interaction, though, are the NSs. (The sequence of M’s contradiction and K’s modification can be analyzed in terms of other-correction, which is done in chapter four, segments (4.43) and (4.57).)

It would, again, be an oversimplification and distortion to say that the NS participants control the interaction. However, they do exert a powerful influence on the structure of the participation framework as the interaction shifts around them, placing the NS participants in the position of pivot around which the shifts between one participation framework and another occur.

The Valentine Story

A number of points have been made in characterizing the nature of the interaction that takes place in the conversation club. It has been demonstrated that, at times, the participants orient to the institutional constraints of the conversation club as a language school event. In particular, the participants orient to the conversation club as a scheduled recurrent event and, at least on the part of the NS participants, to the responsibility for groups to produce talk. It has been argued, based on various lines of evidence, that roles such as NS and NNS are not just analytical labels, but roles that are relevant, even omnirelevant, to the participants themselves. The omnirelevance of these roles, which may result from the purpose of the interaction, may make the conversation club interaction in one way similar to language classroom interaction. Finally, the manner in which the NS serves as a pivotal figure in the participation framework has been illustrated. To bring these different points together, it can be argued that each illustrates one aspect in which the interaction in the conversation club
can be seen as a particular language game (Wittgenstein, 1953). In this final section of the chapter, a series of segments from talk about a particular topic, the story of the origin of Valentine's Day, will be analyzed to illustrate how this particular language game is played. From the beginning of the first segment (2.26) to the end of the final segment (2.38) to be analyzed in this section, the talk, most of which is related to what participants refer to as the "Valentine story," continues for approximately eight minutes and twenty seconds.

The conversation club group in which this talk occurs consists of three NNSs (H, S, and E) and one NS (M). They are meeting for the first time and the talk occurs near the beginning of the meeting. In fact, the first segment (2.26) occurs while M is occupied in getting the students' names. The students introduce Valentine's Day as a topic to discuss because of a homework assignment in one of their classes. The talk begins with segment (2.26), part of which was analyzed above as segment (2.22).

(2.26)  
[tape 5, 19; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]  
1  M: so easily ((smilely voice))  
2  ?: .hh  
3  (1.1)  
4  M: okay  
5  (2.5)  
6  M: let me find some paper:  
7  (1.4)  
8  H: Setsuko we can research for (1.2)  
9  for for  
10  M: oh [for your class?  
11  ?: [(xx)]?  
12  S: ah-  
13  H: mm  
14  S: yeah  
15  M: it's for your (.) for your class?  
16  ?: (but)=  
17  H: =yes [oh-  
18  M: [yeah no problem,
Prior to this segment, M has been asking for the students' names, but then states that he should write the names down in order to avoid forgetting them. Though there is no video to corroborate this, M's talk in lines 4 and 6 and the long silences in lines 3, 5, and 7 would seem to indicate that he is busy searching for some paper. In lines 8 and 9, H then says something about the students’ class assignment, explicitly marking another NNS as the recipient of this utterance. As discussed above, though, M, in his role as an interactional pivot, takes what H says as a request for his participation in their class assignment. Though Valentine's Day is not mentioned in this segment, this is what the assignment turns out to be about.

Following segment (2.26), the talk briefly returns to the business of M's getting the students' names. Then comes segment (2.27)

(2.27)

[tape 5, 26; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]

1 H: yeah ou:r: (0.4) uh:- (0.3) we:
2 uh: same (.) uh we have (0.4) take
3 a: (0.4)
4 ?: "same"=
5 H: =same classes.=
6 M: =mm-hm=
7 H: ="yes" .h [we:- (0.5) we do::-
8 ?: ] (xx) (sometimes)
9 H: (0.5) ha (0.5) our homework?
10 M: uh-huh
11 H: "we will" .h uh: (0.4) American?
12 or: conversation partner?
13 M: okay=
14 H: =some question?
15 M: sure
16 H: is about Valentine Day:s,=
17 M: =okay okay

In segment (2.26), M took H’s utterance directed to S as a request for his participation in their assignment, to which he acquiesced. However, the talk then returned to the business of getting names, rather than to the assignment. Here, in segment (2.27), the talk has returned to the assignment. In lines 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-12, 14 and 16, H gives
information about their assignment. Throughout most of this segment, M produces continuers, at lines 6, 10, and 13, displaying that he is following the talk and, by passing the floor back to H, that he believes H desires to continue. In line 15, though, M says “sure,” treating the information that H has been giving as a request for his participation in the assignment.

There are two important things to note at this point. First, the information about their assignment that H has given is being analyzed as what in speech act theory has been called an indirect request. However, that this is an indirect request is something which emerges from the interaction. It is an indirect request because M treats it as a request by saying “sure” and because much of the following talk involves M’s participation in this assignment. What H’s intentions were, either in the utterance she directed to S in segment (2.26) or in her multiple utterances in segment (2.27), cannot be known and are, for the purposes of analyzing the interaction itself, irrelevant. Second, in giving the information about the assignment, H emphasizes that she is not the only member of the group who will benefit from M’s participation. By saying such things as “same classes” (line 5) and “our homework” (line 9), as well as by repeating “we” (lines 1, 2, 7, and 11) and “our” (lines 1 and 9), H is able to indicate that this assignment is something which multiple student members of this group need to do. Combined with H’s introduction of the assignment in segment (2.26) by explicitly directing her utterance to another student, H is orienting to herself and the other NNS participants as students who, taking the same class and having the same assignment, require the same assistance from the NS, M.

The end of segment (2.27) overlaps with the beginning of segment (2.28), in which M’s actual participation in the assignment begins.
Most of the talk that is being analyzed in this section is talk about the story of the origin of Valentine’s Day, or the “Valentine story.” However, the assignment itself, based on the question H asks in lines 6-7 and the questions that other participants ask at other times during the conversation club meeting, does not appear to involve learning about the Valentine story. Rather, the assignment appears to be to ask some Americans some questions about Valentine’s Day. In segment (2.28), though, the talk begins to turn toward the Valentine story.

In lines 6-7, H’s question, “how often do you Valentine Days mean,” is non-target-like to the extent that it is unclear what she is trying to ask. M does not respond immediately, resulting in a 0.4 second pause in line 8, and H begins to self-initiate repair in line 9 by saying “what.” At this point, M comes in with a reformulation of the question as “the meaning of Valentine’s Day,” said with rising intonation. H accepts this reformulation in lines 11-12, accepting it even before M has completed it. M and H can here be heard to be orienting to roles as NS and NNS, with the NNS as someone who has limited competence to use her second language and the NS as someone who can provide needed help with the language. Finally, having established what H’s topic and/or question is, M introduces the information about the existence of
“the story,” while at the same time, by saying “I think” and “the story is something about,” indicating his limited familiarity with the story. It would seem, though, that M is introducing the story as relevant to the meaning of Valentine’s Day.

As it turns out, one of the NNS participants happens to be more familiar with the story, as can be seen in segment (2.29).

(2.29)
[tape 5, 36; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; H, NNS, female; E, NNS, female]
1 M: [somebody (x)]
2 S: [yeah I know it ha ha ha
3 ?: oh--
4 M: =you know the story?
5 (0.6)
6 S: yes
7 M: yeah I think it’s (0.5)
8 [I can’t (rn) ((creaky voice))]
9 H: [Valentine’s story:, [you know?
10 S: (yeah
11 S: yeah
12 H: oh::=
13 E: =Valentine story
14 S: yeah (0.3) I read: (0.4) this
15 story: (0.4) from int(h)ern(h)et ha
16 M: oh from the internet.
17 S: [yeah ha ha
18 ?: [oh:[
19 ?: [oh[: oh:
20 M: [I can’t remember
21 everything but I think he was in
22 jail right?

In segment (2.29), the participants establish their relative knowledge of the Valentine story, with S somewhat surprisingly turning out to be more familiar with the story than M. In the prior talk, M has indicated that there is a Valentine story, but that he is unsure of the details. In line 2 of segment (2.29), S indicates that she knows the story, which is then confirmed by M and S in line 4-6. In lines 7-8, M once again indicates his uncertainty about the details of the story. Even though S’s familiarity with the story has already been established, another NNS participant, H, questions this
knowledge once more in line 9, with S again confirming her knowledge of the story in lines 10 and 11. H then produces a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) in line 12, indicating that S’s familiarity with the Valentine story is something which H did not know before, possibly something that H could not have been expected to know before. In lines 14-15, S then accounts for her knowledge of the story, stating that she got it from the internet. In line 16, M produces a change-of-state token and then repeats “from the internet,” with falling intonation, which together indicate that M now understands how S knows the story and that, given M’s unsurprised tone of voice, it is unsurprising that S could learn the story from the internet. Finally, in lines 20-22, in saying “I can’t remember everything but I think he was in jail right,” with rising intonation, M indicates again his uncertainty of the details of the story, introduces a plot element, and appeals for help with this plot element, presumably from the person, S, who has more knowledge.

For the purposes of this chapter, one thing that is quite interesting about this story is the participants’ orientations to roles as cultural native and cultural non-native, roles which would appear to be related to roles as NS and NNS. As a cultural native, a member of a culture the lore of which includes the origin of Valentine’s Day, M is somebody who can introduce the Valentine story as relevant to the meaning of Valentine’s Day. However, he also repeatedly alludes to his limited knowledge of the story, indexing, possibly for the benefit of cultural non-natives, his deficiency as a cultural native. As a cultural non-native, it is somewhat surprising that S knows this story, and especially that S may know the story in more detail than does M. The participants can be heard to be orienting to the surprising nature of S as a knowledgeable cultural non-native. Even though it has already been established that S knows the story, H again questions S’s knowledge in line 9. S then comes to give an
account for her knowledge, something which M has not been compelled to do. This account is accepted by M in line 16 and by the NNS participants in lines 18 and 19. Finally, in spite of the fact that it has been established that S is relatively more knowledgeable about the story, it is M, the cultural native, who decides which plot element to introduce first. It was argued above that the roles of NS and NNS may be omnirelevant for the participants in the conversation club. Another possibility is that it is the roles of cultural native and cultural non-native that are omnirelevant, with NS and NNS being narrower versions of these roles.

A somewhat different role orientation, one more closely related to language, is found in segment (2.30), the beginning of which overlaps with the end of segment (2.29).

(2.30)
[tape 5, 37; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]
1 M: I can't remember everything but I think he was in jail right?
2 (0.5)
3 H: jay:?
4 M: n- (.) understand jail?
5 H: [no
6 M: [prison?
7 ?: prison
8 ?: ah [(praps]
9 ?:: [ (m-)
10 (1.7)
11 S: prison. yes.

In response to H's repair initiation targeting the word "jail" in line 4, M enters into some brief vocabulary instruction. In line 5, he asks somebody, possibly H, if she understands the word. Then, in overlap with her negative answer, he provides a synonym in line 7. This synonym appears to be helpful to at least one of the participants in line 8. Finally S accepts it as a plot element in line 12. In responding to H's repair initiation by asking "understand jail" and providing a synonym, M treats the problem with the word as being one of vocabulary knowledge. In this
segment, H is an NNS whose limited second language vocabulary may interfere with her comprehension, while M is an NS who is able to provide instructional assistance in the form of synonyms for unknown vocabulary.

As the talk continues, S takes more responsibility for telling the Valentine story, indicating that the hero is a priest and that the story takes place "long long time ago" in the "Roma period." Segment (2.31) begins as S is introducing more important plot elements.

(2.31)
[tape 5, 43; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  S: uh kink h (1.6) kink hh said (0.3) don't marriage ha
2  M: wow
4  (1.0)
5  S: m because uh (1.2) there a lot of w wah? (0.9) but=
7  M: =a lot of war?
8  S: wah [uh
9  M: [(because]
10 (1.6)
11 S: uh (nan to yuu) (0.8) uh s sorry I forgot the- (0.7) (xxxxx) (.).army
13 like a- (.) [army
14 M: [uh-huh (.). okay
15 (0.4)
16 S: army: (0.7) a::nd want to go back to ho:me,
18 M: [uh-huh
19 S: [if they get marriage,
20 M: uh-huh=
21 S::=mm then kink (0.9) not allow to
22 (0.4) marriage.
23 ?: ["mm"
24 M: [oh: so he wants everybody to: be in the war,
26 (0.4)
27 S: yeah
28 M: ah: okay okay

By this point in the talk, M has become the primary recipient of the story. In this segment, as S is telling the story, M produces assessments and continuers, at lines 3, 14, 18, and 20, which function to pass the floor back to S so that she can continue her
story. Even after M’s assessment, “wow,” in line 3, where there is a 1.0 second pause in line 4, neither M nor any of the other participants take the floor, allowing S to continue the story in line 5. M also indicates, with a change-of-state token “oh” in line 24 and his utterance “ah okay okay” in line 28, that these elements of the story were unknown to him before. In acting as the primary story recipient, M can be heard as functioning in the role of interactional pivot. He introduced the Valentine story in his response to one NNS participant’s question. At that time, M and the NNS H were the primary participants in the interaction. Now the participation structure has shifted, with S telling the story and M being the primary recipient. True to his role as interactional pivot, M remains a primary participant as the primary NNS participant changes.

In addition, though, S displays difficulty in telling the story, difficulty which seems to be linguistic in nature, and M provides some assistance. As they do this, they can also be heard to be orienting to roles as NNS and NS. One indication of S’s difficulty is the large number of long intraturn pauses she produces in this segment, at lines 1, 5, 12, and 21, as well as brief intraturn pauses at lines 1 and 22. These can be analyzed as being intraturn in that the turn is not a hearably complete unit. Two other indications of difficulty are her switch to Japanese in line 11, “nan to yuu,” and her apology and account, “sorry I forgot the,” in lines 11-12. Finally, in addition to providing encouragement to continue talking with his continuers, M can be analyzed as providing some assistance with the language by saying, in line 7, “a lot of war” with rising intonation following some display of difficulty by S with the word “war,” and by demonstrating his understanding, in lines 24-25, with a formulation of the plot elements that S has introduced.
In segment (2.31), S may have been the story-teller and M the primary story recipient, but this does not mean that the other NNS participants are completely left out of the interaction. In segment (2.32), H shows that she is still a participant.

(2.32)
[tape 5, 63; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: some man: (.J go to army?
2 S: yes
3 H: he his wife (0.6) uh his
4 girlfriend?
5 (0.5)
6 S: no no no .h (0.5) many man go to
7 war?
8 (0.6)
9 H: go to war?
10 S: go to war? .h but (.J uh: ift (0.3)
11 man get marriage,
12 H: [mm
13 M: [uh-huh
14 (0.4)
15 S: uhmm (0.4) they want to go back to
16 home?
17 H: [mm
18 M: [uh-huh
19 S: then kink (0.8) said
20 M: no marriage.=
21 S: =no (0.3) don’t you don’t marriage.
22 (0.6)
23 M: yeah (0.4) because he wants the
24 people to fight? (0.3) the men
25 should fight the war?
26 (0.5)
27 ?: mm=
28 M: =but if they love somebody at home,
29 they have a wife?
30 S: mm=
31 M: =they won’t fight.
32 (0.4)
33 S: [mm
34 ?: [oh
35 M: [the war. they want (0.4) come
36 home.
37 S: yeah.
38 M: right?
39 S: yeah.
In lines 1 and 3-4, H both displays her understanding of the story and some difficulty with the story. Following a pause at line 5, S indicates the problematic nature of H’s understanding by saying “no no no” and reformulating the plot elements that she introduced earlier. The interaction in lines 1-19 would at first appear as a counterexample to the argument that part of the NS participant’s role is to function as an interactional pivot. In these lines, the primary participants are both NNSs, with H displaying her understanding of the story and S taking that understanding to be inadequate and reformulating what she said earlier. However, M is still acting as one story recipient, producing continuers, in overlap with H, in lines 13 and 18. Then, in line 20, M begins to take over the reformulation of the story so far. In line 20, M completes the sentence started by S in line 19. S reformulates this sentence in line 21, which is followed by a 0.6 second interturn pause. M then takes over the reformulation completely in lines 23-25, 28-29, 31, and 35-36. Finally, S provides confirmation of M’s reformulation by saying “yeah” in line 37, M seeks further confirmation in line 38 by saying “right” with rising intonation, and S provides further confirmation by saying “yeah” again in line 39.

In taking over from S the reformulation of the story, M can be heard to be doing at least two different things. First, he again places himself in the role of primary story recipient, with his reformulation serving as a display to S of his understanding of the story she has been telling, an understanding which she confirms in lines 37 and 39. This extended reformulation serves a similar function to the shorter reformulation in lines 24-25 of segment (2.31). Second, this reformulation serves to provide H with another opportunity to grasp the plot of the story. In his role as NS, he is helping an NNS participant understand a story told in English. In addition, even though the participation structure briefly switches from S as the story-teller and M as the primary
recipient to S as the story-teller and H as the primary recipient, pushing the NS to a peripheral role, M soon reenters as a primary participant, both as the primary story recipient displaying his understanding of the story, and an NS teaching the language to an NNS, reformulating the story for the benefit of the NNS participant who is having trouble understanding it.

In segment (2.33), M and S are again the primary participants.

(2.33)
[tape 5, 73; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; H, NNS, female]
1 M: so it's illegal.
2 S: yeah it's illegal.
3 M: [oh:.
4 S: [and kink (0.6) very upset?
5 M: uhn
6 S: he uh king sent him: to prison.
7 M: oh[:: okay.
8 ?: [oh:
9 H: mm-hm?
10 (0.4)
11 M: oh. (0.4) so you teach me something
12 about my own [(0.3) culture.
13 ((overlapping sounds
14 as conversation continues))

Prior to this segment, S has stated that, in spite of the king having forbidden marriage, there is a priest, who so far has not been mentioned by name, who married people together. In line 1 of segment (2.33), M states something that so far has been left implicit, that the priest's actions are illegal. S uses repetition to confirm this, a use of repetition which Schegloff (1996) terms confirming an allusion. In lines 4-12, the story reaches a point where it is hearably complete. After S says that the king was "very upset" and sent the priest "to prison," M says "oh okay" in line 7 and then, a bit later, says "oh" again in line 11. He then provides an assessment of the story as being used by S to teach him something about his own culture.

This assessment in lines 11-12, as a statement of what S has just done with her story, is implicative of closing down the topic of the Valentine story. In addition, it
also shows a reorientation on M’s part to the roles of cultural native and cultural non-native. He refers to the Valentine story as “something about my own culture,” forming an implicit contrast between himself, a member of a (the?) culture of which the Valentine story is a part, and S, not a member of this culture, but someone who nevertheless knows this story. (Perhaps S could be considered to be a member of a more global internet culture.)

However, though the talk related to the Valentine story is hearably complete, in segment (2.34), H continues to display difficulty with the story and the talk is reopened.

(2.34)
[tape 5, 76; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  H: he: (0.4) uh didn’t uh he di- (.)
2  he do- he don’t want to: .h go-
3  want to: go to army?
4  (1.3)
5  M: no uhm (1.5) everybody (.). the king
6  said nobody can marry.
7  H: mm nobody
8  ?: [ah ah: (the king) (.). (said)
9  M: [nobody can marry. (0.5) because if
10  they marry they stay home.
11  ?: stay home.
12  M: but if they’re single,
13  (0.4)
14  ?: mm=
15  M: =they go to the war.
16  ?: mm=
17  H: =mm:=
18  M: =so he said don’t marry. (1.1) but
19  (0.4) the priest (1.1) married
20  people. (1.3) it’s illegal.
21  (0.5)
22  H: oh-
23  M: another priest.
24  (1.3)
25  H: don’t (0.4) don’t (0.3) want war?
26  (0.5) to war?
27  M: no no the [priest is
28  ?: [hh thh [ha ha .hh hh
29  ?: [not not married
30  is the (.). war?
In lines 1-3 of segment (2.34), H again displays her understanding of the story. Even though the story, as told by S, is that the hero, whose name is not mentioned but is presumably St. Valentine, went to prison as punishment for marrying people when the king had forbidden marriage in order to get more people to go to war, H’s understanding seems to be quite different. As she understands the story, the hero himself did not want to go to the army or to war. Following a 1.3 second pause in line 4, M takes over completely the telling of the story, once again reformulating it for the benefit of H. M also displays, though, some difficulty with how to reformulate the story. He does not immediately disconfirm H’s understanding, but instead waits for 1.3 seconds before beginning his turn in line 5. He starts his turn by saying “no” to disconfirm H’s understanding, but then goes into a word search, saying “uhm” and pausing 1.5 seconds. Following this, he says “everybody,” but then apparently abandons what he was going to say and produces the complete sentence “the king said nobody can marry.” As M continues to reformulate the story, he uses a great deal of repetition, orienting to the difficulty H has been having. He repeats “nobody can marry” in line 9. He gives the reason, “because if they marry they stay home” in lines 9-10 and then reformulates this as “if they’re single, they go to the war” in lines 12 and 15. He then repeats the king’s order, “so he said don’t marry” in line 18. In lines 19 and 20, he states what the priest’s action was and that it was illegal. It seems that he is about to repeat this again in line 23, but stops. Following the long 1.3
second pause in line 24, H once again displays her understanding of the story, which apparently has not changed. From line 27 to 40, M continues to try to reformulate the story in a way that H can understand, H continues to try to grasp the plot of the story, and there is laughter from multiple participants, showing their orientation to the problematicity of the story for H. Even though the story was originally told by S, as the NS participant, M has taken over the responsibility for finding a formulation of the story that H can understand.

One thing that is interesting here is that H’s understanding of the story, though completely wrong, is actually quite reasonable. If H, in trying to understand a story told in her second language, is relying on general world knowledge, or perhaps some sort of story schema, to compensate for limited proficiency, and if she understands that there is a hero who was sent to prison in a time of war, but could not catch much else, a perfectly reasonable conjecture on her part is that the hero was sent to prison for refusing to go to war. In addition, if H realizes that the hero is a saint, and believes saints to be peaceful as well as courageous people, it would be a reasonable conjecture that the hero was a pacifist or conscientious objector.

In segment (2.35), H displays her realization that she is not grasping the plot of the Valentine story.

(2.35)
[tape 5, 83; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
1 ((multiple laughter, overlapping with H))
2 H: I’m so so(h)rry b(h)ut .h I(h)
3 c(h)an’t .hh [I a(h)m (why)
4 M: [(let me think).
5 (0.8)
6 S: (think)
7 (0.4)
8 M: so- (1.7) the prie:st, (1.4) would
9 marry people together.
10 (0.5)
11 S: yeah
M: but it's illegal.

M: =he would marry (. ) a man and woman
they would go to the priest, and he
would marry them.

M: but it's illegal.

M: okay if like (. ) if I have a
wife.

After H apologizes in lines 3-4 for not being able to understand the story, M again tries to reformulate it in a manner that H can understand. That this is not so easy to do is something that M orients to in line 5, where he says, apparently, “let me think.”

Over one second later, in line 9, M starts the reformulation with “so,” but cuts this off and pauses for a further 1.7 seconds. He then says “the priest,” elongating the vowel in the noun, pauses another 1.4 seconds, and then completes the sentence with “would marry people together.” M continues to orient to the difficulty of reformulating the story so that H can understand, as he does not continue immediately. Rather, there is a 0.5 second pause at line 11, after which S confirms what M has said so far. This is followed by another brief pause and M saying “yeah” with rising intonation. In lines 16-18, M reformulates what he has said in lines 9-10. Then, in lines 20, 24-25, 27, and 29-30, M explains what the problem is with the priest’s actions. What is interesting about this segment is M is continuing to take responsibility for finding a
formulation of the story that H can understand, even though he is hearably having difficulty fulfilling this responsibility. It is also interesting that M does not introduce the plot element of going to war, but rather focuses on the priest’s actions and the reason that they are illegal. When, in line 32 following a long pause, H says “go to,” which is followed by another long pause, M starts a new reformulation, which can be seen in segment (2.36).

(2.36)
[tape 5, 88; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; H, NNS, female]
1  M: okay if like (0.4) if I have a
2    wife.
3   ?: mm-hm
4  M: and there’s a war,
5   ?: mm
6  M: if I have a wife,
7   ?: [mm
8  M: [and maybe children,
9   ?: mm=
10 M: =I want to stay.
11 ?: mm-hm
12 ?: [mm
13 M: [in Hawaii.
14 ?: mm=
15 S: =yes [yes
16 M: [but if the war is in
17   California,
18 S: yes=
19 M: =I don’t want- I won’t go.
20 ?: ah[: yes
21 H: [single is a war.
22 M: yeah the war is in California, I’m
23   in Hawaii. (0.5) so if I marry,
24   (0.3) I’m gonna stay in Hawaii.
25   (0.4) but the king
26 ?: mm[:
27 H: [“king”
28 M: wants me to go (0.3) to the war.=
29 H: =oh ah: yes.=
30 M: =so he said don’t marry.
31 H: [oh
32 M: [nobody can marry.
33 ?: mm
34 H: [oh=
35 M: [=so you’ll- don’t stay home.
36 H: oh: [yes.
In this segment, M makes serious modifications to the story. As S told it earlier, it involved two characters, the priest and the king, and extras, people that the king wanted to go to war but that the priest would marry. In this reformulation, M removes the story from its historical context and turns it into an imaginary current event, places himself in the story as a new character, and brings in specific places presumably known to H, Hawai‘i, and California. He also, as before, relies on a great deal of repetition in this reformulation. As he reformulates the story, it can be broken down into three parts, based on the introduction of each character, one character at a time. Lines 1-24 comprise the first part, in which he is talking about his own role in the story as someone who, if he has a wife and children and is living in Hawai‘i, and if there is a war in California, would not want to go fight in the war, but would rather stay home with his family. Lines 25-38 comprise the second part of the story, in which it is explained that the king has forbidden marriage in order to encourage people to go to the war in California. Finally, lines 41-51 comprise the third part, in which the role of
the priest, his actions, and their illegality are introduced. The story at this point would seem to be incomplete, as the fact that the priest was put in prison for his actions has not been introduced, but in line 55, M goes on to check H’s understanding, which she confirms.

What is most interesting in this segment is work that M is doing to produce a reformulation of the story that H can understand. One modification that NSs may make as they try to make themselves understood to NNSs is to focus more on the here-and-now (Long, 1981). This is something we can see M doing here. However, he is not doing it by changing the topic, but by casting himself as a character in the story and giving the story a concrete setting in locations which can be presumed to be known to the NNS who is having difficulty. M is apparently taking the responsibility to get H to understand the story quite seriously, refusing to give up and move on to something else. However, it appears that by lines 55-56, this responsibility is becoming too much of a burden, as he elicits only a claim of understanding from H, rather than some sort of display.

After eliciting this claim of understanding, M goes on to complete the story, as shown in segment (2.37).

(2.37)
[tape 5, 95; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female; E, NNS, female]
1 M: so this priest (...) is named (...) 
2 Valentine. 
3 H: ah[: ]
4 ?: [mm[:]
5 M: [saint his name saint 
6 Valentines.
7 (0.3)
8 ?: [mm
9 M: [so he marries everybody together.
10 ?: [mm
11 M: so the king is angry.
12 (0.8)
13 H: oh yes
14 (0.6)
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In segment (2.37), in lines 1-2 and 5-6, M gives a part of the story that has so far been absent, the priest’s name, St. Valentine. In introducing this new element, he again makes use of self-repetition. M then reformulates the story once again. However, whereas before he made use of elaboration in his modifications, to the point of casting himself in the story and setting it in concrete locations, this last reformulation is best characterized as a brief synopsis of the most important plot elements: “he marries everybody together,” “the king is angry,” the king put St. Valentine in “jail.” Repetition is used, but only in lines 15-16.

Once again, the talk about the Valentine story is hearably complete. There is a long pause in line 21, shortly after which E says, while laughing and with rising intonation “this is the Valentine story,” and M replies, with falling intonation, “that’s the Valentine story.” This involves a change from E’s “this” to M’s “that,” formulating the story as a conversational object that the talk has now moved away from. Indeed, segment (2.38), the beginning of which overlaps with the end of
segment (2.37), shows the participants successfully moving out of talk about the
Valentine story.

(2.38)
[tape 5, 99; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: =from [now
2 M: [so that’s the s that’s the
3 history, but I think uh (.) now the
4 meaning (. ) today: [is
5 ?: [mm
6 ?: mm
7 (0.4)
8 M: it’s just about love I think,
9 (0.6)
10 ?: mm?
11 (0.5)
12 M: (in) today?
13 ?: mm mm=
14 M: =Valentine’s Day is just for: love.
15 (0.4)
16 H: love?
17 M: [yeah:
18 ?: [(I think) hm?
19 (0.5)
20 ?: mm
21 (0.6)
22 M: because the priest was marrying
23 people for love so. (0.6) it’s a
24 day a day for. (0.5) day for love.
25 (0.6) but (0.5) now it’s also very
26 uh: (0.7) about money.

In segment (2.38), in lines 2-4 and 8, M closes down talk about the Valentine story
and ties the talk back to the question that he and H had collaboratively produced
several minutes earlier, about what the meaning of Valentine’s Day is. He states
(somewhat simplified), “that’s the history, but I think now the meaning today is . . .
just about love.” In a sense, the talk about the Valentine story can be seen as a long
insertion sequence, an extended preliminary leading up to the conclusion that,
somewhat anticlimactically after all the work that has gone into bringing H to
understand the story, the meaning of Valentine’s Day is love. This, then, provides an
answer to H’s question about the meaning of Valentine’s Day in segment (2.28),
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which itself was collaboratively produced with M’s help. Finishing up some repair work, M once again ties the Valentine story to the theme of love as the meaning of Valentine’s Day in lines 22-24. He then takes one further step away from the Valentine story in lines 25-26, by saying that Valentine’s Day is also “about money,” something completely missing from the story as originally told by S and reformulated several times.

In this eight-minute-plus stretch of talk about the Valentine story, the participants can be observed doing several of the things that give the conversation club interaction its feel as a particular language game. The pivotal role of the NS participant in the interaction can be observed as he, for example, takes responsibility for helping one NNS understand a story told by another NNS, rather than leaving it to the original NNS story-teller to develop an adequate reformulation. The participants can also be observed engaging in language learning/teaching behavior with regard to such things as vocabulary. Finally, the omnirelevance of such roles as NS and NNS can be observed as participants orient to the limited linguistic knowledge of the NNSs and even to expected limits on the cultural knowledge of NNSs as cultural non-natives.

Conclusion

This study is not intended as an ethnography of the conversation club, though a study of the club which combined CA with an ethnographic approach, as done by, for example, Moerman (1988) and Goodwin (1990), would be quite interesting. The purpose of this chapter was simply to demonstrate some aspects of the nature of the interaction from which the data for this study were drawn. One thing that should be clear is that the interaction, though in some ways certainly similar to other types of
interaction, is in many ways unique to the conversation club context. The data to be analyzed in later chapters of this dissertation need to be understood as both the product of this context and as talk which itself constitutes the context. Finally, several of the themes introduced in this chapter will be further developed in later chapters.
CHAPTER 3
OTHER-REPAIR AND OTHER-CORRECTION IN CA

In order to characterize the nature of the interaction in the conversation club, several segments of the interaction were introduced and analyzed in chapter two, some of which illustrate two phenomena fairly common in conversation, repair and correction. As corrective recasts, or other-correction of language form, would seem to be related to repair and correction, chapter four presents analyses of other-initiated repair and other-correction of content found in the data. First, though, in order to provide some necessary background for chapter four, this chapter briefly reviews the rather large body of CA research on repair and correction.

The chapter is organized as follows. The next section discusses some general findings about how repair is organized and realized. The following section then discusses some constraints on other-repair and other-correction. Correction itself, either self-correction or other-correction, can be seen either as a subset of repair or as a closely related phenomenon, but here it is treated as a subset of repair. This is followed by a section in which the relationship between other-correction and asymmetrical access to knowledge is discussed. The final section before the conclusion then discusses the importance of repair for the maintenance of intersubjectivity. One technical note to keep in mind while reading this chapter is that the data are presented as they appear in the original sources, so there may be some minor differences between the conventions used in this chapter and the conventions illustrated in chapter one and used in all the other chapters. When necessary, differences in transcription conventions are explained. Also, whenever possible, examples are laid out in the same way that they appear in the original source.
Organization and Realization of Repair

**Basic distinctions.** The term *repair* refers to attempts to deal with problems that occur in conversation, such as problems related to hearing, reference, or remembering. It plays a vital role in the ongoing maintenance of intersubjectivity among participants in interaction. An item in interaction which is the target of repair is referred to as a *trouble source*. The turn which contains the trouble source is referred to as the *trouble source turn*. With regard to how repair is organized, Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) make three basic distinctions. The first is between initiation and completion of repair. While often the same utterance may both initiate and complete repair, this distinction is necessary for two reasons. First, an initiated repair may not necessarily be completed and, second, the person who initiates repair may be different from the person who completes it. This leads to the second distinction, that between self and other. Repair may be initiated, completed, or both by the person who produces the trouble source or by another person. These two distinctions lead to six possible combinations: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated other-repair, self-initiated repair-failure, and other-initiated repair-failure. The third distinction deals with the position of repair initiation in the sequential organization of interaction. Initiation may occur during the trouble source turn, in the transition space between the trouble source turn and another speaker's turn, in the turn following the trouble source, or later, often in the third or fourth turn following the trouble source. Initiation during the trouble source turn or in the transition space is self-initiation, while initiation in the next turn is other-initiation.

The following examples from Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) demonstrate some of these different types of repair. Segment (3.1) is an example of
self-initiated self-repair within the trouble source turn. (Double slashes, //, are used to indicate the onset of overlap. An arrow, -->, is used to indicate turns being focused on.)

(3.1)

Deb: Kin you wait til we get home? We'll be home in five minutes

Anne: Ev'//en less th'n that.

--> Naomi: But c'd we- c'd I stay u:p?

(0.2)

Naomi: once we get // home,

Marty: For a few minutes,

Deb: Once you get yer nightgown on,

At the arrowed turn, Naomi changes “we” to “I.” She makes this self-initiated self-repair before her turn reaches a point where it could be heard as complete. That is, she cuts off at “we” and begins her turn again, incorporating the self-initiated self-repair.

Segment (3.2) is an example of self-initiated self-repair in transition space following the trouble source turn.

(3.2)

L: An’ ‘en bud all of the doors ‘n things were taped up=

--> L: =I mean y’know they put up y’know that kinda paper ‘r stuff,

--> L: the brown paper.

At the end of the first line, L’s turn can be heard as complete. However, with no pause L continues in the two arrowed lines. Once the first turn, the trouble source turn, is complete, L produces a self-initiated self-repair by changing the initial description of “the doors ‘n things” being “taped up” to “paper ‘r stuff” having been put up.

This turn in the second line is also hearably complete, but in the third line L produces self-initiated self-repair in the transition space again by changing “that kinda paper ‘r stuff” to “the brown paper.”

Segment (3.3) is an example of other-initiated self-repair. The initiation occurs in the turn following the trouble source turn.

(3.3)

D: Wul did’e ever get married ‘r anything?

--> C: Hu:h?
D: Did jee ever get married?
C: I have // no idea.

At the arrowed turn, C initiates repair by saying “Huh,” with rising intonation. The previous turn is the trouble source turn, but it is ambiguous exactly what the trouble source is. D completes the repair by partially repeating the trouble source turn. That this repair is treated as successful can be seen in the fact that C then answers the question.

Segment (3.4) is an example of other-initiated other-repair, or more specifically, other-correction. An instance of repair belongs to the subset of correction when the trouble source is treated as an error of some type, such as an error of word choice or pronunciation, or a factual error.

(3.4)
Lori: But y’know single beds’r awfully thin tuh sleep on.
Sam: What?
Lori: Single beds. // They’re-
--> Ellen: Y’mean narrow?
Lori: They’re awfully narrow // yeah.

In the arrowed turn, Ellen simultaneously initiates and completes repair by correcting Lori’s “thin” to “narrow.” Lori then agrees with this correction by saying “They’re awfully narrow yeah” in the next turn. Note that Sam first initiates repair by saying “What,” with rising intonation, in the second line and that Lori attempts to self-repair in the third line by repeating “Single beds.” The exact trouble source that Sam’s other-initiation is targeting is ambiguous, but if it is “thin,” then Lori’s attempted self-repair in the third line is unsuccessful. Ellen’s other-correction in the arrowed turn and Lori’s acceptance of it in the following turn can be seen as treating Sam’s turn in the second line and Lori’s turn in the third line as other-initiated repair-failure.
**Third and fourth position repair.** The distinctions and examples discussed above demonstrate the systematic organization of repair. Further research has demonstrated that it is also quite intricate. This can be seen by looking at how repair is initiated after the turn following the trouble source turn, in the third or fourth turn or, more accurately, in the third or fourth position. The distinction between turn and position is important. The terms *third turn* and *fourth turn* refer only to the serial location of a turn; the terms *third position* and *fourth position* refer the location of a turn with respect to the prior turns that it is designed to be subsequent to. The following examples from Schegloff (1992, 1997a) can help clarify this distinction.

Segment (3.5) is from a group therapy session of teenagers (Schegloff, 1992).

(3.5)

Dan: Well that's a little different from last week.  
Louise: heh heh heh Yeah. We were in hysterics last week.  
--- Dan: No, I mean Al.

In this example, the arrowed turn is self-initiated self-repair in third position and in third turn. Dan makes a comment about the prior week in the first turn, to which Louise responds in the second. Dan treats her turn as showing that she misunderstood who he is talking about--he orients to the first turn as containing a trouble source in need of repair. He repairs the trouble source by making it clear who he is referring to. While this is in the third serial turn, it is also designed to be subsequent to Louise's turn, which itself is designed to be subsequent to the turn containing the trouble source. That is, the arrowed turn is in third position with respect to Dan's first turn. It is also possible for third position to be later than third serial turn. Segment (3.6) is also from group therapy (Schegloff, 1992).

(3.6)

Dan: ... See Al tends, it seems, to pull in one or two individuals on his side (there). This is part of his power drive, see. He's gotta pull in, he can't quite do it on his own. Yet.
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AI: W'l-
Roger: Well so do I.
--> Dan: Yeah. [I'm not criticizing, I mean we’ll just uh=
Roger: [Oh you wanna talk about him.

In this example also, the arrowed turn is self-initiated self-repair in third position, but it is not in third turn. Dan treats Roger’s first turn as showing that Roger misunderstood something in Dan’s first turn. Even though AI’s (minimal, incomplete) turn intervenes between Dan’s turn and Roger’s turn, Roger’s turn is a response to Dan’s comment about AI. It is designed to be subsequent to (in second position to) Dan’s first turn. The arrowed turn is then designed to repair a trouble source in the turn that Roger’s turn was designed to be subsequent to. It is, therefore, in third position with respect to Dan’s first turn.

It is also possible that a repair can be in third serial turn without being in third position. Segment (3.7) demonstrates this (Schegloff, 1997a).

(3.7)
Jim: Is it goin to be at your house?
Bonnie: Yeah.=
--> Jim: =Your apartment?= 
Bonnie: =My place.

What makes this repair different is that Bonnie’s second turn does not indicate to Jim that there was trouble with his first turn. While Bonnie’s first turn is designed to be subsequent to Jim’s first turn, Jim’s second turn is not designed to be subsequent to Bonnie’s first turn. Instead, Jim’s self-initiated self-repair targets what he said in his first turn even though there is no indication of problematic understanding in Bonnie’s turn. Had Bonnie delayed her first turn a little, Jim’s repair would have appeared in the transition space following his first turn.

Finally, fourth position repair can be seen in segment (3.8) (Schegloff, 1992).

(3.8)
Phil: Hello?
Lehroff: Phil!
Phil: Yeh.
Lehroff: Josh Lehroff.
Phil: Yeh.
Lehroff: Ah:: what've you gotten so far. Any requests to dispatch any trucks to any areas,
--> Phil: Oh you want my daddy.

The arrowed turn is other-initiated other-repair in the fourth position. When Phil (actually, Phil, jr.) hears the caller, Lehroff, say his name, he ratifies that he is, indeed, Phil. This ratification is designed to be subsequent to Lehroff’s first turn. Lehroff then proceeds to give his identification in a turn designed to be subsequent to Phil’s ratification. In this turn, Lehroff does not realize that his first turn is in need of repair. Two turns later, Phil realizes that there was trouble with Lehroff’s first turn and he then initiates repair.

The turn/position distinction is important for understanding the organization of repair after next turn. For example, in the final excerpt above, the repair organization would be no different had Phil initiated repair in the turn following Lehroff’s self-identification rather than two turns later. It is the location of repair with respect to the turn(s) that it is designed to follow that is important, not its serial location. There is also a systematic relationship between position and self- and other-initiation, with third position repair typically self-initiated, but fourth position repair typically other-initiated. These details of repair in third and fourth position demonstrate how intricately repair is organized.

Repair resources. CA research on repair has also demonstrated some of the resources used to realize it. While the existence of repair and, if conceived at a sufficiently abstract level, its organization are likely to be universal, the resources used to realize it are more open to variation. Below are some examples.

One resource that may be used to initiate repair in the next turn is called open class repair initiator, a brief utterance, such as “what,” “huh,” and “sorry,” that can
be used to indicate that something in the prior turn is in need of repair without indicating precisely what the trouble source is. In an analysis of certain environments in which open class repair initiators may be found, Drew (1997) demonstrates that, in addition to being used to indicate such things as trouble with hearing, they can also be used to indicate that a prior turn is perceived as being topically unrelated. In segment (3.9), from Drew (1997), Gordon has called Norm to ask for a ride that night to some social event. Norm has consented and seems to want to end the conversation and get back to his bath.

(3.9)
Gordon: .hhh (0.3) Very kind of you.

( .)
Norm: Caught me in the bath again

--> Gordon: [ .p. hhh Forg?n?=

Norm: =hgh Caught me in the bath
Gordon: [.t .hh .hh Oh(hh) I'm sorry(hh) I'm sorry ye ,hhhhh Oh we'll I sh' let you get back to it.

Gordon produces an open class repair initiator at the arrowed line. Apparently, the trouble is that he does not see how Norm's turn is topically related to what has come before, making it difficult for him to understand the interactional import of what Norm says. In his analysis of these initiators, Drew emphasizes that they have various uses, such as indicating problems with hearing, and that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the resources used to initiate repair and the nature of the trouble.

Other resources are used to self-initiate repair in the same turn. For example, Schegloff (1987) investigates the use of recycled turn beginnings to initiate repair. Turn beginnings are often recycled--the speaker produces a mid-turn cut-off and then goes back to the beginning to start over--when the beginning of the turn is produced in overlap with another speaker's turn. What is most interesting about this repair mechanism is that the first try at the turn is typically cut off and recycled as soon as
the overlap ceases, indicating sensitivity to the rules of turn-taking. Jefferson (1975; also Schegloff, 1979) investigates a different resource—the use of “uh” to mark self-repair of an error. Specifically, “uh” is often used to indicate that an about-to-be-uttered word is in error. “Uh” might be followed by the word that is in error, a brief pause, and then another word. Or, “uh” may be followed by only a partial production of the error word. One thing that these two examples demonstrate is that such things as cut-offs, recycled beginnings, “you know”s, “uh”s, and so on are not necessarily haphazard performance slips. Instead, they are systematic and rule-like. Other research indicates how intonation (e.g., Selting, 1988) and language specific morphosyntax (e.g., Fox, et al., 1996) are used as resources for repair.

Interactive nature of repair. With terms such as self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, third position repair, fourth position repair, and so on, it may seem possible, maybe by some even desirable, to use these different categories to code instances of repair in order to extract information from interaction about their relative frequency. However, this is not possible without losing the interactive nature of repair, and it is certainly not desirable. Like any other kind of action that occurs within interaction, such things as trouble source turns, self- and other-initiation, and self- and other-repair are embedded within and must be analyzed within the local sequential context in which they occur. Work in CA has demonstrated that abstractions about the organization of repair and the resources that a language makes available for the realization of repair can be made, but only on the basis of a detailed understanding of an aggregate of single cases, each embedded in a particular sequential context which both shapes the repair turn and is itself shaped by the repair turn.

For example, in segment (3.4), it is only as a result of Ellen’s correction and Lori’s acceptance of the correction that Lori’s initial attempt at repair can be heard to
be unsuccessful. This is what makes the sequence of Sam’s first turn and Lori’s second turn an example of other-initiated repair-failure. In segment (3.6), it is the design of turns as being subsequent to other particular turns that allows Dan’s self-initiated self-repair to be heard as occupying third position. Similarly, in segment (3.7), the fact that Jim’s repair is not designed as subsequent to Bonnie’s is what allows it to be heard as designed in the same way as self-initiated self-repair in the transition space following the trouble source turn. Understanding each particular case of repair requires that it be analyzed within its particular sequential context.

Schegloff (1997b) very nicely illustrates the dangers of ignoring the interactive nature of repair. He demonstrates that resources often used for repair, such as those discussed above, can be used for other things as well. Segments (3.10) and (3.11), from Schegloff (1997b), demonstrate that the same resources that can be used as open class repair initiators can also be used for actions other than repair. (Capitals in unusual places are used to show extra loud speech. Segment (3.11) is somewhat simplified.)

(3.10)
1 Anne: Ask Uncle Freddy nice[ly]
2 Fred: [Whatchu] want Naomi,
3 c’mon (I-) come t’the kid (tchen.)
4 Naomi: [Please a glass a’milk,]
5 Deb: [Water fer me FRE:d,]
6 Fred: Ajuu [ahhh! ((sneeze))]
7 Marty: [En’n ash[ray fer] me Fred,
8 Fred: [(Scuze me??)]
9 Fred: What?
10 Marty: Ashtray fer me,
11 Fred: [Two [ashtrays?]]
12 Deb: [Ash ray,] water, milk.
13 Fred: Okay. En ashtray en ennything tuh drink.
14 (0.5)

(3.11)
1 Naomi: hh if you [do this] one [you wi][n,
2 Anne: [Fredeluh,]
3 Fred: What,
As Schegloff points out, the "scuze me" in segment (3.10), line 8, and the "What" in segment (3.11), line 3, are resources provided by the language for initiating repair. However, in these cases, they do very different work. The "scuze me" in (3.10) is a kind of ritualized expression that a person makes after he or she sneezes. The "What" that follows it in line 9 is a repair initiator. The "What" in (3.11), though, is not a repair initiator, but rather Fred's response to Anne's summons in line 2. Understanding that these tokens are not being used to initiate repair in these particular cases requires that they be analyzed within their interactional context.

**Constraints on Other-repair and Other-correction**

The importance of repair in interaction follows from its use in the maintenance of intersubjectivity, the shared understanding among participants as to what is happening in interaction. (See the section below entitled, Repair and Intersubjectivity.) Other-repair and other-correction, though, appear to operate under certain constraints that shape how they fulfill this role. There could be various reasons for these constraints. For example, Drew (1997) argues that one use of open class repair initiators is for other-initiation of repair when the participant who initiates repair "has grounds for suspecting (another participant's) lack of alignment" (p. 93).

Segment (3.12), from Drew (1997) illustrates this.

(3.12)

14 Emma: EN BARBRA wouldju CALL 'im tonight for me, h
15 (.)
16 Barbara: Ye:ah,
17 Emma: :h HU_H?h
Emma requests that Barbara do something in line 14, which is followed by a brief pause and then a minimal and less than enthusiastic response, which “displays a degree of unwillingness” (p. 90). This displayed unwillingness provides Emma with grounds for suspecting lack of alignment between herself and Barbara, leading Emma to initiate repair in line 17. A possibility that results from this particular use of open class repair initiators is that they may highlight areas of non-alignment among participants, which may be a reason for the use of other-initiation of repair to be constrained. There may also be situations in which something could be corrected, but failure to provide a correction would seem to have no consequences for the maintenance of intersubjectivity. In such cases, the tendency may simply be to let the opportunity for correction pass. For example, Firth (1996) analyzes business telephone conversations in English among NNSs with different first language backgrounds and finds that participants rarely other-correct non-target-like language use. It is only when it is clear that limited proficiency may lead to misunderstandings of important information that they focus explicitly on linguistic form. A possibility is that providing other-correction in situations where its absence would have no consequences for intersubjectivity may itself be a distraction that complicates the maintenance of intersubjectivity, which may be a reason for other-correction to be constrained.

Constraints on the use of other-initiation of repair, either other-initiated self-repair or other-initiated other-repair and including cases of other-correction, can be seen in how it is produced. First, other-initiation is often marked by what Pomerantz (1984) calls dispreference markers and Bilmes (1988), for reasons discussed below, calls reluctance markers, or “expressions that conventionally indicate reluctance” (p. 93).
173), for example, pauses or vocalizations such as “well” and “uh.” This is demonstrated in segment (3.13), from Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977).

(3.13)
A: Hey the first time they stopped me from sellin cigarettes was this morning.
1.0
B: From selling cigarettes?
A: From buying cigarettes. They // said uh
C: Uh huh

There is a rather long 1.0 second pause following the completion of A’s turn before B initiates repair. As Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) point out, this type of pause is what often allows the producer of the trouble source turn to repair in the transition space following the possible completion of the turn. Second, while for self-initiated self-repair, the initiation and completion components often cannot be separated, for other-initiation of repair, these components often can be separated and the repair initiation turn often does nothing besides initiating repair, giving the producer of the trouble source turn another opportunity to self-repair (Schegloff, et al., 1977). This can be seen in segment (3.14), form Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977).

(3.14)
Ken: 'E likes that waider over there,
Al: Wait-er?
Ken: Waitress, sorry,
Al: 'At's bedder,

In this segment, which is specifically a case of other-initiated self-correction, Al initiates but does not complete the correction, giving Ken the opportunity to self-correct. Third, while self-initiated self-repair often results in a speaker interrupting his or her own turn before it is complete, other-initiation rarely occurs until the trouble source turn is hearably complete (Schegloff, et al., 1977). This can be seen in (3.13) and (3.14) above, as well as in segment (3.15) (Schegloff, et al., 1977).
(3.15)
Frieda: This is nice, did you make this?
Kathy: No, Samu made that.
Frieda: Who?
Kathy: Samu.

Notice also that the only interactional work done by Frieda’s turn is to initiate repair. When it comes specifically to other-correction, either self-initiated other-correction or other-initiated other-correction, Jefferson (1987) illustrates how, unlike other-initiation turns which are not used to complete the repair or correction, other-correction is often embedded in a turn which performs other work as well. This can be seen in segment (3.16), from Jefferson (1987).

(3.16)
Customer: Mm, the wales are wider apart than that.
Salesman: Okay, let me see if I can find one with wider threads
((Looks through stock))
Salesman: How’s this.
Customer: Nope, the threads are even wider than that.

In this segment, the salesman corrects “wales” to “threads,” but does so within a turn in which he informs the customer that he will try to find the kind of object that the customer wants. This turn is not one that is primarily occupied with the business of correction.

Jefferson also points out that, when other-correction is not so embedded, accounting for the error that has been corrected often becomes the interactional business of the following talk. This can be seen in segment (3.17), also from Jefferson (1987).

(3.17)
Desk: ...but it’s at-on three o’clock and she might just be free or between interviews.
(1.0)
Mr. O.: w-What time is it now sir?
Desk: Three isn’t it?
(0.7)
Mr. O.: (We’ll?) I thought it was earlier than that:
(0.3)
In this segment, Mr. O initiates the correction of the time, after which there is a 0.3 second pause before Desk self-corrects and then apologizes. Desk then accounts for the error by stating that he/she "got the hour wrong."

Finally, in analysis of conversations between NSs and proficient NNSs of Japanese, Hosoda (2000) only found instances of other-correction by the NSs, related to lexical items or aspects of language form, when the NNSs initiated it through verbal and/or non-verbal means, which may function to invite correction. Similarly, in conversations between NSs and NNSs of Finnish, Kurhila (2001) found that other-correction related to language form was either embedded within turns that did non-corrective work or followed self-initiations produced by the NNSs.

The constraints on other-repair and other-correction has led to other-repair and other-correction being depicted as dispreferred, and self-repair and self-correction being depicted as preferred. This can be traced back as least as far as Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), the title of which is *The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation*. However, Bilmes (1988) has argued that this use of the concept of preference is problematic. Bilmes demonstrates that preference is a useful concept for understanding how inferences can be made. For example, following an invitation, the preferred response is acceptance, or following an attribution about someone made in that person’s presence, the preferred response for that person is denial. There is nothing psychological about this as it has nothing to do with such things as motivation, intention, or desire. Rather, if acceptance does not follow an invitation, its absence is noticeable and implies rejection, while the absence
of rejection does not imply acceptance. Similarly, following an attribution, the absence of a denial implies acceptance, while the absence of acceptance does not imply denial. (For an interesting case of this, see segment (4.59) in the next chapter.) Preference is thus a technical concept in CA and should not be treated as referring to any psychological dispositions of individuals.

However, this technical use of preference cannot be applied to repair—it would make no sense to say that the absence of self-repair implies other-repair. In stating that there is a preference for self-repair or self-correction, it is difficult to see what is meant if the term preference is not to be taken in its psychological or statistical sense. Bilmes (1988) also argues that so-called dispreference markers (Pomerantz, 1984) are “part of a different, partly independent, phenomenon” (p. 173) separate from preference. For this reason, as mentioned above, Bilmes (1988) uses the term reluctance markers to refer to “expressions that conventionally indicate reluctance” (p. 173). (Whether the person who uses reluctance markers is “actually” reluctant may be a concern of participants in a conversation, but it is not the type of question asked by CA.) What can be said about other-repair and other-correction, then, is that while it may not be very illuminating to depict them as dispreferred, their production does seem to operate under certain constraints.

**Other-correction and Asymmetrical Access to Knowledge**

There may be situations where the constraints on other-correction are somewhat relaxed. For example, Langford (1981) analyzed sequences in parent-child conversation in which the parent uses a clarification request following a child’s non-target-like utterance, the child responds by reformulating his or her utterance to make it more target-like, and the parent then gives some indication that the original problem
has been adequately dealt with. What Langford (1981) calls a clarification request and
the child's reformulation can be seen as instances of other-initiated self-correction.
McHoul (1990), analyzing a high school geography class in Australia, found that,
when it came to correction of class content, the most common form was other-initiated
self-correction, with the teacher initiating the correction and the student who produced
the trouble source completing it. The other-initiations produced by the teacher were
not preceded by any kind of reluctance markers. The teacher did, though, give the
students ample opportunity to self-correct following the initiation. The teacher also
provided some indication of whether the self-correction was adequate or not. When it
came to repair unrelated to class content, the teacher's use of other-initiation was much
more constrained. In language classrooms, a common pattern of correction of
language form that has been observed is what could be called other-initiated delegated-
correction, with the teacher initiating the correction following a student's production of
a non-target-like form and then calling on a different student to complete the
correction. Successful delegated-corrections are typically followed by confirmation
from the teacher (Jung, 1999; Kasper, 1985).

In situations where participants have asymmetrical access to knowledge of
some domain, such as linguistic knowledge in parent-child interaction and language
classrooms, or knowledge of class content in other classrooms, and participants orient
to this asymmetrical access, then other-correction by the more knowledgeable
participant within that domain may be much less constrained. In particular, parents
and teachers may be less constrained in initiating correction and may wield the power
to decide who completes a correction and whether a proposed correction is adequate.

Norrick (1991) argues that in cases of asymmetrical access to knowledge,
other-correction is even less constrained that the above cases seem to indicate, with the
more knowledgeable participant typically producing unmitigated other-initiated other-correction, in which there are no reluctance markers and the initiation and the completion components cannot be separated, giving the producer of the trouble source no opportunity to self-correct. Segments (3.18) and (3.19), from Norrick (1991), demonstrate.

(3.18)
John: Hey Frank. How far is Reading (\texttt{rid\textsc{\textsc{g}}}) from London?  
Frank: Reading (\texttt{rc\textsc{\textsc{d\textsc{g}}}}). Oh: not that far really.  
John: Well: I was just looking at this map.

(3.19)
P: I lost my coffee. Oh: it's on the heater, over there on the heater, on the gas heater, can you get it?  
N: Furnace.  
P: On the furnace, yeah.

Norrick (1991) argues that in the first case, Frank knows more about the pronunciation of place names in England, having recently returned from an extended visit, which provides a warrant for him to other-correct John’s pronunciation without any sort of hesitation or other kind of mitigation. In the second case, P is an NNS of English and her husband N (actually, Norrick himself) is an NS. N’s superior knowledge of the English lexicon provides a warrant for him to other-correct P’s lexical error. A closer look at the data reveals, though, that Norrick is overstating the unconstrained nature of other-correction, even when there is asymmetrical access to relevant knowledge. In segment (3.18), even though Frank immediately other-corrects John’s pronunciation, he also then immediately answers John’s question. For his part, at least in the data that are presented, John does not go on record as taking notice that his pronunciation has been corrected. The result is that the correction is to some degree embedded in that it does not become, to use Jefferson’s (1987) term, interactional business. In segment (3.19), even though there is no pause between the end of P’s turn and the beginning of N’s turn, nor any other reluctance markers, P’s
turn is hearably complete following the first time she says “heater,” but N does not take the opportunity to other-correct. Instead, P is given ample opportunity to self-correct, during which she again says “heater” and then “gas heater.” P continues to hold the floor and eventually makes a request. It is only then that N’s other-correction appears, after a considerable delay, with respect to the original error. This is not mentioned in Norrick (1991), but it seems plausible that he produced his other-correction while getting his wife’s coffee, in which case the other-correction could also be seen as embedded in a different action which itself was a response to P’s request.

Still, Norrick (1991) does seem to be on to something, which is that when participants have asymmetrical access to knowledge, and they are oriented towards this asymmetrical access, then the constraints on other-correction in that knowledge domain may be relaxed. As discussed above, this is also what is demonstrated by studies of parent-child and teacher-student interaction. In segment (3.18) above, John can be seen to be orienting to Frank’s greater knowledge about England, in particular about English geography, by asking him a question about English geography. The relaxation of the constraints on other-correction in this case does not automatically follow from Frank’s superior knowledge, but from his knowledge having been made relevant by John’s question. In the previous section, mention was made of the findings of Hosoda (2000) and Kurhila (2001) that NSs only produced unmitigated other-correction of language form when the NNSs produced some signal to initiate the correction, such as the use of rising intonation in the production of a troublesome form. Such self-initiations function as appeals for help with language form, or even as means to invite correction, making relevant the superior linguistic knowledge of the NSs. In chapter four of this study, which focuses on instances in the data of other-initiated repair and other-correction apparently unrelated to language form, it will be
argued that other-correction often appears to be invited. In chapter eight of section II, the same will be demonstrated for other-correction of language form, similar to what was found in Hosoda (2000) and Kurhila (2001).

Finally, as orientation to asymmetrical access to knowledge may allow constraints on other-correction to be relaxed, the use of other-correction, particularly unmitigated other-correction, is itself indexical of this asymmetry. In segment (3.18), John’s question not only orients to Frank’s superior knowledge of English geography, it also attributes to Frank such superior knowledge. In producing the correction, Frank accepts this attribution. Similarly, when NNSs use some verbal and/or nonverbal signal to appeal for help with language form, they attribute to NSs the knowledge necessary to provide such help, with the NSs accepting this attribution by producing the correction. When a teacher, or an NS, or anyone taking the role of participant with greater access to relevant knowledge, initiates correction, completes other-correction, delegates responsibility for other-correction, and/or confirms other-correction, he or she can be seen as making a claim about his or her superior access to a particular domain of knowledge. This, itself, may be one reason that other-correction, and other-repair more generally, is typically constrained.

One final example, from a telephone conversation between Monica Lewinsky and Linda Tripp transcribed by the author, nicely illustrates the way that other-correction indexes asymmetrical access to knowledge.

(3.20)
1 L: hh I- I'm not going to.=
2 L: =how's your mom's hair doing with
3 that.
4 M: awful.
5 L: still?
6 M: yes. (0.7) she hasn't fixed it.
7 L: .hh you know she might wanna put eigh
8 um (0.3) .t a watchamacallit rinse on
9 it.
In this segment, Monica and Linda are talking about a problem with Monica's mother's hair color. In lines 2-3, Linda can be heard to be orienting to Monica's superior access to knowledge by asking a question. Monica does not treat this attribution of superior knowledge as problematic as she immediately answers the question with an assessment in line 4. Following the reason that Monica gives for the state of her mother's hair in line 6, Linda makes a suggestion about what her mother could do in lines 7-9. Following "it" in line 8, this turn is hearably complete, but Monica does not make any response, resulting in a 1.3 second pause in line 10. Linda then adds more talk about the kind of rinse she is talking about, talk that is syntactically tied to her earlier turn by being in the form of a relative clause. In line 12, Linda's turn is again hearably complete, both syntactically and intonationally, following "look," but she then adds the word "the," projecting a new turn. She does not add anything more to this turn, though, resulting in a 1.2 second pause in line 12. In lines 13-14, Monica other-corrects by contradicting, "it's not platinum," stating that if Linda were correct there would be no problem, "platinum would be okay," and then providing the correct information, "it's ash." Finally, Linda accepts this correction in line 15. Even though this correction is produced following a 1.2 second pause, it is difficult to hear it as delayed, given that the pause comes after Linda has projected a new turn, rather than between turns. In addition, there are no reluctance markers, such as "well" or "hm," or anything that would qualify Monica's knowledge, such as "I think" or "it seems to me." This unmitigated correction, and the acceptance of the correction by Linda, can be heard as indexing Monica's superior access to knowledge.
of the state of her mother's hair. It also has the effect of rendering Linda's suggestion in lines 7-9 and 11-12 useless.

**Repair and Intersubjectivity**

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, repair plays an important, even vital, role in the maintenance of intersubjectivity, or a shared understanding among participants of what is happening in interaction. Just how important repair is can be seen by looking at what happens when participants fail to recognize the need to initiate it. This section discusses two cases, one involving a conversation between an NS and an NNS, the other a conversation between, presumably, two NSs, which show what can happen when repair is not initiated. In addition, a comparison of these two conversations shows that very similar problems can occur whether or not one of the participants is an NNS.

Tyler (1995) analyzes a tutoring session between a Korean tutor (NNS) and an American student (NS). The purpose of the tutoring session is to help the American student learn how to write a computer program to score bowling games. Near the beginning, the student asks the tutor whether he knows how to calculate bowling scores, to which the tutor responds with "approximately." Actually, the tutor is an avid bowler who knows perfectly well how to calculate bowling scores. As the conversation continues, the tutor and the student go off, metaphorically, in separate directions, with the tutor trying to use his expert knowledge to explain the scoring procedure, but the student trying to collaborate with the tutor to use what she takes as their limited combined knowledge to figure out how scores are calculated. By the end, the conversation has degenerated into shouting.
Schegloff (1992) analyzes a conversation between a radio talk show host and a caller, both, presumably, NSs of English, during the Vietnam War. The topic is U.S. military involvement in both Korea and Vietnam. During the conversation, the caller begins using the deictic term “there” to refer to Korea, but the host begins using the same term to talk about Vietnam. Neither person, though, recognizes that there has been a misunderstanding and that there is a need for repair. The conversation starts to degenerate as the caller and host begin arguing about whether or not U.S. involvement “there” began under UN auspices. By the end, the conversation has degenerated into shouting. It is only when the caller calls back with a reference stating that U.S. involvement in Korea began under UN auspices that the misunderstanding is cleared up. (Actually, though, there is no way of knowing which country the caller was really referring to by using “there.” It is plausible that he thought U.S. involvement in Vietnam began under UN auspices, discovered his mistake when he looked the information up, and then changed his story by claiming that he had been talking about Korea all along.)

Tyler (1995) argues that conflicting cultural practices are the source of the breakdown in the tutor/student conversation. Being asked whether he knows how to calculate a bowling score, the Korean tutor responds in an appropriately humble way, for Koreans, by saying “approximately.” However, the student takes this as meaning that he lacks knowledge. Also, the tutor sees the student-tutor relationship as one in which the student shows respect for, and does not directly argue with, the tutor, but the student sees it as one in which status is negotiated. All of this may be true, but such an appeal to conflicting cultural practices is not really necessary, and seems to entail that almost all cross-cultural conversations should end up as shouting matches. What is happening here is that, when the tutor answers the student’s question with
“approximately,” the conversation starts to break down as the interlocutors go their separate interactional ways. The same thing happens in the conversation analyzed by Schegloff when the participants begin using the deictic term “there.” In Tyler’s conversation, neither the student nor the tutor recognizes the need to repair the trouble source. In Schegloff’s conversation, neither the caller nor the host recognizes the need to repair the trouble source either. In regard to the conversation analyzed by Tyler, it is not hard to imagine that, had the tutor’s use of the word “approximately” been treated as a trouble source and had repair been initiated, the conversation between the student and tutor would not have degenerated into shouting. In regard to the conversation analyzed by Schegloff, it is not hard to imagine that, had the use of the deictic term “there” been treated as a trouble source and had repair been initiated, the conversation between the caller and host would not have degenerated into shouting. Together, Tyler (1995) and Schegloff (1992) demonstrate just how important a role is played by repair in maintaining intersubjectivity, regardless of whether participants are NSs or NNSs.

Conclusion

Work in CA has found that repair is both systematic and ubiquitous. It can be said to be ubiquitous in that repair is used for a wide variety of trouble source types, such as in cases analyzed by Drew (1997) in which repair is used when there are grounds for suspecting lack of alignment in the stance taken by another participant. The discoveries that have been made about when repair is used, how it is organized, what resources are made use of, and how certain types are constrained have been possible because repair has been treated as an interactional phenomenon and instances of repair have been analyzed within their sequential context.
There appear to be important constraints on the use of other-repair and, more specifically, other-correction. When it comes specifically to other-correction, though, these constraints can be relaxed under certain circumstances. This relaxation of constraints occurs when participants in interaction orient to asymmetrical access to knowledge in a particular domain. Likewise, the use of other-correction may function to index such an asymmetry. In SLA, this would seem to be especially important with regard to other-correction of language form, or to the type of turn that in SLA has been called a corrective recast. Anticipating section two of this study, other-correction of language form is illustrated in segment (3.21), the final segment to be analyzed in this chapter and the only one from the conversation club interactions that form the primary database of this study.

(3.21)
[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female]
12 T: a:n' you [guys wanna hear-
13 F: [lee- (0.5) le:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))
15 T: [yeah liza[rd.
16 ?: [oh::
17 F: [lizard. yeah

In this segment, F (NNS) says “lizard” with non-target-like pronunciation of the first vowel in line 13. T (NS) then responds by saying “yeah lizard” in line 15. In partial overlap, F then says “lizard” with much more target-like pronunciation in line 17. A fine-grained analysis of this segment, though, reveals much more interesting work being done than this short gloss indicates. In line 13, F makes two attempts to say “lizard,” both of which contain the non-target-like vowel. The first attempt is cut off after the first syllable and is followed by a 0.5 second pause before the second attempt. Her production of this lexical item displays a degree of uncertainty over whether it is correct. When T says “yeah lizard” in line 15, he places extra stress on the first syllable, the syllable with the problematic vowel sound. He is producing
other-correction of F’s pronunciation. Simultaneously, he is confirming that F has the correct lexical item. (Prior to this, they have been discussing various life forms which inhabit T’s dorm room, especially geckos.) F’s tentative articulation of the word functions as an appeal for help or an invitation to correct, allowing constraints on other-correction to be relaxed. In line 17, F takes note of the other-correction by repeating “lizard,” even before T has finished articulating it, immediately after he has articulated the troublesome syllable. Both F and T can be heard to be orienting to asymmetrical access to knowledge of English pronunciation, and this orientation itself serves to index roles for F and T as, respectively, an NNS with limited knowledge of English pronunciation and an NS with extensive knowledge of English pronunciation. It may even be that the omnirelevance of the roles of NNS and NS in the conversation club interaction, as discussed at length in chapter two, serves as a resource that allows F to elicit help with pronunciation.
This chapter investigates the nature of other-initiated repair, as well as other-correction which does not seem to be related to language form, within the interaction that forms the primary database of this study. The sequential organization of other-initiated repair was not found to be unusual, in comparison to, for example, repair organization as discussed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and reviewed in the previous chapter. However, the status of some participants as NNSs, or to put it another way, the status of the language of interaction as a second language for some participants, was quite often found to be relevant to the nature of the trouble source. As for the more specific phenomenon of other-correction, this chapter focuses on exposed rather than embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987). That is, this chapter focuses on cases in which there is a particular turn that can be identified as having a primarily corrective function, rather than being incidentally corrective. It was found that, in most but not all cases, correction of some factual matter tended to follow some type of correction invitation device (Sacks, 1992), regardless of the status of the different participants as NS or NNS. It was also found that turns occupied with other-correction could often be separated into two components, a contradiction and a replacement of the erroneous information. As in Jefferson (1987), other-correction was sometimes found to be accompanied by some means of accounting for the corrected error.
Other-initiated Repair

*Sequential organization.* The most striking thing about the sequential organization of much of the other-initiated repair found in the data is its extreme normality. This can be seen clearly in segment (4.1).

(4.1) [tape 6, 329; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
1 M: where did you meet him
2 (0.7)
3 H: hm?
4 M: where did you meet him.
5 H: .h ah: in university.

In line 1, Masks H a question about her husband. H does not respond immediately, resulting in a 0.7 second pause in line 2. In line 3, H responds, but by initiating repair rather than by answering the question. The repair initiator is “hm,” said with rising intonation, a so-called open class repair initiator which does not explicitly target something specific in the trouble source turn for repair (see, though, Drew (1997), reviewed in the previous chapter). As is typical of other-initiation, the initiator is delayed. Not only is it not produced in overlap with M’s turn in line 1, but it is not produced until after a pause. This delay provides structural opportunities, both during the trouble-source turn itself and in the transition space following the turn, for M to self-initiate repair. M completes the repair in line 4 by repeating the question. H answers the question in line 5. There is nothing in this repair sequence that would indicate that either of the participants is an NNS.

The same sequential organization and use of open class repair initiators can be found in the following segments, (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5).

(4.2) [tape 1, 304; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
3 P: oh too fah: don’t you think?
4 (0.3)
5 T: huh?
6 P: too fah:?
In segment (4.2), the trouble source turn is produced by P, an NNS, in line 3. After a brief pause, T, an NS, initiates repair by saying “huh” with rising intonation. P then completes the repair by repeating “too far” in line 6. In segment (4.3), the trouble source turn is the question produced by T, an NS, in lines 13-15. Following a brief pause, F, an NNS, initiates repair by saying “hm” with rising intonation. T completes the repair by reformulating the question in lines 18-19. In segment (4.4), the trouble-source turn is the question asked by E, an NNS. Following a 0.8 second pause, M, an NS, initiates repair by saying “huh” with rising intonation. E completes the repair in line 42 by repeating the question. Finally, in segment (4.5), the trouble source turn is the question asked by A, an NS. Following a 0.9 second pause, N, an NNS, initiates repair by asking “what.” A then completes the repair by reformulating her question. These cases all illustrate canonical other-initiated repair sequences. They also
illustrate that the participant who produces the trouble source turn, as well as the participant who initiates repair, may be either an NS or NNS.

A slight permutation of this use of open class repair initiators can be seen in segment (4.6).

(4.6)
[tape 4, 505; M, NS, male; C, NNS, male; Y, NNS, female]

4 C: oh hh I'm: (0.3) compter ((two syllables)) game.
6 (0.5)
7 Y: oh[:
8 M: [huh? (0.9) what?
9 C: compute game

In lines 4-5, C is answering a question put by M about what his hobby is. Following a pause in line 6, Y begins to respond in line 7 and M produces an open class repair initiator in overlap with Y in line 8. However, following the initiation of repair, no response from C is forthcoming and M produces another open class repair initiator following a 0.9 second pause. C then completes the repair in line 9. The difference between this case and segments (4.1) to (4.5) is the presence of two repair initiators targeting the same trouble source.

Segments (4.7) and (4.8), in which the same NNS initiates repair, also illustrate the canonical sequence with open class repair initiators, but involve an interesting non-native touch.

(4.7)
[tape 4, B102; Y, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 Y: oh:. (. ) where's your wife.
2 (0.5)
3 C: yeah?
4 Y: where's your wife. (. ) now

(4.8)
[tape 4, 88; M, NS, male; C, NNS, male]
1 ((multiple laughter))
2 M: how often do you [go out drinking
3 C: [ha ha .h ha ha ha
4 ((continuation of previous
laughter; others laughing also, but
more quietly)
C: yeah yeah?
M: how often.

In both of these segments, in line 3 of segment (4.7) and in line 7 of segment (4.8), C, an NNS, initiates repair with an open class repair initiator. However, the repair initiator itself, either “yeah” or “yeah yeah,” each said with rising intonation, does not seem to be one typically used by NSs of English. (See Wong (2000a) for a discussion of a different use of “yeah” by NNSs.)

A slightly different repair sequence, but one that is still quite normal, is illustrated in segments (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), and (4.12).

(4.9)
[tape 6, 90; M, NS, male; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female]
1 M: I wanna go for the water park.
2 K: oh yeah [yeah yeah
3 S: [water park?
4 M: yeah (%) like water slide?

(4.10)
[tape 5, 151; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female]
11 M: usually everybody gave to all the
12 students in the [(0.3) class=
13 ?: [eh:
14 E: =a:ll student.
15 M: yeah all the students.=

(4.11)
[tape 11, 11; A, NS, female; T, NS, male; D, NNS, female, N, NNS, female]
1 A: oh my gosh (%) I didn’t recognize
2 you [under that (%) fisher hat.
3 T: [want some
4 D: ah ha ha
5 ?: ha ha [ha ha
6 D: [ha ha ha ha sorry (0.4)
7 [uh-
8 N: [fisher- fisher hat?
9 A: it looks like a fisherman’s hat

(4.12)
[tape 6, B108; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: .h uh you: understand they?
In each of these segments, the trouble source is more specifically targeted through the use of repetition to initiate repair. In segment (4.9), S targets part of M’s turn in line 1 for repair by repeating “water park” with rising intonation. Note that here also the repair is not initiated immediately. In segment (4.10), E initiates repair by saying “all student,” a slightly modified repeat. Even though this repair initiation is produced immediately after M says “class” in line 12, it is not produced until M’s turn is hearably complete. In addition, there is a brief pause within M’s turn. In segment (4.11), N initiates repair by repeating “fisher hat” with rising intonation. Here the repair initiation is separated from the trouble source turn by laughter produced by other participants. Finally, in segment (4.12), M, an NS, initiates repair by repeating “they” with rising intonation. The initiation is again produced after a pause. As with the earlier cases, this provides structural opportunities for self-initiation.

Segments (4.13), (4.14), and (4.15) demonstrate that this targeting of the trouble source through repetition may involve some guesswork.

(4.13)
[tape 1, 375; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
1  F: uh (.) tomorrow I will (.) I think (1.1) I watch movie.
2  (0.7)
3  T: moving?
4  (0.4)
5  F: movie.

(4.14)
[tape 5, 37; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
1  M: I can’t remember everything but I think he was in jail right?
2  (0.5)
3  H: jay:?
4  M: n- (.) understand jail?
In segment (4.13), T targets the trouble-source word, “movie,” by saying “moving” with rising intonation. In segment (4.14), H targets the trouble-source word, “jail,” by saying “jay” with rising intonation and an elongated vowel. In segment (4.15), S targets the trouble-source word, “them,” (or perhaps the phrase “married them”) by saying “marry dam dam” with rising intonation. In each of these cases, it appears that the person who is initiating repair, whether an NS or NNS, is making a best guess about what word their interlocutor actually articulated.

Segment (4.16) illustrates a double repair sequence involving the use of both an open class repair initiator and repetition.

In this segment, somebody initiates repair in line 10, though it is not clear who. This involves the use of an open class repair initiator. After M completes the repair in lines 12 and 14, H initiates repair again by repeating “love” with rising intonation.

Segments (4.17) and (4.18) are cases of other-initiated repair in which the repair initiator is more explicit than an open class repair initiator, but targets something other than a particular word or phrase in the trouble source turn.
As is typical with other-initiation of repair, and as in the other segments in this chapter, the repair initiator is not produced immediately. Rather, there is a 1.8 second pause between the trouble source turn and the repair initiation. In this segment, E asks K a question. In lines 4-5, K initiates repair by reformulating the question and using rising intonation. E completes the repair by confirming the reformulation. By reformulating the question, K’s repair initiation in lines 4-5 targets the comprehensibility of E’s question as a whole as the source of trouble.

In segment (4.18), a partial reformulation is used to initiate repair.

T asks F a question in lines 9-10 and F initiates repair in line 12. Again, the repair is not initiated immediately, but after a 1.8 second pause, which provides T with the, untreated, opportunity to self-initiate repair. F initiates repair by saying “my roommate” with rising intonation. This targets the referent of the pronoun “them” in T’s question. T completes the repair by confirming that the intended referent of the question is F’s roommate.

What has been demonstrated so far is that the sequential organization of other-initiated repair in the conversation club is not unusual in comparison to the sequential organization of other-initiated repair in normal conversation. Repair initiators are not
produced in overlap with the trouble-source turn, but, rather, after some delay, though
the length of this delay may vary greatly. This allows the producer of the trouble
source turn at least two opportunities to self-initiate repair, either during the trouble
source turn itself or in the transition space, the delay following the completion of the
trouble source turn. In addition, as far as the sequential organization of segments
(4.1) to (4.18) is concerned, it does not seem to matter whether either the producer of
the trouble source turn or the person who initiates repair is an NS or NNS.

Two final instances of other-initiated repair, though, are organized quite
differently. In these two segments, which involve the same set of three participants, the
NNS status of the participant who initiates repair, as well as the shared first language
of the two NNS participants, are both relevant to how the repair sequence is organized.

(4.19)
[tape 6, 471; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; E, NNS, female]
1 M: oh: so you want to improve (0.7)
2 your English?
3 (1.8)
4 S: imp' improve wa nani?
5 E: joutatsu suru.

(4.20)
[tape 6, 447; M, NS male; S, NNS, female; E, NNS female]
1 M: °oh° (0.5) so why did you decide
2 to: (0.5) come to Hawaii?
3 (1.7)
4 S: mm (1.5) just moment? ((Japanese))
5 E: mm::

In each of these segments, M asks S a question. In neither one does S respond
immediately, resulting in fairly lengthy pauses. In each case, S then initiates repair, but
does so by asking E something in Japanese, a language which S and E share, but that
M does not appear to understand. In segment (4.19), S targets a word in M’s
question, “improve,” and asks E what it is. E completes the repair by providing a
Japanese translation. In segment (4.20), S first asks M to wait and then targets the
meaning of the entire question by producing a Japanese translation. E completes the repair by confirming the translation.

There are two important things to note about segments (4.19) and (4.20). The first is that the sequential organization is in one way similar to but in other ways different from the kind of other-initiated delegated-repair found in interaction in language classrooms by Kasper (1985) and Jung (1999). It is similar in that someone other than the producer of the trouble source turn initiates repair and then elicits completion of the repair from a third party. However, in Kasper (1985) and Jung (1999), the trouble sources were produced by students and involved language form, it was the teacher who initiated repair, and the teacher used her classroom authority to delegate the completion of repair to other students. In these two segments, the trouble sources are produced by an NS of English and involve the meaning of a word or of the whole turn, the NNS recipient of the turn initiates repair, and repair completion is delegated to the other NNS participant through the use of a shared language, Japanese, unknown to the producer of the trouble source. The other thing to note is that these segments illustrate how an NNS participant can resort to her first language in order to participate in the interaction, as discussed in chapter two, and that this action is procedurally consequential (Schegloff, 1991), as it has a powerful influence, possibly even a determinate influence, on who can complete the repair. Unlike what was found for segments (2.1) to (2.18), the status of S and E as NNSs is relevant to how the repair sequences are organized in these two segments.

**Omnirelevance of NNS status in targeting the trouble source.** Even though it was demonstrated in the previous subsection that, in most cases, it does not matter for the sequential organization of other-initiated repair whether the participants are NSs or NNSs, these roles are sometimes relevant in the identification of the trouble
source, or more precisely, in the targeting of the trouble source by the participants
themselves. This is clear for segments (4.19) and (4.20), in which Japanese is used in
targeting the meaning of an English word or question as the trouble source, but can
also be demonstrated for several other of the segments in the previous subsection if
more of the interactional context in which the repair sequence is embedded is shown.

In four of the segments in the previous subsection, (4.1), (4.10), (4.16), and
(4.18), there are no indications that the trouble has anything to do with one or more of
the participants being an NNS. These segments are redisplayed here, along with more
of their interactional contexts, as segments (4.21), (4.22), (4.23), and (4.24),
respectively.

(4.21)
[tape 6, 329; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
1 M: where did you meet him
2 (0.7)
3 H: hm?
4 M: where did you meet him.
5 H: .h ah: in university.
6 M: 'n university.=
7 H: =yes.

(4.22)
[tape 5, 151; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female]
11 M: usually everybody gave to all the
12 students in the [(0.3) class=
13 ?: [eh:
14 E: =a:ll student.
15 M: yeah all the students.=
16 E: =if you: don't like hh h:im?
17 M: no: [but you give to everybody.
18 ?: ['ha ha°
19 E: everybody.
20 M: yeah usually.
21 E: °oh°

(4.23)
[tape 5, 99; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
8 M: it's just about love I think,
9 (0.6)
10 ?: mm?
11 (0.5)
M: (in) today?
?: mm mm=
M: =Valentine’s Day is just for: love.
H: love?
M: [yeah:
?: [(I think) hm?
(0.5)
?: mm
(0.6)
M: because the priest was marrying
people for love so. (0.6) it’s a
day a day for. (0.5) day for love.

(Tape 1, 313; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female)
T: an’ you- . knew them from (0.4)
(1.8)
F: my roommate?
T: mm-hm
F: she’s local girl (0.4) she’s Chinese
though.

In segment (4.21), the trouble-source is apparently treated as a problem of hearing.
Following the repair initiation, M completes the repair by just repeating the question,
without any attempt at reformulating it, articulating it more clearly, or explaining parts
of it, actions that will be illustrated below. In line 5, H responds to the repair
completion by answering the question. This is followed by M using repetition to
display his understanding of the question, which H confirms in line 7. Likewise in the
other three segments, the participants do not give any indication that the trouble source
is related to language.

However, there are indications in segments (4.22) and (4.23) that the trouble
may be related to cultural knowledge. In segment (4.22), the talk is about M’s
experience in elementary school of “everybody” in a class giving Valentine’s cards to
one another. E’s initiation of repair in line 14 indexes her lack of knowledge of this
custom. Following M’s repair completion in line 15, in which he says “yeah all the
students," E initiates repair again, this time stating what she finds unusual about this custom, as it would involve giving Valentine's cards even to people one does not like. This repair initiation also indexes E's lack of knowledge or familiarity with the custom being described by M. In segment (4.23), the talk is about the meaning of Valentine's Day. The repair sequence, targeting the word "love" as the trouble-source, eventually results in M tying the meaning of Valentine's Day to the Valentine story which has occupied much of the prior talk. This draws a cultural connection between the story as a cultural artifact and love as the meaning of Valentine's Day. Though the trouble source in these two segments is taken to be cultural knowledge, language itself is not being treated as problematic.

Finally, in segment (4.24), the source of trouble would seem to be a presupposition of T's question, that F's roommate or roommates are from Japan, which is untrue. This segment will be discussed in more detail as segment (4.55) in the next section of this chapter.

In some cases, repair initiation which targets individual words is treated by the NS as requiring vocabulary instruction, as discussed in chapter two. In these cases, the NS is treating lack of vocabulary as the underlying cause of the trouble, as can be seen in segments (4.25), (4.26), and (4.27), which correspond to, respectively, (4.9), (4.11), and (4.14) above.

(4.25)
[tape 6, 90; M, NS, male; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female]
1 M: I wanna go for the water park.
2 K: oh yeah [yeah yeah
3 S: [water park?
4 M: yeah .] [like water slide?
5 K: [{that}
6 S: oh::
In segment (4.25), M responds to S’s repair initiation by providing “water slide” as a synonym of “water park.” M uses vocabulary instruction to complete the repair, which is then followed by S using the change-of-state token to index a new understanding of the semantic relationship between “water slide” and “water park.” In segment (4.26), A completes the repair by giving “it looks like a fisherman’s hat” as an explanation of her use of the expression “fisher hat,” treating the trouble with “fisher hat” as one of vocabulary comprehension on N’s part. In segment (4.27), M responds to the repair initiation by, first, asking if H understands the word that she has targeted for repair, “jail,” and then, in overlap with H’s answer, providing a synonym,
“prison.” Here again the trouble is treated as one of vocabulary comprehension on the part of an NNS participant, H.

In the previous three segments, the trouble was treated as an NNS being unable to understand a word used by an NS. In the next three segments, (4.28), (4.29), and (4.30) (respectively, (4.2), (4.6), and (4.13) above), the trouble is treated as having its source in the NNS pronunciation of a word.

(4.28)  
[tape 1, 304; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male]  
3 P: oh too fah: don’t you think?  
4 (0.3)  
5 T: huh?  
6 P: too fah:  
7 (0.6)  
8 T: it’s pretty far.

(4.29)  
[tape 4, 505; C, NNS, male; Y, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
4 C: oh hh I’m: (0.3) compter ((two syllables)) game.  
5 (0.5)  
7 Y: oh[::]  
8 M: [huh? (0.9) what?  
9 C: [compute game  
10 Y: [computer game.  
11 M: oh computer game.

(4.30)  
[tape 1, 375; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]  
1 F: uh (. ) tomorrow I will (. ) I think  
2 (1.1) I watch movie.  
3 (0.7)  
4 T: moving?  
5 (0.4)  
6 F: movie.  
7 T: oh movie.

In segment (4.28), P’s pronunciation of the word “far” is quite non-target-like. That this is treated by both P and T as the source of trouble is indicated by at least two things. First, in completing the repair in line 6, P indexes a tentativeness in what she says by saying “too far” with rising intonation. Second, there is another pause, this
one of 0.6 seconds, twice as long as the pause in line 4 prior to the repair initiation, before T produces a turn in which he indicates that he understands the word by saying "pretty far," which may indicate that he has just come to understand P's use of the word "far."

Segment (4.28) is somewhat ambiguous, but (4.29) and (4.30) are much clearer. In line 11 of (4.29), following the simultaneous repair completions produced by C and Y in lines 9 and 10, M says "oh computer game." In line 7 of (4.30), following F's repair completion in line 6, T says "oh movie." In both cases, there is a change-of-state token followed by a repetition of the trouble source word. This token plus repetition is being used by the NS, M or T, to index that he has just recognized what the word is that the NNS has been trying to say.

In segment (4.31) (segment (4.15) above), it appears that the cause of the trouble is NNS recognition of a word that an NS has been trying to say.

(4.31)
[tape 5, 60; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
1 M: oh he married he married them?
2 (0.3)
3 S: marry dam dam?
4 M: married them?
5 S: marry them? (.) yeah.

After M completes the repair in line 4 by repeating "marry them" with rising intonation, S changes the "dam" of line 3 to "them" in line 5, indicating that she now recognizes the word that M used in line 1. The confirmation token which follows is a confirmation that what M said in line 1 is a correct formulation of part of what S had been talking about in the prior talk. With M completing the repair by repeating "married them" and S responding by adjusting her pronunciation of the word following "marry," both participants appear to be treating S's processing or perception of M's turn in line 1 as the cause of the trouble.
In segment (4.32) (segment (4.8) above), difficulty displayed by an NNS is also treated as a language processing difficulty.

(4.32)
[tape 4, 88; M, NS, male; C, NNS, male; Y, NNS, female]
1 ((multiple laughter))
2 M: how often do you [go out drinking
3 C: [ha ha .h ha ha ha
4 ((continuation of previous laughter; others laughing also, but
5 more quietly))
7 C: yeah yeah?
8 Y: how often.
9 (0.5)
10 Y: how often=
11 C: =uh:m (2.5) soju: [ha ha
12 Y: [no no no
13 (xxxxxxx) ((Korean, 1.0 seconds))

C does not immediately respond following M’s completion of the repair in line 8, resulting in a 0.5 second pause. Y, another NNS, helps out by completing the repair again in line 10. C then makes a noise, but pauses again after this noise, resulting in a 2.5 second pause in line 11. He then says “soju” and laughs. However, this is an anomalous answer to the question, as this is the name of a Korean alcoholic beverage. Y, who like C is Korean, immediately corrects C by saying “no” three times and then something in Korean. It would appear that C is having difficulty understanding the question. Moreover, Y treats C’s difficulty with the question as a difficulty with understanding English and resorts to their first language in order to help C understand (as discussed in chapter two).

In segments (4.33) and (4.34) (segments (4.3) and (4.5) above), NS participants use reformulation to complete repairs. These reformulations indicate that the cause of the trouble is taken to be the limited second language ability of the NNS participants.
In segment (4.33), T's original question in lines 13-15 had two parts, the question and a suggested answer, run together under one intonation contour with no pauses in between. (It is also ambiguous whether "from" is part of the question or part of the suggested answer.) T can be heard orienting to the possible difficulty of understanding the question in the way he reformulates it, which is as a hypothetical situation plus a statement with the question tag "right" appended to it, separated intonationally by the continuing intonation following the word "scholarship." F still displays difficulty answering the question, but eventually starts her answer in line 21.

In segment (4.34), A can also be heard orienting to the possible difficulty of her question in line 1. As she reformulates the question in line 5, she changes "how come you didn't go" to "why didn't you go," adopting the canonical word order for wh-questions, and articulates the reformulation in a very deliberate manner. N does not
respond immediately, but when she does, in line 8, the first thing she does is display an understanding of the kind of question that has been asked by repeating "why."

In segment (4.35) (segment (4.17) above), an NS uses reformulation in a different way, to indicate trouble understanding a question posed by an NNS.

(4.35)
[tape 6, 213; E, NNS, female; K, NS, female]

1 E: do you want to go abroa:d? (. ) for
2 stud(h)y?
3 (1.8)
4 K: do I wanna study in other
5 countries?
6 E: mm
7 (0.8)
8 K: I think it would be interesting,
9 E: mm mm
10 K: but hard.

The effect of K initiating repair by reformulating the question with rising intonation is to ask whether the reformulated version is what E wants to say. In accepting the reformulation in line 6, E is accepting it as a version, possibly even a better version, of her original question. K is then able to go on to answer the question in lines 8 and 10. By reformulating the question, rather than targeting a particular word or using an open class repair initiator, K indicates that the original question itself was in a form which was difficult to understand.

Finally, segment (4.36) (segment (4.4) above) illustrates a repair sequence which does not seem to be completely successful, apparently because of trouble caused by an NNS's non-target-like pronunciation of English.

(4.36)
[tape 5, 302; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]

39 E: do you know: Hwaido Day?
40 (0.8)
41 M: huh?
42 E: do you know Hwaido Day?
43 (0.4)
44 M: no
45 E: [no?]
In this segment, M initiates repair in line 41 with an open class repair initiator. The trouble source appears to be the expression “Hwaito Day,” which is the Japanese pronunciation of “White Day,” a day in Japan on which men who received chocolate from women on Valentine’s Day are supposed to reciprocate with a present of their own. It appears, though, that M does not recognize “hwaito” as the word “white.” After he has answered “no” in line 44, he asks again what the expression is in line 47. E says “Hwaito Day” again in line 49, which M repeats, imitating the Japanese pronunciation and giving no indication of recognizing this as the Japanese pronunciation of “White Day.”

The argument in this subsection has been that, even though other-initiated repair sequences in the data are typically organized in such a way as to be indistinguishable from other-initiated repair sequences in conversations in which there are no NNSs, the source of the trouble may often be related to the fact that at least one of the participants is an NNS, using a language in which he or she has limited proficiency. Much of the argument in this subsection is highly speculative and comes dangerously close to being based on attributions of unobservable mental processes. However, quite often at least, the participants themselves can be heard to be orienting to NNS use of their second language as the underlying cause of interactional trouble, such as when an NS uses deliberate articulation to reformulate a question following an NNS repair initiation, or when an NS responds to repair initiation targeting a particular vocabulary item by giving vocabulary instruction, or when an NS eventually displays recognition of a word an NNS has been trying to say, and even when an NNS finds it
necessary to provide help to another NNS in their first language. The status of participants as NS or NNS may, in the majority of cases, be completely irrelevant when it comes to the organization of other-initiated repair, but may be much more relevant when it comes to what is taken by participants to be the cause of the interactional trouble.

However, the fact remains that instances of other-initiated repair found in the data are not always related to trouble with language. Understanding the source of trouble is only possible by close analysis of the interaction, as can be seen in segment (4.37), which contains multiple instances of other-initiation of repair. (This segment is analyzed in more detail in the next chapter.)

(4.37)
[tape 8, 5; M, NS, male; G, NNS, female; L, NNS, female]
1 M: so either of you are married? or
2 (0.5) boyfriend, or
3 (0.6)
4 ?: nani?=
5 M: =children, (0.7) any[body (. ) ha ha
6 G: [hm?
7 G: wh(h)a(h)t?
8 (0.3)
9 M: ha ha (1.3) family [(0.3) (anybody)
10 L: [childr(h)en ha
11 M: .h ha ha
12 L: .hh I’m [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I’m a children.=
16 M: =you’re a child?= 
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [goode (goon)=
18 L: [I’m a child.
19 G: =I have a granddaughter
20 M: [you have a gr(h)andd(h)aughter
21 L: [ha ha ha (. ) ha ha ha
22 G: y(h)eah

In this segment, M asks a question in lines 1-2 and 5. G initiates repair with the open class repair initiator “what” in line 7. M then adds a bit more to the question in line 9 and G uses the same open class repair initiator in line 13. However, neither of these
initiators is targeting problems with hearing or understanding. Rather, the rising intonation of “what,” as well as the simultaneous laughter in line 7, gives the initiators the quality of indexing surprise or disbelief. (See Selting (1988) for an analysis of the importance of intonation in the interpretation of the analogous German repair initiator, "was.") Also, something is going on here that participants take to be a laughable event, as different participants produce laugh tokens at lines 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21, and 22. The laughter at lines 20-22, produced by all three participants, can be heard as a response to the implausibility of G having a granddaughter. Why, though, does G claim to have a granddaughter? And what are the participants laughing at prior to G’s claim in line 19?

What is being laughed at is the presupposition of M’s question that G and L are old enough to have children. That G takes this presupposition to be preposterous and laughable is indicated by her surprised or disbelieving intonation of “what” in lines 7 and 13. That L takes the presupposition the same way is indicated by her repetition while laughing of “children,” in line 10, and by her stating that she herself is a child in lines 12, 15, and 18. In saying “I have a granddaughter” in line 19, G escalates the preposterousness of the presupposition of M’s question that she is old enough to have children, this escalation being the source of the humor of this line. The repair initiators produced by G in lines 7 and 13, and possibly the one produced in line 6, have nothing to do with her ability to hear or understand M’s question, but rather target for repair this preposterous presupposition.

There is, though, another open class repair initiator in this sequence, the “huh,” said with rising intonation, produced by M in line 14. The sequence from line 12 to 18, ignoring for the moment G’s turns, starts off as L says “I’m children” in line 12, which is targeted for repair by M in line 14. The repair is completed in line 15.
when L says “I’m a children.” However, M initiates repair again with a reformulation, saying “you’re a child” with rising intonation. The sequence is completed as L then produces her own reformulation, saying “I’m a child” with falling intonation. By initiating repair a second time through a reformulation with rising intonation, M is effectively asking L whether “a child” is what she has been trying to say. By producing the reformulated version with falling intonation, L displays her acceptance that this is indeed what she has been trying to say. The upshot of this is that the underlying cause of M’s trouble understanding L’s “I’m children” in line 12 is taken to be the manner in which L originally formulated this statement. That is, the basic problem is L’s non-target-like use of the language.

Both G and M use open class repair initiators to target something for repair. In one case, though, the trouble is related to non-target-like language use, while in the other, the trouble is about something completely different.

**Other-correction**

As other-correction of language form will be analyzed and discussed in extensive detail in the second section of this study, this section of this chapter only investigates other-correction in the data which does not appear to be related to language form. Also, each of the instances analyzed here are examples of exposed correction (Jefferson, 1987), in that (one of) the primary function(s) of at least one turn in each example appears to be correction. Three aspects of correction are focused on: 1) the separability of correction turns into two components, a contradiction and a replacement item, 2) the invitation of correction through what may be termed *correction invitation devices* (Sacks, 1992) and 3) how errors are sometimes accounted for. As with much of other-initiated repair, the sequential organization of
other-correction does not seem much influenced by the status of participants as NS or NNS.

**Two components of correction.** In several of the instances of other-correction identified in data, the correction turn can be separated into two components, a contradiction and a replacement item. This is illustrated in segments (4.38), (4.39), (4.40), and (4.41).

(4.38)
[tape 4, 518; Y, NNS, female]
6 Y: no not June. May.

(4.39)
[tape 1, 538; T, NS, male]
28 T: no I think it's five hundred
29 points.

(4.40)
[tape 1, 304; T, NS, male]
12 T: no just an hour. (. ) to get- (0.3)
13 up to North Shore.

(4.41)
[tape 6, 447; S, NNS, female]
13 S: no no no in live in: Hawaii.

In each of these cases, the two components are clearly separable. In segment (4.38), Y first produces a contradiction, “no not June,” and then a replacement item, “May.” This is an especially clear instance in that the two components are each produced with their own falling intonation. In segment (4.39), T produces the contradiction “no” and the replacement item “it’s five hundred points,” qualifying the replacement item with “I think.” In segment (4.40), T produces the same contradiction token, “no,” and then, with some disfluencies, the replacement item, “just an hour to get up to North Shore.” Finally, in segment (4.41), S produces the contradiction “no no no” and the replacement item “live in Hawaii.”
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However, both components are not necessarily present, as can be seen in segments (4.42), (4.43), and (4.44).

(4.42)  
[tape 4, 195; Y, NNS, female]  
6 Y: nineteen

(4.43)  
[tape 6, 95; M, NS, male]  
6 M: not a lot of people ha ha ha

(4.44)  
[tape 4, 103, Y, NNS, female]  
13 Y: it’s not alcoholic is a (just) ha  
14 ha ha

In segment (4.42), there is only a replacement item. In segment (4.43) there is only a contradiction, though it is followed by laughter. In segment (4.44) also, there is only a contradiction. Here, however, there is the possibility that Y is starting to produce a replacement item by saying “is a just,” but this is abandoned as Y starts to laugh.

Finally, in all cases found in the data in which both components are present, the contradiction always precedes the replacement item.

**Inviting correction.** Unlike what is typical of other-initiation of repair that does not involve correction, other-correction is often produced immediately after the completion of the turn containing the to-be-corrected item, eliminating the opportunity for self-correction in the turn-transition space. However, such other-correction can often be heard as elicited or invited. One way of inviting correction is through the production of a question plus a candidate answer, inviting either confirmation or correction of the candidate answer by the one who asks the question. This is illustrated in segments (4.45), (4.46), and (4.47). (Parts of these segments can be found above as segments (4.38), (4.39), and (4.40), respectively.)

(4.45)  
[tape 4, 518; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female]  
1 M: yeah (.) when is it.
2 (.)[this summer? 
3 ?: [(xx) 
4 Y: [no is a 
5 R: [Ju- June? 
6 Y: no not June. May. 

(4.46) 
[tape 1,538; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male] 
21 P: okay so how: (. ) how well how 
22 well the score can we go to the 
23 college? (. ) go to [UH? 
24 T: [oh how well? 
25 P: how how (0.7) [like six hundred= 
26 T: [uh:: 
27 P: =points? six (sef)= 
28 T: =no I think it’s five hundred 
29 points. 

(4.47) 
[tape 1,304; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male] 
10 P: how long it take like two houwa: 
11 ((final r of hour sounds like wa)) 
12 T: no just an hour. (. ) to get- (0.3) 
13 up to North Shore. 

In line 1 of segment (4.45), M asks a question about when the World Cup will be held. This is followed by a micropause, and then the candidate answer, “this summer,” said with rising intonation. Immediately, Y contradicts this by saying “no is a.” However, in overlap with this, R provides another candidate answer by saying “June” with rising intonation. Y immediately contradicts this by saying “no not June” and then gives a replacement item, the correct answer to M’s original question, “May.” In segment (4.46), the talk is about the TOEFL. P asks a question about the score that is necessary in order to enter college or, more specifically, UH. In lines 25 and 27, she then provides the candidate answer of “six hundred points.” T immediately contradicts the candidate answer by saying “no” and then gives the correct answer to the question, “it’s five hundred points,” prefaced by the qualification “I think.” In segment (4.47), P asks a question about how long it takes to get to the North Shore and immediately provides the candidate answer “like two
hour.” This is then contradicted and corrected by T in lines 12-13. In each of these excerpts, the act of asking the question itself involves an orientation on the part of the questioner to the recipient’s superior access to the knowledge necessary to answer. In addition, in using rising intonation with the candidate answer, in segments (4.45) and (4.46), the questioner indexes uncertainty about its veracity, thus inviting the recipient to provide a correction.

In the previous three segments, the question and the candidate answer were produced as separate components. In other cases, though, the question and the candidate answer cannot be clearly separated into individual components. This is illustrated in segments (4.48) and (4.49).

(4.48)
[tape 5, 284; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 E: uh- I have a question this is a
2 (0.3) chris (0.2) Christian
3 cus:to:m?=
4 M: =no not Christian

(4.49)
[tape 4, 144; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female]
11 M: oh but he can speak a little (.)
12 Korean?
13 Y: little Korean just (anyon) ha

In segment (4.48), E announces that she has a question about the topic they have been discussing and then asks the question in lines 1-3. Syntactically, this is not in the form of a question, but the use of rising intonation, as well as the prefacing announcement, indicate that it is a question. Namely, it is a yes/no question. It can also be heard, though, as proposing that the thing being asked about is a “Christian custom.” In addition, this is a question about something, Valentine’s Day, which the participants take to be part of M’s culture, so he is assumed to have access to the knowledge necessary to answer the question. M’s answer, “no not Christian,” is a contradiction. There is no replacement item, such as “it’s a secular custom.” In
segment (4.49), M asks Y a question. As in (4.48), it is not in the syntactic form of a question, but becomes a question through the use of rising intonation. In addition, it appears that the person being talked about is an acquaintance of Y, but not of M, as a few seconds earlier in the interaction, Y and the person being talked about exchanged greetings in a brief interaction in which M did not participate. Y can thus be assumed to have superior access to knowledge about his proficiency in Korean, especially as Y herself is an L1 speaker of Korean. M’s utterance about his proficiency in Korean can be heard both as a yes/no question and as proposing that the person being talked about can speak some Korean. At first, Y’s answer, “little Korean,” appears to be a confirmation, but she then says “just anyon” and produces a laugh token. This can be heard as a replacement item in that the person cannot “speak a little Korean,” but rather can say “just anyon.”

A display of understanding produced with rising intonation can also invite correction, as is shown in segments (4.50), (4.51), and (4.52). (Part of segment (4.52) can be found above as segment (4.41).)

(4.50)
[tape 5, 63; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]
3 H: he his wife (0.6) uh his girlfriend?
5 (0.5)
6 S: no no no .h (0.5) many man go to war?

(4.51)
[tape 5, 76; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: he: (0.4) uh didn’t uh he di- (.)
2 he do- he don’t want to: .h go-
3 want to: go to army?
4 (1.3)
5 M: no uhm (1.5) everybody (. the king
6 said nobody can marry.

(4.52)
[tape 6, 447; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
11 M: oh (. comes from Hawaii?
In segments (4.50) and (4.51), H is displaying her understanding of a story, the Valentine story, that has been the topic of talk. In both cases, H indexes the tentativeness of her understanding through the use of rising intonation. In each case, though it is not immediate, this tentative display of understanding is contradicted by the interlocutor. In (4.52) also, there is a tentative display of understanding, as M states his understanding about a person that S has been talking about. This display of understanding is also produced with rising intonation. S contradicts this in line 13 by saying “no no no” and then provides the replacement item, which is that the person lives in Hawai'i, by conversational implicature implying that she is from a different place. In each of the segments (4.48) to (4.52), the person who is the recipient of the question or the display of understanding, and who produces the other-correction, has superior access to the knowledge necessary to decide what is and what is not correct. This knowledge may be cultural knowledge, personal knowledge of one’s acquaintances, or knowledge the possession of which is established elsewhere in the interaction.

When a candidate answer, whether separable as an individual component or part of a yes/no question, or a tentative display of understanding is not corrected, it can be assumed to be correct. For example, in segment (4.53), part of which is displayed above as (4.50), a single confirmation token is taken as indicating that a tentative display of understanding is adequate.
In line 1, as in lines 3-4, H displays her tentative understanding of the story that has been the focus of the talk by making a statement with rising intonation. After S says “yes,” H then goes on to make a further tentative display of understanding, the one that is then corrected by S in lines 6-7.

In segment (4.54), which displays the talk immediately preceding segment (4.46), the absence of either a correction or confirmation following a correction invitation appears to be understood as indexing lack of superior access to relevant knowledge.

(4.54)
[tape 1, 538; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
15 P: an’ okay an’ cost about seventeen
16 do:llars?
17 (0.6)
18 T: just g[o: to the office and=
19 P: [okay:
20 T: =[they’ll:
21 P: [okay so how: (.) h how well how

In lines 15-16, P asks a yes/no question in the form of a statement with rising intonation. As in the segments above, this invites a correction, should the answer be no. T does not answer immediately, but when he does start to answer, in line 18, he does so without producing either a confirmation or contradiction. In lines 18 and 20, he starts to tell P where she can get this information. However, P starts to respond to what T says, in line 19, before he has even completed his second word. She then starts to ask her next question before T’s turn is hearably complete, with the result that T abandons his turn in line 20. When it is clear in the interaction that T does not have the necessary knowledge to decide whether the cost actually is seventeen dollars, P goes on to ask her next question.
Finally, segment (4.55) shows an NNS participant apparently learning how to respond appropriately to yes/no questions which also invite correction.

(4.55)
[tape 1, 313; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female]
1 T: do you live alone?
2 (0.8)
3 F: no
4 (1.3)
5 T: host family?
6 F: no I- I have (. ) roommate
7 T: oh you have roommates
8 F: [right
9 T: [an' you- (. ) knew them from (0.4)
10 Japan?
11 (1.8)
12 F: my roommate?
13 T: mm-hm
14 F: she's local girl (0.4) she's Chinese
15 though.

In lines 1-3, T asks F a yes/no question, there is a 0.8 second pause, and F answers by just saying "no." As discussed in chapter two, there is something that seems inadequate about F's minimal answer, as if she is hiding something and does not want to give any more information than is necessary. At least, T responds as if F's answer is inadequate. There is a 1.3 second pause in line 4, during which F has ample opportunity to expand her answer, and then T asks a follow-up question. It would appear that the reason F's answer seems inadequate is that T's original question invites correction. It not only asks whether or not F lives alone, it also proposes, however tentatively, that F does live alone. If this proposition is untrue, then a correction is expected. When F does not provide this correction, but only a minimal contradiction token, the result is 1.3 seconds of silence and, eventually, T's follow-up question. This follow-up question in line 5, or more accurately a candidate correction to T's original question, itself invites correction, if the proposition that F lives with a host family is untrue. In line 6, F again answers "no," but this time does provide a
correction by saying “I have a roommate.” T’s response in line 7 indicates that this is the kind of answer, a correction, that he has been expecting. He responds immediately with the change-of-state token, “oh,” indicating that he has learned something new, and then uses other-repetition to display his understanding of the information F has provided. In overlap with F’s confirmation of his understanding in line 8, T goes on to ask another question in lines 9-10, topicalizing the information that F has provided. Syntactically, this is not a question, but it is produced with rising intonation. Again, should the proposition that is being questioned, that F knew her roommates from Japan, turn out to be untrue, a correction of this proposition would seem to be expected. At this point, there is an intervening repair sequence, discussed in the previous section of this chapter, following which, in lines 14-15, F makes a statement that could generally be taken to contradict the proposition that she knew her roommates, or actually roommate, from Japan. She says that her roommate is a “local girl,” pauses briefly, and then says “she’s Chinese though.”

It seems that here F is not even bothering to include a confirmation or contradiction token in her answer. What is being corrected, though, is not actually the proposition that she knew her roommates from Japan, but a presupposition of T’s question in lines 9-10 that her roommates are Japanese. F has gone from, in line 3, responding with a minimal “no” to a correction invitation in the form of a question, a response which is taken by her interlocutor to be inadequate, to, in line 6, responding with a “no” plus a replacement item, to, finally, responding without a contradiction token, but with a correction of a presupposition of a question that functions as a correction invitation.

*Dealing with a correction.* All the examples of other-correction discussed in this chapter are to some extent exposed (Jefferson, 1987). Even if it is exposed, when
a correction is invited, the invitation itself orients to the superior access to knowledge of the invitation recipient. This would seem to allow the recipient to other-correct without, to use some rather non-CA terminology, threatening the face of the person being corrected (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Goffman, 1967). As a result, in all but one of the cases analyzed in the previous subsection, there is no attempt by the person who is corrected to account for the error in the first place. The one exception is displayed in segment (4.56), part of which is displayed as (4.38) and (4.45) above.

(4.56)
[tape 4, 518; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female]

1 M: yeah (.) when is it.
2 (.) [this summer?  
3 ?:        [(xx)
4 Y: [no is a
5 R: [Ju- June?
6 Y: no not June. May.
7 R: May?=
8 M: =M[ay?
9 Y:    [yeah May.
10 M: [I thought it was in June.
11 R: [May
12 Y: May.
13 M: May. (.4) [oh:
14 R:     [oh:
15 (.1)
16 M: wow. that’s exciting yeah?

Following Y’s correction in line 6, there is some discussion, in lines 7-9, about whether May is indeed correct. Rather than immediately accepting the correction, both R and M repeat “May” with rising intonation, giving Y the chance to renounce her correction and prompting her to reassert the correction in line 9. M then says, in line 10, “I thought it was in June.” This accounts for his error by indicating that his candidate answer in line 2 was not merely a guess, but was something that he had reason to think was true. In overlap with this, R repeats “May” again, apparently accepting that her candidate answer of “June” was in error. Y asserts “May” once more in line 12, immediately following M’s accounting. M repeats “May” one last
time, this time with falling intonation, accepting that he has been corrected. Both M and R then produce change-of-state tokens, in overlap, in lines 13 and 14, indicating that they have acquired new knowledge. Overall, the correction has been discussed, accounted for, and, finally, accepted. The talk then moves on, following a 1.0 second pause, as M states his opinion about the World Cup coming up in May.

It appears that in this case, even though both M and R invite correction of their candidate answers through the use of rising intonation, they are not clearly oriented to Y having superior access to relevant knowledge. Even though Y is from the Republic of Korea, one of the two countries which will host the 2002 World Cup, an event that at the time of the conversation was still in the future, R is from Japan, the other host country. All other things being equal, it would seem that R and Y have equal access to information about when it will be held. In addition, as an internationally followed event, there would seem to be no reason to assume that M knows less about it than either of the other two. There also does not seem to be anything else in the prior talk which would establish Y as being especially knowledgeable about the World Cup. In the absence of an orientation to Y having superior access to information, the correction does have the potential to threaten the face of those who are corrected, resulting in discussion of, accounting for, and eventually acceptance of the correction becoming interactional business (Jefferson, 1987).

Segment (4.57) presents an example in which the correction is not only uninvited, but the corrected person is the one participant who can claim superior access to the relevant information. (Part of this segment can be found above as segment (4.42).)

(4.57)
[tape 4, 195; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; C, NS, male]

1 M: how old is your daughter now?
2 (1.1)
In line 1, M asks C a question about his daughter. It is clear that the question is about his daughter, and not about the daughter of any other participant, as it is a continuation of talk about his daughter. C does not answer immediately, resulting in a 1.1 second pause. Then both Y and C answer simultaneously, with C saying “nine months” with falling intonation and no other indications of tentativeness or uncertainty. In line 6, though, Y corrects this with the replacement item “nineteen,” a correction which C immediately accepts in line 7. M then displays his understanding of this being the correct answer by saying “oh nineteen months” in line 8. C confirms this understanding in line 9 and M goes on to explicitly state an upshot of the correct answer in lines 10-11.

What is interesting, and surprising, about this segment is that C is the one participant in the group who can claim the greatest access to information about the age of his daughter. His wife is not a member of the group. It is apparent in the interaction that Y and C are school acquaintances and that Y knows C’s wife. Y and C also share their first language, Korean, and at times in the interaction Y uses this language to assist C. However, it does not seem plausible that she can claim greater knowledge than C of the age of C’s daughter, who also happens to be, it is clear in other parts of the interaction, his only child. Even if C were not perfectly clear about her age, whether she is eighteen months or twenty months, it seems unlikely that he would not be sure whether she was nine months or nineteen months. Finally, when M
displays his understanding of the correct answer to his question, in line 8, it is C who confirms it in line 9.

However, all three participants in this interaction find an interesting way of accounting for C’s error by orienting to his role as an NNS of English. When Y corrects C, she does so by saying “nineteen” with heavy stress on the second syllable, “teen.” When C accepts the replacement item by repeating it, he also places heavy stress on “teen,” in addition to lengthening the vowel. It is then M’s turn, and he does the same thing, stating “oh nineteen months” with heavy stress on “teen.” In doing this, and in not focusing at all on the factual matter of whether C’s daughter is indeed nine or nineteen months old, the participants treat C’s error as a language problem. He meant to say “nineteen months,” but as he is an NNS of English, he had difficulty articulating “teen,” and ended up saying “nine months” instead. As it turns out, then, Y’s correction is not a correction of some factual matter, but a correction of a non-target-like form. Whether the correction is really of content or of language form is irrelevant. Treating the error as a language problem has the effect of providing C with an excuse for making what, for any half-decent father, would be an inexcusable factual error.

In segment (4.58), there is another uninvited other-correction. While in (4.57) the corrector and the person who is corrected are both NNSs, in (4.58) they are both NSs. (Part of this segment can be found above as segment (4.43).)

(4.58)
[tape 6, 95; K, NS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  K: I guess they like to gamble:
2   (0.5)
3  S: mm: ?=
4  K: =because a lot of people win like
5     millions of dollars:=
6  M: =not a [lot of people [ha ha ha=
7    S: [oh:
8  K: [I know=
143
9 M: =.h ha
10 ((others laughing too))
11 K: =I know ha ha .hh (I mean) some
12 people who win like million:s
13 S: mm:=
14 M: =everybody’s hoping to win lot of
15 money.

The talk prior to this segment has been about the popularity of Las Vegas as a
destination for vacationing residents of Hawai‘i. In lines 1 and 4-5, K expresses her
opinion about why it is a popular destination, stating that “a lot of people win like
millions of dollars.” This is stated with falling intonation, with no indications that a
correction is being invited. Immediately though, in line 6, M contradicts this by stating
“not a lot of people” and laughing. In overlap with M’s laughter, K states “I know”
twice, then laughs herself, and finally changes “a lot of people” to “some people.”

In making this change, K self-corrects, with the result that this correction sequence
consists of two turns, M’s contradiction, which initiates the sequence, and K’s self-
correction. M then states that “everybody’s hoping to win lot of money.”

In stating “I know” twice, in lines 8 and 11, K is asserting that what she said
in lines 4-5 is not something that she actually believes to be true. She then asserts,
though, that it is the case that some people win millions of dollars. Following M’s
contradiction and her own assertion that she knows what she said earlier is not
accurate, this self-correction to “some people” is presented as what K believes really
is the case. K’s original assertion of “a lot of people” is thus presented as having
been an exaggeration, something which can be laughed at, but is not be taken as an
accurate description of what K really believes. K is able to avoid a threat to her
personal face by claiming that she knows perfectly well that what she said is not true.

On the other hand, treating her assertion in lines 4-5 as an exaggeration preserves it,
once it has been reformulated in lines 11-12, as a legitimate reason that people like to
M’s assertion in lines 14-15 can then be heard as a related reason that people like to gamble.

In the previous three segments, it could be argued that other-correction presented some sort of possible face threat, which participants then found some way to minimize. In one last segment, (4.59), it appears that an initiation of other-correction, in the form of a blatant contradiction, is used by a participant to protect her personal face. (Part of this segment can be found above as segment (4.44.).)

(4.59)  
[tape 4, 103; R, NNS, female; Y, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
1  ((multiple laughter))  
2  R: uh: (. ) do you like drink?  
3  (0.7)  
4  Y: y:eah: is a when I: wa:s a (. ) a  
5  college student? (0.8) (it was) (. )  
6  al:most every day:.  
7  R: wow  
8  Y: mm  
9  M: wow  
10  Y: yeah almost every day.  
11  M: alcoholic  
12  (1.1)  
13  Y: it’s not alcoholic is a (just) ha  
14  ha ha  
15  ((multiple laughter))

In line 2, R asks Y a question about whether she likes to drink. Y responds that, at a different point in her life, she drank “almost every day.” Both R and M produce assessments of this, in lines 7 and 9, that indicate their surprise, to which Y responds by reaffirming that she drank “almost every day.” At this point, M produces what is hearable as a more judgmental assessment by saying simply “alcoholic.”

At this point, M has made an attribution about Y, one that seems rather judgmental and negative. As discussed by Bilmes (1988) and reviewed in chapter three, following an attribution, a rejection is preferred, not in the psychological sense that people enjoy being contrarian, but in the sense that if an attribution is made about
a person in that person's presence, then the absence of a rejection will be taken as a tacit acceptance. M has at this point attributed to Y the status of being an alcoholic. If Y does not do something to reject, contradict, or correct this, then she will end up having accepted it as true. Following a 1.1 second pause, Y's solution is to initiate other-correction by flatly contradicting M. The sequence is then treated as something to be laughed at, as Y begins to laugh and other participants join her.

Conclusion

As will become clear in the chapters in section II, other-correction of language form is related to the more general phenomena of other-initiated repair and other-correction. Other-correction of language form may be found within repair sequences, and some of the segments analyzed in the section on other-initiated repair will be reanalyzed in later chapters as instances of such correction. Also, as with the other-correction analyzed in this chapter, it will be demonstrated that other-correction of language form is often invited. When other-correction of language form is invited and provided, the participants can be heard to orient to roles as NS and NNS, as discussed in chapter two. At other times, though, the correction of language form has the effect of drawing attention to the error, and may result in a threat to face that participants work to minimize. As will be discussed in chapter nine, this illustrates how participants come to the interaction with various concerns, which may limit the extent to which they orient to form.
Hatch (1978) argued that conversational interaction plays an important role in language acquisition, either first or second. According to this argument, language learners first learn to do conversation, and then through conversation learn the morphosyntax of a language. For second and foreign language learners, this reverses an assumption implicit in a great deal of language instruction and language learning materials, that learners must first master the grammar of a language before they will be able to use the language in conversation. Hatch's insight can be seen as foundational of a tradition of research on interaction involving NNSs in the field of SLA, a tradition that will be referred to here as the interactionist paradigm. Research within this paradigm has investigated such things as how interaction involving NNSs differs from interaction involving only NSs (e.g., Long, 1981, 1983a, 1983b), how NSs may make adjustments to accommodate the perceived limited proficiency of NNSs (e.g., as discussed in Hatch & Long, 1980), and whether participation in interaction is associated with successful acquisition of certain features of the morphosyntax of the target language (e.g., Mackey, 1999). The large amount of research that has been conducted within the interactionist paradigm is evident in reviews by Pica (1994), Long (1996), and Gass (1997). In addition, the majority of research on corrective recasts has been conducted within the interactionist paradigm. Discussion of this, however, will be taken up in later chapters.

The interactionist paradigm is a scientific paradigm in the sense developed by Kuhn (1962, 2000), a framework of assumptions about the nature of the phenomena under investigation within which certain lines of research are interesting, certain
methodological approaches are valid, and the results of research are interpreted. Within a given paradigm, the explicitness of these assumptions may vary from being completely implicit, even commonsensical, to being part of an explicitly developed theory which can be used to deduce testable hypotheses. This chapter will focus on two assumptions of the interactionist paradigm: 1) the assumption that (linguistic) communication is a form of telementation (Harris, 1981) and 2) the assumption that interaction is the source of input for learner-internal language acquisition processes.

The first assumption is somewhat more implicit, but has nevertheless had a strong influence on how the nature of interaction involving NNSs has been conceptualized. The second assumption, which has been more explicitly developed, has had important implications for the types of methodology given validity within the paradigm.

The purpose of this chapter is to draw attention to the problematic nature of the interactionist paradigm. This will be done through a discussion and empirically-based critique of these two assumptions. The next section of this chapter focuses on the telementation assumption. The following section then focuses on interaction as input assumption. There is then a discussion of the issue of choosing between the interactionist paradigm and CA. First, though, it should be emphasized that this is a critique of underlying assumptions, not a critique of quality of research, as judged by criteria valid within the interactionist paradigm. The critique draws on work within the paradigm, but it is not intended as a review of research, critical or otherwise. Work which is cited is representative of what appears to be the highest quality work in the interactionist paradigm.
Telementation Model of Communication

Background. One reason that Wagner (1996) finds to criticize research within the interactionist paradigm is that it is based on what he terms "the information transfer model of communication" (p. 220). According to this model, (linguistic) communication involves the transfer of packets of information, or linguistically encoded propositions, from one person's mind to another person's mind. However, as Wagner is no doubt aware, this model of communication is not restricted to this particular paradigm or to the field of SLA. As Harris (1981) clearly demonstrates, this type of mentalist model, which he terms telementation, is both historically ancient and currently widely accepted. According to Harris, the telementation model of communication can be traced back as least as far as Aristotle and it forms an important component of what he refers to as the language myth of western civilization. For example, one version of telementation, discussed by Harris (1988), is de Saussure's "speech circuit." According to de Saussure (1972):

The starting point of the circuit is in the brain of one individual, for instance A, where facts of consciousness which we shall call concepts are associated with representations of linguistic signs or sound patterns by means of which they may be expressed. Let us suppose that a given concept triggers in the brain a corresponding sound pattern. This is an entirely psychological phenomenon, followed in turn by a physiological process: the brain transmits to the organs of phonation an impulse corresponding to the pattern. Then sound waves are sent from A's mouth to B's ear: a purely physical process. Next, the circuit continues in B in the opposite order: from ear to brain, the physiological transmission of the sound pattern; in the brain, the psychological association of this pattern with the corresponding concept. If B speaks in turn, this new act will pursue--from his (sic) brain to A's--exactly the same course as the first, passing through the same successive phases, . . . (pp. 12-13)

In this speech circuit, communication takes place between the heads of (at least) two individuals, with language as the means by which a concept in one person's head can
be encoded as a signal, transmitted in the form of sound waves, and then decoded in another person’s head.

Telementation entails that language has a biplanar structure, with two separate but connected levels of form and meaning (Harris, 1981). This is clear in the passage from de Saussure, with “concepts” (meaning) being “associated with representations of linguistic signs or sound patterns” (form) used to express the concepts. As another example, this biplanar structure is also clear in Pinker’s (1994) discussion of “mentalese,” a symbolic system which is used, it is argued, to represent thought. Linguistic communication involves the translation of a proposition from mentalese into a shared linguistic code, such as English, which allows the proposition to be transmitted, followed by the retranslation of the proposition by the recipient back into mentalese. As a third example, Levelt’s (1989) model of speech production, though only concerned with one end of de Saussure’s speech circuit, also illustrates this biplanar structure, with speech beginning in a nonlinguistic form in the “conceptualizer.” The function of the other components of this model is to take the meanings formed in the conceptualizer and encode them as utterances which can be articulated.

Somewhat more sophisticated models of communication, which take into account Austin’s (1962) and Wittgenstein’s (1953) insight that people do more with language than just encode and transmit propositions, also treat (linguistic) communication as telementation. In particular, within the theory of speech acts developed by Searle (1969) and the theory of inferential communication developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), speaker intentions are central. Language is not used to linguistically encode propositions so that they can be transmitted from one mind to another. Rather, listeners are able to infer a speaker’s intentions on the basis of
particular linguistic messages interpreted in context. Still, this view of communication involves the telementation of information about one's intentions from the speaker's mind to that of the listener's.

**Telementation and negotiation in the interactionist paradigm.** Within the interactionist paradigm, the telementation model of communication is important for understanding the concept of *negotiation of meaning*, also known as *negotiation for meaning*. The version of the model that is generally adopted, most of the time implicitly, involves the telementation of propositional content, rather than information about intentions. For example, Long (1981) investigates the number of *topic-continuing moves* per *topic-initiating move* in NS-NS dyads and in NS-NNS dyads. This is taken as indicative of the amount of information exchanged per topic. As this number was much higher, on average, in NS-NS dyads, it is argued that particular topics are discussed in greater detail in this type of dyad than in NS-NNS dyads. The number of turns per topic is equated with the amount of information exchanged; the amount of information exchanged is taken as indicative of the degree to which a topic is developed; and the amount of information exchanged is assumed to provide an objective metric for comparisons to be drawn between different types of dyads. Pica (1994) discusses *negotiation utterances*, which consist of *signals* of a need for negotiation and *responses* to those signals. It is apparent in this discussion that these signals index problems in the encoding, transmission, or decoding of meanings. Varonis and Gass (1985a) analyze certain utterances in a conversation between an NS and NNS of English on the basis of the degree that they show comprehension of the propositional content of the other's utterances, which implies that degree of comprehension is equivalent to the degree to which the hearer's decoding corresponds to the meaning that the speaker has encoded. The widespread use of the terms
clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check (e.g., Gass, 1997; Long, 1996) also implies a model of communication based on the telementation of propositional content, with clarification request taken to be a request for help in decoding the meaning of another's utterance, confirmation check taken to be a check by the hearer that he or she has decoded the meaning of another's utterance correctly, and comprehension check taken to be a check by the speaker that the hearer has decoded the meaning of one's own utterance correctly. Finally, research within the interactionist paradigm has elicited interaction from participants, who are often meeting one another for the first time, by having them participate in communication tasks which typically instruct participants to complete the task by using language to exchange information (e.g., Crookes & Rulon, 1985; Gass & Varonis, 1989; Mackey, 1999). One finding presented in Long's (1996) review, for example, is that more modification occurs during two-way tasks than during one-way tasks, with the difference between these two types of task being whether the information exchange in a dyad goes in only one direction or in both directions. The use of such tasks to elicit representative samples of interaction only makes sense on the assumption that communication is basically the telementation of propositional content.

The most explicit version of this kind of model in SLA is presented by Varonis and Gass (1985b). In this model, communication is seen as progressing horizontally as long as the exchange of messages--discrete bundles of information, propositions, meanings--between interlocutors remains unproblematic. When there is a problem in this exchange, and the problem is not ignored, there is a negotiation sequence in which the interlocutors attempt to identify the problem and clarify the propositional content, the meaning, of the message. This type of sequence is characterized as a vertical deviation from the normal horizontal progression of
unproblematic communication. The beginning of such a sequence is called a pushdown, and the sequence ends, when the attempt to clarify the message has either been successful or abandoned, with a pop up to the horizontal progression. The model is recursive, with the possibility of further pushdowns within a negotiation sequence. If the purpose of communication is metaphorically conceived as getting somewhere by traveling along the horizontal dimension, then the more negotiation that occurs, the more vertical deviations, and the less the distance that is traveled. The exchange of information, in terms of the amount of propositional content, is less efficient the more that negotiation is found to be necessary.

Given the assumption of the interactionist paradigm that communication is basically telementation, it is clear that what is meant by the term negotiation is negotiation for meaning rather than negotiation of meaning. Negotiation takes place within interaction, but meaning is located in the minds of individual participants in the interaction. What is being negotiated is not seen as being meaning itself, but rather how particular meanings or propositions are best encoded in and decoded from particular utterances.

Problems with telementation. It may be objected at this point that even if, as has been argued, the telementation model of communication is a basic and important assumption of the interactionist paradigm, this in itself does not seem to be problematic. After all, it has also been argued that the telementation model is widely accepted, and could even be described as plain common sense. There are, however, at least two serious problems with this model, problems which the interactionist paradigm inherits.

One problem has to do with the reducibility, or rather the irreducibility, of what is expressed through particular utterances to the concepts, thoughts, propositions, or
intentions of the speaker. For example, within Brown and Levinson’s (1978) politeness theory, the choice of linguistic elements that are used in a particular utterance has a great deal to do with the minimization of threats to positive and negative face. It is difficult to see how such face considerations can be reduced to propositions or intentions. As a second example, Streeck (1980) points out that, if a particular intention is taken to underlie a particular utterance or speech act, as in Searle’s (1969) speech act theory or Sperber and Wilson’s (1986) theory of inferential communication, then the theory becomes unable to handle cases in which one utterance realizes “different forces vis-à-vis different parts of the audience” (p. 139).

A third example of this irreducibility is provided by Heritage (1990/1991), who states that the change-of-state token “oh” is used to convey that just received “information was ‘news’ to the ‘oh’-producer” (p. 325). To illustrate, he gives the following instance:

(5.1)
1 S: .hh When d’ju get out. Christmas week or the week before Christmas
2 (0.3)
3 G: Uh::m two or three days before Ch[ristmas.]
4 S: [0 h :, ] .hh

However, it is rather implausible that S is using “oh” to encode a proposition such as “what you’ve just said is news to me,” or even that S merely intends to convey that news has been received, for the simple reason that “there is no conscious vernacular knowledge that ‘oh’ is a resource for showing that one has been ‘informed’” (p. 325). Something similar is illustrated in segments (5.2) and (5.3), from the conversation club data.

(5.2)
[tape 1, 120; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]
24 T: so that’s why I’m
Both these segments come from a stretch of talk in which T first explains why he has come to Hawai'i and then explains why he got the job he has at the language school. Each of these explanations is a multi-turn unit. At the end of each explanation, he produces a coda of the form “so that’s why I’m over here” (i.e., over here in Hawai'i) or “that’s why I’m here” (i.e., here at the language school). After each coda, or even in overlap with the end of the coda, P says the same thing, “that’s nice.” What is interesting is that T’s turns in lines 24-25 and 45 are implicative of closing the current topic of talk. By saying “so that’s why I’m over here,” he is stating that his previous several turns taken together are to be heard as an explanation of why he is “over here” and that the explanation is now complete. Similarly, by saying “that’s why I’m here,” he is stating that his previous several turns taken together are to be heard as an explanation of why he works at this school and that the explanation is now complete. Assessments, such as those produced by P in lines 26 and 46, are also closing implicative. By placing them where she does, P displays her recognition that the explanations T has given should be heard as complete. With their turns, T and P display a joint orientation to the completeness of T’s explanations. It seems rather implausible, though, that T and P are using their turns to encode some proposition in their mental conceptualizers such as “my explanation is now complete” or “I understand that your explanation is now complete.” It is equally implausible that T and P are using their turns to convey some sort of analogous intention. On the one hand, by looking closely at the interaction, it is possible to see what the participants are
doing, but on the other hand, the interaction does not provide any kind of objective or non-interpretive view about what is happening inside the participants' heads. This leads to the second major problem with the telementation model, that understanding interaction in terms of telementation requires privileged access to the thoughts or intentions inside participants' heads, but this access is not available.

Of course, participants in interaction do attribute such things as meanings and intentions to their interlocutors, as can be seen in the following segments (5.4) to (5.8).

(5.4)
[tape 5, 155; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female]
1 H: oh (0.2) what do you think, mm .h
2 eh- (0.3) children is .h mm (0.3)
3 don't think commercial uh .h
4 Valentine Day is commercial: means
5 .h uh .h (0.4) education uh (0.2)
6 children i:s (.) mm pure yes .h
7 °mm° (.) we: (0.6) we can give a
8 (0.4) uh Valentin::e's .h mean?
9 (0.8) uh: (2.2) education
10 ?: oh::
11 H: for education? (0.6) mm child we
12 can give (1.3) child (1.7) a
13 Valentine:e's Day?
14 M: mm-hm
15 H: mm especially .h mm (0.9) a child
16 feel (1.3) feel? (1.3) child= 
17 E: =fear [fear
18 H: [fear
19 M: mm
20 H: [(it) feeled
21 ?: [(xxx) (0.4) [feeled? ((pronounced
22 as two syllables))
23 H: [yes Valentine Day
24 ?: mm mm
25 (0.9)
26 H: they're they:,
27 E: mm children?
28 H: [they are yes (0.3) pure
29 E: pure [ah ah
30 H: [yes
31 M: mm
32 H: so (0.4) we can give (.) education
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In this segment, and for quite some time prior to this segment (see chapter two), the NNS participants have been asking M questions about Valentine’s Day as part of a class assignment. In line 1, it appears that H is asking a question to elicit M’s opinion about something related to this topic, as she says “what do you think.” However, even though she produces quite a bit of talk in lines 1-9, 11-13, 15-16, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 30, 32-33, and 35, she never produces a recognizable question. In this segment, E, another NNS, is an active participant who can be heard attributing to H the intention to ask M a question and trying to help her articulate the question she wants to ask. In line 17, she provides H with help in articulating the correct word, which would appear to be either “feel” or “fear.” In line 27, she initiates repair, apparently related to the referent of H’s “they’re they” in line 26. In line 29, E says “pure ah ah,” hearably displaying recognition that the word “pure” is important for H’s question. After H says “educate” in line 33, E says “ah” again in line 34. Finally, in line 37, she attempts to formulate H’s question by saying “how do we educate children” with rising intonation. In this segment, E is not only attributing to H the intention to ask a question, but is also behaving as if she believes that H has a question in mind, a question that she is struggling to articulate in English. In her formulation in line 37, she is asking if this is the question that H has in mind.

However, M, who would appear to be the recipient of H’s question, behaves as if H is doing something quite different from struggling to articulate a question. In each turn that M takes in segment (5.4), in lines 14, 19, and 31, he only produces
continuers, saying just “mm-hm” and “mm.” He does the same thing as H continues to produce talk in segment (5.5).

In this segment, H at first responds to E’s formulation of her question by saying yes, but then continues to produce talk, effectively rejecting the formulation. As H continues, in lines 38-40, 43-44, 46-49, 51, 53-56, 58-63, and 65-66, she again produces no recognizable question. Meanwhile, M displays his attentiveness by producing more continuers, in lines 45, 50, 57, and 64. The effect of these continuers is to forego the chance to talk and to pass the floor back to H. It would seem to be
clear in the interaction that H has a question. Not only have the participants been asking M questions for their class assignment, but H began this stretch of talk in segment (5.4) by saying “what do you think.” However, M is not treating H’s talk in segments (5.4) and (5.5) as an attempt to ask a question. Instead, by using continuers to pass the floor back to H, rather than attempting to help H formulate her question, as E does, or claiming a turn in order to give an answer, M is treating H’s talk as preliminary to her question, which has not arrived yet. Through their behavior in the interaction, E and M appear to be attributing to H quite different intentions.

In segment (5.6), though, M starts to change the way he responds to H’s talk.

(5.6)
[tape 5, 155; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
67 M: hard to say
68 H: (that’s) my qu(h)estion ha ha ha
69 M: [ha ha ha
70 ?: [ha (. ) [ha ha ha mm
71 ?: [ .hhh ( . ) .h

In line 67, for the first time, M responds to H’s talk as if she has asked him a question about his opinion. His response, though, is a cliché, one that would seem to be typically used as a stalling device. In line 68, H responds to this response by claiming that she has completed her question. This claim is followed by laughter produced by H herself, M, and other participants. (The transcription of the laughter in this part of the interaction should be considered a best guess attempt, especially for lines 70-71.)

In the next segment, both M and H orient to the necessity of figuring out what question has been asked.

(5.7)
[tape 5, 155; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
74 M: so if you are a teacher, (1.0)
75 H: mm
76 M: you want to teach the children,
77 H: mm .hh ah- .h=
78 M: =about Valentine’s Day?
79 H: mm (1.3) mm (0.6) we can give (1.9)
80 ?: "child"
81 M: give a valentine
82 H: some yes
83 M: to (.) to the children?
84 H: yes
85 M: oh:
86 H: what uh (0.5) what
87 (1.8)
88 M: oh what what can I give to the children?
89
In lines 74, 76, and 78, M attempts to reformulate, not the question itself, but what would appear to be background information. Across these three lines, he says, "so if you are a teacher, you want to teach the children, about Valentine's Day," using continuing intonation after "teacher" and "children" and rising intonation after "Day." In each of these places where there is either continuing or rising intonation, M also gives H the opportunity to confirm or correct his formulation. H takes these opportunities, at lines 75, 77, and 79, to confirm, though in line 77, it appears that she is about to start producing more talk and, in fact, does so in line 79. In lines 79-86, H and M both appear to be searching for a way to formulate the question. Finally, in lines 88-89, M produces a change-of-state token, which functions to display recognition of what H has been asking, and produces a formulation of the question as "what can I give to the children," said with rising intonation.

In segment (5.8), H accepts this as her question.

In lines 74, 76, and 78, M attempts to reformulate, not the question itself, but what would appear to be background information. Across these three lines, he says, "so if you are a teacher, you want to teach the children, about Valentine's Day," using continuing intonation after "teacher" and "children" and rising intonation after "Day." In each of these places where there is either continuing or rising intonation, M also gives H the opportunity to confirm or correct his formulation. H takes these opportunities, at lines 75, 77, and 79, to confirm, though in line 77, it appears that she is about to start producing more talk and, in fact, does so in line 79. In lines 79-86, H and M both appear to be searching for a way to formulate the question. Finally, in lines 88-89, M produces a change-of-state token, which functions to display recognition of what H has been asking, and produces a formulation of the question as "what can I give to the children," said with rising intonation.

In segment (5.8), H accepts this as her question.

(5.8)
[tape 5, 155; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
88 M: oh what what can (I give to the
89 children?
90 H: [yes (0.7) yes
91 M: oh same thing (0.3) usually candy
92 or (0.3) a car- card
93 ?: [mm
94 M: [a small card happy Valentine's Day

H behaves as if she is quite eager to confirm that M's formulation is the question that she has asked, producing her first confirmation token in line 90 before M has
produced even half the question. As soon as H has produced her second confirmation token, M starts to answer the question in line 91. His “oh” at the start of line 91 is quite interesting, as Heritage (1998) has argued that prefacing answers with the change-of-state token “oh” is used to index a shift of attention imposed on the answerer by some problem with the presuppositions or relevance of the question. M is behaving as if the question that he has formulated and attributed to H is in some way problematic. Given his answer of “same thing,” the problem would appear to be that he has already answered a very similar question.

Throughout these segments, (5.4) to (5.8), the participants can be heard to be taking different orientations to what H is doing. E behaves as if H has a question in mind but is having trouble saying it in English. In line 68, H herself makes the claim that she has, at some point in her long stretch of talk, asked a question and can now expect an answer. M’s behavior is perhaps the most interesting, at first responding to H as if she is working her way up to a question, then responding as if H has a question in mind but has not been able to articulate it clearly, and finally responding as if H has asked a question that she should have already known the answer to.

What becomes an important question at this point in the analysis, but only if the analyst is working with a telementation model of communication, is what H has really been doing in these segments. Is M’s formulation of the question in lines 88-89 the question that H intends? Is the question that E asks earlier, in line 37, a closer approximation? Is H’s talk up through line 66 an attempt to ask a question, as E responds to it as, or preliminary information leading up to a question, as M responds to it as? At line 68, does H really believe that she has asked a question? If so, what does she think she has asked? Is it fair of M to formulate H’s question for her, and then turn around and behave as if the question is problematic? For the analyst
studying the interaction in these segments as data, though, all these questions are unanswerable. They are unanswerable because the analyst does not have any direct access to what is going on inside H’s head. All the analyst has is the behavior of the participants.

Summary. The telementation model of communication may seem like common sense, but its use in the empirical study of interaction is problematic. Various lines of evidence indicate that particular utterances cannot be reduced to particular propositions or intentions in the head. Perhaps more importantly, while participants in interaction may have the privilege of attributing thoughts, intentions, and so on to others, or even to themselves, there is no way for the analyst to empirically ground his or her own such attributions so that they may be used as a basis for the analysis of interaction. Though it is rarely made explicit, telementation is a basic assumption of the interactionist paradigm. The problematic nature of this model of communication also renders problematic the way that research on interaction within the interactionist paradigm is pursued and interpreted.

Interaction as Source of Input

Interaction in the interactionist paradigm. Within the interactionist paradigm, interaction is an interesting object of study primarily as a source of input for learner internal language acquisition processes and/or mechanisms. The language learner is conceptualized as an information processor constructing a language system, usually a grammatical or morphosyntactic system, on the basis of this input. This receives what is probably its most explicit formulation in Gass (1997), in which the language learner is depicted as a diagrammatic flowchart. In this model, which has input at one end and output at the other, the language which the learner encounters
during interaction, the input, interacts with frequency, prior knowledge, affect, and attention to yield a subset labeled as *apperceived input*, some of which is comprehended by the learner. Some aspects of interaction, namely negotiation for meaning leading to NS modification, help determine what subset of the apperceived input is actually comprehended. This subset, along with linguistic universals and other prior linguistic knowledge, is labeled as *comprehended input*, which then interacts with linguistic universals, first and second language knowledge, and the quality of analysis of the input to produce *intake*. Processes of hypothesis formation, hypothesis testing, and hypothesis rejection, modification, and confirmation proceed on the basis of this intake, supplemented by feedback received as the learner produces output. Elements of intake and products of the hypothesis testing processes are integrated into the learner's developing language system, either as stored chunks of language or as grammatical rules. This developing language system, in interaction with learner personality, production mode (spoken or written), and situation, underlies the learner's use of the language, or the learner's output. This output in turn may result in negotiation for meaning leading to NS modification, thus influencing what in the input is comprehended, as well as in feedback influencing the processes of hypothesis testing.

Learner internal acquisition mechanisms are central, both conceptually and iconically. Interaction itself is split in half, with input at one end of the model and output at the other. Though output may be of some interest, in that, for example, the pressure to produce output may encourage learners to stretch their linguistic resources (Swain & Lapkin, 1995), or because output may elicit more input in the form of feedback, it is as input that interaction has received the most attention within the interactionist paradigm. (See, e.g., the reviews by Pica (1994), Long (1996), and Gass
When a connection between input and output is made, it is in terms of the effects of different types of input on the nature of learners' output (e.g., Van den Branden, 1997).

There is perhaps nothing inherently problematic with this view of interaction as primarily a source of input, particularly if one’s interest is the psycholinguistic study of learner internal acquisition processes and/or mechanisms, as it would appear to be for those working within the interactionist paradigm. In addition, this assumption that interaction is primarily of interest as a source of input allows the study of language acquisition to be clearly demarcated from the study of language use. Within the interactionist paradigm, the concern is with acquisition, so interaction is of interest as a source of input. Within other research traditions which focus on language use, interaction may be seen as an interesting object of study in its own right. The main problem with this assumption is the effect it has on the kinds of methodology that are considered valid within the interactionist paradigm, methodologies which may be quite problematic, particularly if one is concerned about the nature of interaction.

**Experimental methodology.** There are two major methodologies which have been adopted within the interactionist paradigm, an experimental methodology and a descriptive methodology. With the experimental methodology, the purpose has been to compare the quality of learning among learners participating in (presumably) different types of interaction and who are thus receiving (presumably) different types of input. For example, Mackey (1999) compared the learning of groups participating in interaction, observing interaction, and participating in partially scripted interaction. In such experimental studies, the quality of learning is independently measured and any measured differences among groups are attributed to differences in the input they received. Pica (1994) urges greater adoption of an experimental methodology, stating:
We also badly need more experimental studies comparing the effects on L2 learning outcomes of interaction with negotiation and that without negotiation. These studies should use tasks designed to tap into grammatical modifications—in itself, not so easy. (p. 520)

This call for "more experimental studies" provides a nice illustration of what is supposed to be accomplished with this methodology. Namely, comparable "learning outcomes" can be produced by exposing learners to different types of interaction. While it may be difficult, interaction conditions can be manipulated so as to promote different "grammatical modifications," which would have the effect of exposing learners to different types of input.

There are at least two reasons that the experimental methodology is problematic, one having to do with internal validity and the other with external validity. The problem with internal validity is related to the level of control necessary to isolate type of input as an independent variable. In experimental research within the interactionist paradigm, parametric statistical tests such as ANOVA are typically used to assess the statistical significance of measured differences in learning outcomes. The attribution of the cause of these differences to different types of input is based on the assumption of an extremely high degree of experimental control. ANOVA, for example, was developed for use in the study of agricultural technology to assess the effectiveness of such things as different types of fertilizer (Gigerenzer, et al., 1989; Salsburg, 2001). Dealing with small agricultural plots rather than human beings, Fisher, the statistician and agricultural researcher who created ANOVA, could exercise a degree of control over experimental conditions that allowed him to isolate particular differences in growing conditions as independent variables. It is at least debatable, though, whether the degree of control necessary to isolate such things as different types of input as an independent variable is even possible when researchers are
working with unpredictable human beings in unpredictable, even if artificial, communicative contexts.\textsuperscript{xxxv}

The problem with external validity has to do with the assumption that it is possible to elicit representative samples of interaction. A typical procedure in experimental research on interaction is to assign subjects a task to perform which requires that they use language to communicate. The interaction that is thus elicited is then treated as being representative of interaction in general, or perhaps as being representative of interaction involving NNSs. As Wagner (1998) points out, though, the interaction that is elicited is the interaction of participants who are "doing being a guinea pig." That is, what is elicited will not be some kind of representative sample of general interaction, but rather will consist of instances of interaction produced for research purposes. If the interest of the researcher is the nature of interaction produced by people who are engaged in producing talk as part of an experiment, then elicited interaction will provide valid data, but if the interest of the researcher is in what happens in interaction outside the experimental context, then elicited data lack external validity.

\textbf{Coding and counting methodology}. The descriptive methodology has been more widely used and is the primary target of this critique. This methodology involves the use of coding schemes to categorize individual elements in interaction, which allows for the extraction of quantifiable data from interaction. This type of methodology may be thus called a \textit{coding and counting} methodology. Usually, the data are elicited and thus share with experimental data the problem with external validity discussed in the previous paragraph. In addition, there are serious problems with this type of quantification, which have been lucidly discussed by Schegloff (1993).\textsuperscript{xxxvi} The criticism here, though, focuses on a different problem, which is that
the quantified results of the coding and counting process provide a distorted and impoverished picture of the nature of interaction, a picture in which, ironically, the inter-active nature of interaction is completely lost.

Within the interactionist paradigm, the purpose of coding and counting is to gain objective and reliable information about the nature of the input available from different types of interaction. For example, Long (1983a) argues that understanding how NSs modify their speech during interaction with NNSs requires a comparison of NS-NNS interaction with NS-NS interaction, produced under similar circumstances, and that this comparison requires a coding and counting methodology:

> We are dealing ... with quantitative, not qualitative differences between FTD [foreigner talk discourse, i.e., NS-NNS interaction] and NS-NS talk. ... While suprasentential units are notoriously difficult to define operationally and to quantify, quantification is as essential here as it is for the grammatical input features, given that it is the relative frequency of use ... that is at issue (p. 183) (emphasis in the original).

Even though it may not be easy, Long is arguing that it is possible and necessary to operationally define units of discourse so that these operational definitions can be used to build a categorical classification scheme to code speakers' utterances in actual discourse. Only through such a methodology can discoveries be made about the frequency of use of different types of discourse units in different types of interaction. Uncovering the relative frequencies of different discourse units is important in order to gain an understanding of the nature of the input NNSs receive. It can also be argued that the objectivity of the data collected can be checked by such means as inter-rater reliability and that findings can be generalized beyond the sample used to collect them.

There seems to be little disagreement with Long, within the interactionist paradigm at least, that this is the way to proceed. For example, Varonis and Gass (1985b) used coding, based on their model of communication discussed above, to quantify the frequency of pushdowns in NS-NS, NS-NNS, and NNS-NNS dyads.
and found that the frequency of pushdowns increases as the number of NNSs increases from zero to two. Pica (1994) reviews some of her own research which used coding to quantify the number of negotiation utterances, signals for negotiation, and responses to those signals, produced by NSs and NNSs in NS-NNS dyads. In a review of almost two decades of research in the interactionist paradigm, Long (1996) could discuss a fairly large body of research which followed his advice.

Long (1981) provides a good example of descriptive research adopting a coding and counting methodology. This research compared frequencies of different grammatical morphemes and interactional structures in NS-NS and NS-NNS dyads. One thing that was looked at was how topic continuation and transition were managed. This was investigated by coding participants’ utterances as either topic-initiating or topic-continuing moves and by further coding topic-initiating moves syntactically as questions, statements, or imperatives. As discussed above, Long then calculated the average number of topic-continuing moves per topic-initiating move in NS-NS and NS-NNS dyads and found that this number was higher, statistically significantly higher, in NS-NS dyads. This was interpreted as showing that topics were treated more briefly and involved less transfer of information in NS-NNS dyads than in NS-NS dyads. Long also found that, while questions were the most common form of topic-initiating move in both kinds of dyads, they were more common in NS-NNS dyads. This was interpreted as demonstrating that NSs use more questions to initiate topics when speaking with NNSs in order to make the topics more salient. From an input perspective, it follows that topic-initiating moves and questions used to initiate topics are more frequent in the input learners receive than in interaction with no NNS participants.
A major problem with all this, assuming that one is at least somewhat interested in the nature of interaction, is that it gives a distorted and impoverished view of how topics are managed in real time by participants in interaction. It gives the impression that interaction proceeds as one participant initiates a topic, followed by the participants exchanging information about that topic, until the same or another participant initiates a different topic. Detailed, fine-grained analyses of interaction reveal, though, that topic management is not only much more varied and complex, but also collaboratively accomplished. This is illustrated in segments (5.9) to (5.17) below.

In segment (5.9), T, an NS, introduces a new topic with a question.

(5.9)  
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; O, NNS, male; T, NS, male]  
26 (1.1)  
27 D: ah Ally  
28 (0.6)  
29 O: ° (Ally) °  
30 (1.0)  
31 T: hey so are you gonna be back in Korea?  

T’s question about being back in Korea is topically unrelated to what the participants were talking about earlier, and so it clearly could be coded as a topic-initiating move. In addition, being a question, it would seem that T is making the topic more salient for the NNS participants. While this would seem to be a straightforward and accurate description, it in fact loses most of what is happening in this segment, as will be discussed below, where this segment will be analyzed in more detail.

First, though, consider (5.10).

(5.10)  
[tape 8, 5; M, NS, male; G, NNS, female; L, NNS, female]  
1 M: so either of you are married? or  
2 (0.5) boyfriend, or  
3 (0.6)  
4 ?: nani?=  

This conversation, which is also analyzed in the previous chapter, comes at the beginning of one of the recordings and it is not clear what, if anything, the participants had been talking about prior to this. In line 1, M, the NS, initiates a topic by asking the two NNS participants whether either of them is married. This question, though, does not receive any response, resulting in a 0.5 second pause at the beginning of line 2. M then expands the question by adding “boyfriend,” but there is still no response from either of the NNS participants, resulting in a 0.6 second pause in line 3. After one of the two NNS participants says in Japanese “nani” (“what”) in line 4, which is possibly other-initiation of repair, M expands the question once more by adding “children.” Still, though, there is no immediate response, resulting in a 0.7 second pause in line 5. He then requests that one of the NNSs answer his question by saying “anybody.” In line 6, in partial overlap with M’s request for one of the NNS participants to respond, G initiates repair by saying “hm” with rising intonation. It is unclear here what exactly is in need of repair, but this becomes much clearer in line 7, when G initiates repair again following M’s laughter at the end of line 5. In line 7, G’s laughter and intonation as she says “what” indicate that what is being repaired is not a problem with, for example, hearing or reference, but that there is something unusual about the question itself, as discussed in chapter four. Following this other-initiation of repair, there is a 0.3 second pause, followed by M laughing again, followed by a long 1.3 second pause. M then expands the question once more by
adding "family." Finally, M requests once again at the end of line 9 that one of the NNS participants answer the question.

It could be argued that M is initiating a topic by asking a question, a question that could be glossed as, perhaps, "Are either of you married, or do you have a boyfriend, or any children, or family?" It could further be argued that M is providing a list of alternative answers to his question in order to facilitate the NNSs' ability to give an answer (Hatch, 1978). However, such an analysis, by ignoring the sequential details of how the question is produced, misses an important point, which is that, even though M produces all the words that make up the question, the question itself is a collaborative, interactive accomplishment (see Goodwin, 1979; Sacks, 1992). Each time that M expands the question, it is in response to something in the interaction, either the absence of an answer, in lines 2, 3, and, possibly, 9, and/or an initiation of repair on the part of G, in line 7. The topic that emerges from the interactive accomplishment of producing this question goes from being about marriage, to having boyfriends, to having children (in the sense of being a parent, not becoming a parent), and finally to the participants' families.

This conversation continues in segment (5.11).

(5.11)
[tape 8, 5; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female; G, NNS female]

9 M: ha ha (1.3) family [(0.3) (anybody)]
10 L: [childr(h)en ha
11 M: .h ha ha
12 L: .hh I'm [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I'm a children.=
16 M: =you're a child?= 17 G: =yeah I (have) a [good(e) (goon)=
18 L: [I'm a child.

In line 10, L repeats "children" and laughs, in overlap with M's second request that somebody answer his question. Then in line 12, L says "I'm children." As shown
in chapter four, M initiates repair on this by saying "huh" in line 14, which L completes by saying "I'm a children." M then corrects this in line 16 by saying "you're a child," with rising intonation, and L responds to the correction in line 18 by saying "I'm a child," with falling intonation. L appears to have selected having children as the part of the topic initiated by M's earlier question that she is going to continue. Her turn in line 12 could thus be heard as a topic-continuing move. However, L can also be heard as challenging the topic M has initiated. By saying that she is still a child, she asserts that she is too young to have children of her own, and possibly too young to be married, challenging presuppositions entailed by M's asking whether she has children. She is not answering M's question, but refuting it.

In addition, in overlap with L, G initiates repair with "what" again in line 13. This is produced without audible laughter, but its intonation is similar to her repair-initiation in line 7, indicating that this repair-initiation in line 13 may also be targeting M's earlier question, as discussed in chapter four. G's next turn begins in line 17 and continues in line 19.

(5.12)
[tape 8, 5; G, NNS, female; L, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [good\= (goon)=
18 L: [I'm a child.
19 G: =I have a granddaughter
20 M: [you have a gr\(h)andd\(h)au\(h)ter
21 L: [ha ha ha (.) ha ha ha
22 G: y(h)eh
23 (0.5)
24 M: .h ha ha
25 L: .h (\xxxx) ((said while laughing))
26 (0.7)

In line 19, G says "I have a granddaughter," which is treated as a joke by all participants, as can be seen in M's laughter as he repeats this in line 20, L's laughter in line 21, and G's laughter while she confirms that she has a granddaughter in line 22. As discussed in the previous chapter, the implausibility of this assertion can be
seen as indexing the implausibility of the presupposition of M’s earlier question that G is old enough to have children of her own.

Is there an identifiable topic of the conversation in (5.10), (5.11), and (5.12)? It seems that the topic which develops out of M’s initial question is not one of the things that M actually asked about, but some of the presuppositions of the question. If this is the case, can M be said to have initiated the topic? Or, can M’s question be said to be a topic-initiating move? Are G’s repair-initiations, L’s assertions that she is a child, and G’s joke about having a granddaughter topic-continuing moves? Can the turns taken by G and L in response to M’s question be seen as simply the transfer of information? What information is being transferred when L says “I’m a child”? That she considers herself to be a child? Or that she considers herself to be too young to have children? Or that M’s question has implausible presuppositions? What information is being transferred when G says “I have a granddaughter”? What can be seen in the interaction spanning these three segments is that topic development is much more collaborative and interactive than a coding of turns as either topic-initiating or topic-continuing would indicate, as well as that the development of a topic is not merely the transfer of more and more information.

The conversation in segments (5.10), (5.11), and (5.12) continues in segment (5.13).

(5.13) [tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
27 L: ha ha ha but- I already (1.5) aunt
28 (1.8) I’m already aunt ((clear one-word-at-a-time articulation)) (0.6)
29 aunt?
30 (0.5)
31 M: oh you’re an aunt already.
32 L: yeah
In lines 27-30, L says, with some difficulty, that she is an aunt. Following the 0.5 second pause in line 31, M can be heard in line 32 as requesting confirmation of this, which L provides in line 33. The use by both L and M of the adverb “already,” by L in lines 27 and 28 and by M in line 32, indexes that they take it as somewhat unexpected that L is old enough to be an aunt. When L says that she is an aunt “already,” this can be heard as connected to the earlier talk about the presuppositions of M’s initial question—L is not old enough to be a mother, but she is, perhaps unexpectedly, old enough to be an aunt. This can also be heard as a topic shift, away from talk about presuppositions of M’s question to talk about L’s family. Even so, it is still connected to previous topic, as M adds “family” in one of the extensions of the initial question in line 9. This demonstrates something about topic shifts that has been noted by, among others, Sacks (1992) and Jefferson (1984), which is that abrupt topic shifts are unusual and that participants can be heard to tie the new topics they introduce into a conversation to the preceding topic. The result is step-wise transition of topics. This way of initiating topics is by no means unusual, but as a phenomenon it is completely lost when coding categories such as topic-initiating move and topic-continuing move are used to investigate topic development in interaction.

The interaction continues in segment (5.14).

(5.14)
[tape 8, 5; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female]
34 M: oh so you’re sister has
35 (0.7)
36 L: my: cousin’s (0.4) no (1.1) yeah.
37 my cousin’s: (.) child (1.6)
38 [not aunt
39 M: [so your cou- (0.9) I don’t know
40 what that is. your cousin’s child?
41 (0.6)

In line 34, by producing the first part of a sentence which can be completed with either “a daughter” or “a son,” M can be heard to be eliciting more information about L.
being an aunt, specifically, whether she has a niece or a nephew, by giving her the opportunity to complete the sentence. M's turn can also be heard as a correction-invitation device (Sacks, 1992), in that it provides L with the opportunity to correct him if it is her brother, rather than her sister, who has a child. L does correct this, but in a rather unexpected way, in that it is not her brother who has a child, but her cousin. With this, there is another shift in the topic, away from L's family and to a metalinguistic discussion of English lexical terms for particular kin relationships, specifically whether L can be described as an “aunt” and what one’s “cousin’s child” is called. Even though the topic can now be heard to have shifted to a metalinguistic level—talk about the English lexicon—the new topic is still obviously connected to the preceding topic, making this another example of stepwise transition. The participants continue with this metalinguistic topic in segment (5.15).

(5.15)
[tape 8, 5; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male; T, NS, male; L, NNS, female]

42 G: °cousin’s child°
43 (0.8)
44 M: I: don’t know: what that is.
45 (3.5)
46 M: °I don’t know the name° do you know
47 that? (.) Taka?
48 (1.2)
49 M: what’s your cou- if your cousin
50 (0.3) has a child (0.5) what’s that
51 relation chil- child’s
52 relation to you?
53 G: [°cousin’s child° (0.6) nephew?]
54 (2.7)
55 T: I don’t- (0.5) think there is a
56 relationship (xxxx)
57 M: maybe like second cousin or
58 something right?
59 (1.0)
60 ?: [yeah second cousin. ((male NS))
61 ?: [hh
62 M: se[cond cousin
63 L: [second cousin [mm:
64 M: °I don’t know°
In this continuing metalinguistic discussion, M, after stating a few times that he does not know what the term is for "cousin's child," seeks help from an NS from another group in the conversation club in lines 46-47 and lines 49-52, calling him by name. This other NS, T, does not answer immediately, and during the resulting silence, G offers a possibility, "nephew." This is not responded to, at least not verbally, and T eventually offers his opinion, in lines 55-56, that there is no term in English for "cousin's child." M then proffers "second cousin," somewhat tentatively, in lines 57-58, to which a different male, who seems to be in a different group and sounds like an NS, agrees in line 60, after a 1.0 second pause. M and L repeat "second cousin," almost simultaneously, in lines 62 and 63, before M once again indicates his uncertainty that this is the correct word in line 64. One thing that is interesting about the way that this metalinguistic topic develops is that it involves bringing members of other groups into the conversation of this group, at least temporarily. This illustrates the permeability of group boundaries that was discussed in chapter two.

One more stepwise transition can be seen in segment (5.16).

(5.16)
[tape 8, 5; M, NS, male]
65 (0.6)
66 M: it's so confusing.
67 ?: mm=
68 M: =I think we actually have less
69 words in English (0.3) for family.
70 (.) relationsh
71 ?: [mm::
72 M: than (0.6) maybe Japanese or some
73 (. ) Asian languages?

In lines 68-70 and lines 72-73, M can be heard to be initiating a new topic. Again, though, the new topic is tied to the preceding one. Whereas the preceding talk was related to finding an English term for "cousin's child," the new topic is about kinship terms in general. M gives his opinion that English has fewer kinship terms than are
found in some other languages. This new topic is tied to the preceding topic not only semantically, in that it is still about lexical items for kin, but it can also be heard as an account for why M and other NSs have had so much difficulty finding a term for “cousin’s child” and why, even after “second cousin” was agreed on, M has continued to have his doubts.

As has been argued throughout this analysis of segments (5.10) to (5.16), one thing that all of these segments illustrate quite clearly is that topic development is complex and that managing topics is collaborative, interactive work. Topics are not simply initiated and then continued until a new topic is initiated. Rather, topics are typically introduced in a stepwise fashion that involves tying new topics to preceding talk. In addition, as the initiation of a new topic is something that is interactionally achieved, it may be impossible, and is certainly an over-simplification, to isolate a particular turn as a topic-initiating move.

Finally, let us return to segment (5.9), shown again here as segment (5.17), along with some of the preceding talk.

(5.17) [tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female; T, NS, male; O, NNS, male]
1 D: uh- uh: I forgot you name (.) is
2 (1.8)
3 D: hey can I (. ) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (. ) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (. )
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 [sh(h)ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12 [can you show
13 T: [ha ha ha
14 (0.4)
15 D: .h (. ) is a can you is- I always
16 use could you. (.) yeah:=
17 T: =yeah=
As stated above, T’s question in lines 31-32 is topically unrelated to the preceding talk. It seems to be a fairly clear example of what could be coded as a topic-initiating move. (See discussion of T’s use of this question in chapter two.) However, if it were coded as such, and thus transformed into one data-point in a set of such moves, much would be lost about the work that this turn is doing at this particular place in the interaction. At the beginning of this segment, D tells, apparently, A that she has forgotten A’s name. However, this gets no response, resulting in a 1.8 second pause in line 2. D then makes a more direct request to see A’s name. (NSs in the conversation club wear name tags.) Given this request in line 3, D’s turn in line 1 can be heard as an indirect request. Something apparently happens which allows D to see A’s name, which D then says in line 5.

What happens next, though, is that A repeats part of what D has said and laughs. She is apparently laughing at D’s non-target-like choice of words in line 3. A then provides a more target-like model, while continuing to laugh, in lines 9-10. In lines 11-12, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-22, D accounts for her erroneous choice of words, which has elicited laughter from at least one NS, possibly two if T’s laughter in line 13 is also directed towards D’s error, by claiming confusion over the use of “can
This episode of laughter at and accounting for D's erroneous use of her second language comes to an end, perhaps mercifully for D, with the 1.1 second pause in line 26. D then repeats A's name, the information which was the object of the request in line 3, which itself started the sequence of laughter at and accounting for D's error, followed by a 0.6 second pause, O's repeating the name quietly, and then a 1.0 second pause. By initiating a new topic in a decidedly non-stepwise fashion, in that it is unrelated to the preceding talk, T's turn in lines 31-32 provides an escape from this potentially embarrassing episode, potentially embarrassing for D because her erroneous use of English has been highlighted, potentially embarrassing for A because she has been insensitive enough to laugh at D's English, and potentially embarrassing even for the other participants if they are able to empathize with D and/or A. If it were merely coded as a topic-initiating move and a question, this aspect of T's turn would be completely lost.

The purpose of this subsection has not simply been to show shortcomings of the way that Long (1981) investigated topic management. Rather, it was to demonstrate that the methodology of extracting quantified data from interaction through the use of coding schemes results in an impoverished and distorted view of what is actually going on in the interaction. While it may be true that, as Long found, topics tend to be developed in greater depth in NS-NS interaction than in NS-NNS interaction, and that NSs tend to use more questions to initiate new topics when talking to NNSs than when talking to other NSs, by reducing interaction to collections of standardized data-points, the coding and counting methodology obscures rather than illuminates what happens in particular instances of interaction. This, of course, may not be considered problematic if one's primary purpose is to make general statements about the nature of input. However, one danger of using such a methodology is that it
may give analysts, and their readers, the impression that they understand more about interaction than they really do.

More importantly, by removing turns from their interactive context and transforming them into tokens of a particular coding category, the nature of interaction as *inter-action* is lost. Interaction is *inter-action* because individual actions, or turns at talk, occur in a sequential environment, with actions preceding them and more actions following them, not to mention actions which occur simultaneously. The interpretation by participants of any particular action depends on what has come before, what is happening at the moment, and even on what will follow. Likewise, any particular action has an influence on how surrounding actions are interpreted. Moreover, these different actions are produced by different participants, so how a particular action or turn at talk comes to be interpreted is a collaborative accomplishment. It is even the case that individual turns can be collaboratively and interactively constructed, as is nicely illustrated in the way that M's initial question is interactively constructed in segment (5.10). Ironically, when interaction is analyzed through the use of coding categories to extract quantifiable data, the phenomenon of *inter-action* is lost.

*Summary.* Again, there may be nothing inherently problematic with the assumption of the interactionist paradigm that interaction is interesting primarily as a source of input. However, if one is interested in the nature of interaction, the methodologies, and in particular the coding and counting methodology, that are rendered valid by this perspective on interaction are extremely problematic.

**Paradigms and Choices**

*Choosing CA.* The purpose of this chapter has been to present the case for rejecting the interactionist paradigm and adopting CA. The argument has been made
by focusing on two assumptions of the interactionist paradigm that are problematic if one is interested in the nature of interaction itself, including interaction involving NNSs. As illustrated in the other chapters of this study, CA is an approach to the study of interaction which does not make the assumption that (linguistic) communication is telementation. Applied to SLA, a CA approach allows the emphasis to be placed on interaction itself as an interesting object of study, rather than limiting the role of interaction to being merely, or rather primarily, a source of input. However, placing interaction at the center of SLA, rejecting the assumptions of the interactionist paradigm, entails a reconceptualization of the nature of SLA. Models such as the one presented in Gass (1997), in which learner internal processes and/or mechanisms are central, while interaction is, at best, peripheral, no longer make sense if interaction is seen as central. In addition, the clear line of demarcation between the study of language acquisition and the study of language use becomes blurred once the assumptions of the interactionist paradigm are rejected.

The argument that, for the purpose of studying interaction involving NNSs, the interactionist paradigm, due to its problematic assumptions, should be rejected and replaced by CA, can also be reversed. Adopting CA entails the rejection of the assumptions underlying the interactionist paradigm, resulting in a rejection of the paradigm itself. The epistemological commitments of CA include an insistence that talk, or more broadly, observable behavior, must be interpreted empirically in its own terms. That is, there cannot be recourse to such things as unobservable thoughts or intentions. Thoughts and intentions can only be brought into the analysis when they can be empirically grounded in the data. This entails a rejection of the assumption that (linguistic) communication is telementation. In addition, a basic assumption of CA is that particular turns, or other actions, can only be understood within their sequential
context. This entails a rejection of the coding and counting methodology. Also, though, within CA, interaction is viewed as the primordial site language use (Schegloff, 1979), and even the place where all that is interesting about human behavior is to be found. This view conceives of interaction as much richer, and much more interesting, than as simply or primarily a source of input. In order to adopt CA, the assumption that interaction is interesting primarily as a source of input must be rejected along with the coding and counting methodology.

Corrective recasts and the interactionist paradigm. The second section of this dissertation looks more specifically at corrective recasts and what will be labeled other-correction of language form. It is important to illustrate, though, that the way corrective recasts have been conceptualized, along with the research that has been conducted on corrective recasts within SLA, fits squarely into the interactionist paradigm. Basically, a non-target-like turn which a corrective recast may follow is seen as an erroneous encoding of some particular meaning, a result of the NNS’s limited resources for making form-meaning connections. If a corrective recast follows this non-target-like turn, then it is a, or perhaps the, correct encoding of the meaning. (See chapter seven.) This obviously fits in nicely with the telementation model of communication. As corrective recasts are related to problems with the encoding of meaning, the category of corrective recast also makes a nice addition to the categories of clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check. In addition, the interest in corrective recasts has been in how they function as a particular type of input, albeit a type of input that is obviously connected to an NNS’s output. Research has tended to focus on such things as the effectiveness of corrective recasts as input (e.g., Mackey & Philp, 1998) and the relative frequency, in relation to the number of
non-target-like turns or particular types of errors, of corrective recasts in the input (e.g., Izumi, 1998).

The fact that the conceptualization of corrective recasts and the research which has been conducted on corrective recasts tend to fall within the interactionist paradigm creates a problem for a CA approach to the study of corrective recasts. As argued above, the adoption of CA entails the rejection of the assumptions underlying the paradigm, resulting in a rejection of the paradigm itself. Most importantly, corrective recasts, or rather 'corrective recasts,' are generally identified on the basis of coding criteria which do not take into account how participants orient to turns which are so coded. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the identification of a turn’s function in CA does, even must, take into account how participants orient to the function of a particular turn. For this reason, the term other-correction of language form, will be adopted as a label for turns which participants do orient to as having a corrective function.

A Kuhnian choice. At the beginning of this chapter, the interactionist paradigm was claimed to be a scientific paradigm in Kuhn’s (1962, 2000) sense. This came with a disclaimer, as an endnote, that the adoption of Kuhn’s concept of scientific paradigm should not be taken as endorsing Kuhn’s views on the nature of scientific progress, scientific revolutions, and/or normal science. Nevertheless, in this section, a Kuhnian type argument will be made.

In his analysis of the Copernican revolution, Kuhn (1985) illustrates how, when Copernicus first made his proposal for a heliocentric universe, and for several decades following the proposal, there was no rational reason for adopting Copernicus’s innovation. The heliocentric model solved a few problems with the Ptolemaic geocentric model of the universe, but it also introduced several new
problems of its own. It was by no means simpler than the geocentric model. It also confronted a system that had been developed and refined over a period of more than two millennia and contradicted the commonsense idea that the earth is not in motion. According to Kuhn (1985), the main strength of the heliocentric model was that it offered a kind of mathematical harmony that fit well with neo-Platonic ideas which at the time were popular among the educated European elite, but which today seem to be completely incomprehensible. It was this mathematical harmony which led people such as Kepler and Galileo to accept the heliocentric model. As such people became instructors at universities, they were able to spread the idea of a heliocentric model to a new generation. It was only after the heliocentric model had become widely accepted, among those with an interest in astronomy if not by others, and a great deal of observational research had been conducted within the new paradigm, that results began to accumulate which clearly demonstrated the advantages of the heliocentric model over the geocentric model. For the people who adopted the Copernican model in its early years, rejecting the Ptolemaic model, this was not a rational decision of choosing the better model, but rather was influenced by such things as aesthetic taste, intellectual fashion, and the social structure of universities.\textsuperscript{[46]}

If one is faced with the choice between working within the interactionist paradigm and adopting CA for the study of interaction within the field of SLA, choosing both of them is simply not an option. To use other terminology from Kuhn (1962), the two are incommensurable. Adopting CA entails rejecting the interactionist paradigm. However, in making this choice, it may be that the decision must, to some extent, be based on one’s research interest. If one is primarily interested in investigating learner internal acquisition processes and/or mechanisms, then the arguments made in this chapter will probably seem to provide no reason for rejecting
the interactionist paradigm. If, though, one is interested in interaction, including interaction involving NNSs, then the assumptions of the interactionist paradigm are extremely problematic and CA offers a promising alternative. One of the purposes of this study, of course, is to explore the possibilities of a CA approach to SLA.
A great deal of recent work within the interactionist paradigm has been focused on corrective recasts, which are taken to be a potential source of corrective input that may be beneficial for language learners (see Nicholas, et al., 2001, for a recent review of this research). Research on corrective recasts has been both experimental (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; Leeman, 2000; Long, et al., 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998) and descriptive, using the coding and counting methodology critiqued in chapter five (e.g., Braidi, 2002; Izumi, 1998; Morris, 2002a; Oliver, 1995). While the reason that corrective recasts have been considered interesting is that they may provide a particular type of input, there has also been an interest in whether learners perceive recasts as being corrective. This has led to what would appear to be an interest in the function of recasts in interaction, with some researchers investigating how learners respond to them (e.g., Braidi, 2002; Izumi, 1998; Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Morris, 2002a; Oliver, 1995) and other researchers using the methodology of stimulated recall to elicit from learners themselves their opinions about whether they believe particular recasts to have a corrective function (e.g., Mackey, et al., 2000; Nabei & Swain, 2002).

Within the descriptive research, 'corrective recasts' have been identified for coding purposes based on their relationship to immediately prior turns. For example, in Oliver (1995), "NS responses were coded as recasts if they maintained the central meaning while reformulating the syntactic structure of the NNS error turn" (p. 468). In Izumi (1998), a "turn was deemed to be a recast when the NS response maintained the central meaning of the NNS utterance while reformulating its incorrect part" (p. 186).
In Braidi (2002), an NS “response was coded as a recast if it incorporated the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect NNS utterance, and also changed and corrected the utterance in some way” (p. 20). In Morris (2002a), an utterance was coded as a corrective recast if it constituted an “immediate implicit reformulation of an ill-formed utterance that reformulates all or part of the utterance” (p. 399). These criteria are fairly similar across studies, one reason being that Izumi (1998), Braidi (2002), and Morris (2002a) each to some extent adopted the coding scheme described in Oliver (1995).

If corrective recasts are conceptualized in terms of being a particular type of input, then these coding criteria may indeed describe members of a particular category. This is the rationale of experimental studies such as Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998), in which the effects of providing recasts of particular structures are compared to the effects of providing models of the same structures on participants’ learning of those structures, with recasts and models being conceptualized as two different types of input. However, in research which investigates such things as how learners respond to recasts or how learners supposedly perceive recasts, it is at least implied that one interactional function of turns that can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ is correction. It will be demonstrated in this chapter, though, that turns which can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ are multi-functional, in two different senses. First, individual turns that can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ have primary interactional functions that are different from other individual turns that can be coded as also being ‘corrective recasts.’ Second, even when a turn which can be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ turns out to be oriented to by participants as having a corrective function in the interaction, it can also function in other ways as well.
Identifying ‘Corrective Recasts’

Each of the following segments, (6.1) to (6.14), contains a turn which can be coded as ‘corrective recast’ according to the criteria quoted above.

(6.1)
[tape 1, 215; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
13 F: not belong (.) United States
14 T: [it didn’t (.)
15 belong to the United States.

(6.2)
[tape 1, 430; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
13 F: lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))
15 T: yeah lizard.

(6.3)
[tape 5, 15; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
6 E: I’m from in Japan,
7 M: from Japan

(6.4)
[tape 5, 151; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
14 E: all student.
15 M: yeah all the students.

(6.5)
[tape 5, 222; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
8 H: what means ha ha [(xxx)
9 M: [oh what does it
10 mean? Valentine’s Day?

(6.6)
[tape 5, 401; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
5 H: uh me:? (0.7) got married.
6 (0.5)
7 M: oh you’re married.

(6.7)
[tape 5, B74; H, NNS, female; Q, NS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: he famous (0.4) uh- (0.5) in:
2 student.
3 Q: yeah=
4 H: =(oh our) student yes he yes
5 (0.4)
6 M: he’s famous?
(6.8)
[tape 6, B66; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
2 S: oh (.) what does it say Chinese parsley? {{three syllables}}
4 M: Chinese parsley yeah

(6.9)
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
15 L: .h I'm a children.=
16 M: =you're a child?

(6.10)
[tape 8, 121; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 G: eh? (1.2) "mm" (0.5) but why (0.3)
2 why: (4.6) why (the:) Japanese
3 (0.9) girl {{(0.6) is good
4 M: [yeah {{(nasalized)}
5 (1.1)
6 M: why're they good?

(6.11)
[tape 11, 44; O, NNS, male; D, NNS, female; N, NNS, female]
2 O: how much it.
3 D: how much is it [six or: seven=
4 N: [mm
5 D: =dollars?

(6.12)
[tape 11, 48; N, NNS, female; A, NS, female]
3 N: "I hurt°
4 (0.4)
5 ?: oh
6 A: you're h you're sore?

(6.13)
[tape 11, 116; N, NNS, female; T, NS, male; D, NNS, female]
1 N: (is it) four- (0.5) forty five
2 minute? "hm" (0.3) mm°
3 T: [yeah (.) forty five (minutes).
4 D: [is a- (. ) yeah forty five minutes
5 mm hm.

(6.14)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female]
3 D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (.) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: can you show me

In segment (6.1), F's turn has non-target-like negation, is missing the preposition "to," and is missing the definite article before "United States." (It is also missing a subject, but this could be considered the result of ellipsis.) In T's 'corrective recast,' this is reformulated as the target-like form, "it didn't belong to the United States." In segment (6.2), F says "lizard" with non-target-like pronunciation of the vowel in the first syllable. T then repeats this word with target-like pronunciation. In segment (6.3), E produces a non-target-like prepositional phrase with two prepositions, "from in Japan." M then says "from Japan," which is target-like. This 'corrective recast' is only of the prepositional phrase, not the whole sentence. In segment (6.4), E says "all student," which is non-target-like because it is missing the plural morpheme. M then produces the 'corrective recast,' "all the students." Note that, even though M adds "the," "all students" without the definite article would seem to be target-like. In segment (6.5), the non-target-like question "what means" is changed to the target-like question, "what does it mean." In segment (6.6), the non-target-like "me got married" is changed to "you're married." In segment (6.7), the non-target-like "he famous" is changed to "he's famous." In segment (6.8), S articulates the word "parsley" as three syllables, a non-target-like syllabification. M then articulates "parsley" as two syllables. In segment (6.9), L says "I'm a children," which is non-target-like because the noun should be singular. M changes this to "you're a child." In segment (6.10), G's turn shows a fair amount of disfluency, but she appears to be saying, "why the Japanese girl is good," which is non-target-like because it lacks subject/verb inversion and because the discussion has been about Japanese girls, rather than about one particular Japanese girl. In M's 'corrective recast,' he says, "why're they good," with target-like subject/verb inversion and agreement. In segment (6.11),
O asks "how much it," to which D, another NNS, responds with the target-like question form, "how much is it." In segment (6.12), N says about herself, "I hurt." A then changes this to "you're sore." In segment (6.13), N says "forty-five minute," without the plural morpheme. Both T, an NS, and D, an NNS, respond by saying "forty-five minutes," with the plural morpheme. Finally, in segment (6.14), D asks, "can I show you name," which A reformulates as "can you show me."

If these 'corrective recasts' are taken to be corrections of language errors, then a variety of error types are being corrected: syntax (segments (6.1), (6.3), (6.5), (6.6), (6.7), (6.10), and (6.11)), pronunciation (segment (6.2)), inflectional morphology (segments (6.4), (6.9), and (6.13)), syllabification (segment (6.8)), lexical choice (segment (6.12)), and argument structure (segment (6.14)). If these 'corrective recasts' provide the NNS participants with a useful type of corrective input, then they would appear to receive such input for a wide range of error types.

**Interactional Function of 'Corrective Recasts'**

The previous section contains several instances of turns that could be coded as 'corrective recasts.' However, when such turns are analyzed in terms of interactional function, only a few appear to be taken by participants to function as correction. Those which are not corrective have a variety of other interactional functions which are similar to functions of turns which cannot be coded as 'corrective recasts.'

**Displaying understanding and/or hearing.** In segment (6.15), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.3), the NS uses repetition as a means of displaying his hearing and/or understanding of what another participant has said.

(6.15)
[tape 5, 15; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]
1 M: an' what's your name?
2 E: my name is Emiko.
3 M: Emiko.
4 (0.4)
5 M: okay
6 E: I'm from in Japan,
7 M: from Japan
8 (0.4)
9 M: okay?
10 (1.0)
11 M: and?
12 S: my name is Setsuko and I'm from
13 (Japan) =
14 M: =Setsuko
15 S: yes: =
16 M: =okay

In lines 1-3, M asks a question, E answers the question by giving her name, and M
then displays how he has heard the name by repeating it. In lines 6-7, E states where
she is from and M then displays his understanding of what E has said by saying
"from Japan." In lines 11-14, M asks S a question, S responds by saying her name
and where she is from, and M displays how he has heard the name by repeating it. It
is, of course, M's turn in line 7 that could be coded as a 'corrective recast,' but there is
no evidence that any of the participants treat this turn as having a corrective function.
In fact, it appears to function in precisely the same fashion as M's repetitions of the
other participants' names in lines 3 and 14, as a display of how he has heard and/or
understood the other participants' answers to his questions.

The same thing can be seen in segment (6.16), in which there is nothing that
could be coded as a 'corrective recast.'

(6.16)
[tape 5, 22; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female; E, NNS, female; S,
NNS, female]
3 M: okay so your name is
4 H: Hee: Ju:ng.
5 M: Hee Jung.
6 H: jay you:: en jee. [yes
7 M: [Hee Jung.
8 M: okay and () [E-
9 E: [Emiko, [ee em ay?
10 M: [Emiko
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The talk in this segment actually comes just a few moments after the talk in segment (6.15). Prior to this segment, M has stated that he needs to write the other participants’ names down in order to remember them and is now, apparently having gotten some paper and something to write with, asking for the participants’ names again. One thing that M can be heard doing in this segment is orienting to the fact that two of the participants have already given him their names. In line 8, he articulates the first syllable of E’s name in overlap with her giving her name, while in line 18 he appends the word “again,” said with rising intonation, to his request for S’s name. In addition, in lines 5, 7, 13, 15, 16, and 20, M displays how he has heard the other participants’ names by repeating them. These turns function in same way as M’s turns in lines 3, 7, and 14 in segment (6.15).

In segment (6.17), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.10), the NS uses reformulation to display his understanding of an NNS’s turn.

(6.17)
[tape 8, 121; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 G: eh? (1.2) *mm* (0.5) but why (0.3)
2 why: (4.6) why (the:) Japanese
3 (0.9) girl [(0.6) is good
4 M: [yeah ((nasalized))
5 (1.1)
6 M: why’re they good?
7 G: *mm*
8 M: they’re not
In lines 1-3, G asks a question, but in a very disfluent manner. She says “but why” in line 1, pauses briefly, repeats “why” in line 2, pauses for an extended length of time, says “why the Japanese,” pauses again at the beginning of line 3, says “girl,” pauses once more, and finally finishes the question by saying “is good.” M does not answer immediately, resulting in a 1.1 second pause in line 5. When M does respond, he does not do so by answering the question, but by initiating repair with a reformulation of the question. This reformulation is a display of how M has understood the question. G completes the repair by confirming M’s understanding of the question in line 7, which is followed by M answering the question in line 8. It is possible that the participants take the cause of the trouble that is targeted for repair as G’s limited proficiency with the language. However, there is not any evidence in the interaction that they are treating M’s reformulation as corrective.

Segment (6.18), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.5), is similar.

(6.18)
[tape 5, 222; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  H: is your age: child? (0.3) age:
2     (0.4) you: (0.8) you’re a child?
3         ((age = age?))
4  M: uhn.
5  H: “mmm”
6  ?: (an)
7  (0.9)
8  H: what means ha ha [(xxx)
9  M: [oh what does it mean? [Valentine’s Day?
10 H: [..hh yes .hh hh [,h h you=
11 M: [ah
12 H: = (p(h)rine) [fro:m this .hh
13 M: [ha ha
14 M: uh:m (1.0)
15 H: if (0.4) the day (0.2) uh (. ) not
16 (0.4) the day? (3.3) not important?
17 (1.2)
18 M: uh it was important I think
In lines 9-10, M treats H's prior talk as being a question. He first displays that he has realized what H is asking by producing the change-of-state token “oh” and then initiates repair by reformulating the question with rising intonation. As in segment (6.17), this reformulation also serves as a display of how M has understood the question. Before he can answer, though, H begins producing more talk, in partial overlap with M's reformulation. M appears to be starting to answer the question in line 15, where he says “uhm” and then pauses. However, H then asks a different question in lines 16-17. At least, in his answer in line 19, produced after another long pause, M responds as if H has asked a different question. Again, it is possible that the participants take the cause of the trouble that M targets with his reformulation to be the difficulty that H has in articulating a question in English. H's own laughter in line 8 can be heard as indexing an orientation to such difficulty. However, there is no evidence that the reformulation has any corrective function.

Compare segments (6.17) and (6.18) to segment (6.19), which contains nothing that could be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’

(6.19)
[tape 5, 331; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 E: uh (. ) when you were a (0.5) child?
2 M: [un
3 E: [what did you have any special
4 things on Valentine’s Day.
5 (1.8)
6 M: °an any special things on
7 Valentine’s Day° uh:m (1.4) just in
8 school (0.9) in school

In lines 1 and 3-4, E asks M a question. M does not respond immediately, resulting in a long pause in line 5. When he does respond, he does so by repeating part of the question quietly, then saying “uhm,” pausing again, and then starting to produce an answer to the question. Even though E's question, “what did you have any special things on Valentine’s Day,” can be considered to be non-target-like, M's repetition is
of a part of the question that is not non-target-like, so it cannot be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ Said quietly, this repetition displays M’s understanding of what he has been asked and, in conjunction with the filled pause, “uhm,” and the following silence, also displays that he is thinking of a way to answer the question. By displaying how M understands what he has been asked, this turn functions in a manner very similar to M’s reformulations in segments (6.17) and (6.18).

In segment (6.20), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.11), an NNS participant produces what could be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’

(6.20) [tape 11, 44; O, NNS, male; D, NNS, female; N, NNS female]
2 O: how much it.
3 D: how much is it [six or: seven= [mm]
4 N: =dollars?
5 D: six or seve:n?
6 O: six or seve:n?

O asks a question in line 2. In line 3, D reformulates the question. This reformulation displays her understanding of the question and also seems to index that she is thinking of how to answer, similar to M’s repetition in (6.19). Again, though, there is no evidence in the interaction that the first part of D’s turn in line 3 is corrective. In addition, O uses repetition in line 6, which displays his understanding of D’s answer to his question, similar to M’s use of repetition in segments (6.15) and (6.16), and also indexes his surprise. However, as this involves no reformulation of anything non-target-like in D’s prior turn, O’s turn in line 6 cannot be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’

In segment (6.21), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.6), an NS’s reformulation displays understanding of what an NNS has said, while also indexing that what she has said is unexpected.
Having been asked several questions about Valentine’s Day, M asks the participants a question in lines 1-2 and 4. He does not direct this question to one particular participant, but to “anybody.” In line 5, H answers by stating that she is “married.” Following a 0.5 second pause, M displays his understanding of H’s answer by saying “oh you’re married,” which H confirms in line 8. With the change-of-state token at the beginning of line 7, as well as the three “oh”s, the “really,” and the “wow” in line 9, M also indexes the unexpectedness of H’s answer. As H’s answer in line 5, “me got married,” is non-target-like, M’s turn in line 7 can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ There is, though, no evidence in the interaction that this turn has a corrective function.

Segment (6.22), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.7), illustrates a display of understanding being used to elicit more information.

(6.22)
[tape 5, B74; H, NNS, female; Q, NS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: he famous (0.4) uh- (0.5) in:
2 student.
3 Q: yeah=
4 H: = (oh our) student yes he yes
5 (0.4)
6 M: he’s famous?
7 H: famous yes.
8 Q: for what,
9 (0.9)
10 H: mm (0.4) a good teacher
11 and handsome and
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In line 6, M says "he's famous," which is a repetition and/or reformulation of what H says at the start of line 1. With rising intonation, this can be heard as both a display of understanding of what H has said about the person they are talking about, as well as an elicitation of more information, such as why this person is "famous." H, though, rather than giving more information, merely confirms M's understanding by saying "famous yes" in line 7. Another NS, who has only temporarily joined this group, then more explicitly elicits the reason(s) that this person is famous by asking "for what" in line 8. As with the other segments analyzed so far in this section in which there are turns that can be coded as 'corrective recasts,' there is no evidence in the interaction that M's turn in line 6 has any corrective function.

Finally, segment (6.23) provides an interesting comparison.

(6.23)
[tape 6, 274; K, NS, female; M, NS, male]

1 K: your guys's (0.5) age is different
2 from here too yeah?
3 (0.6)
4 ?: hm?
5 (0.5)
6 K: the age (.)(is) different from=
7 ?: [age]
8 K: =here.
9 M: age of what.
10 (0.4)
11 K: I ee she was trying to explain to
12 me last time.
13 (0.3)
14 ?: hm?
15 K: uhm (0.3) that (0.3) your guy- your
16 birthday? (.)(is) January first.
17 ?: [mm]
18 K: every January first you add a year?
19 ?: [mm]
20 K: [or- (.)(.) you guys do that? (.)(.) in
21 Korea?
22 M: oh:: I know what you mean. (0.7)
23 the age is different.
Both K and M are NSs of English. The talk prior to this segment has been about differences between customs related to Valentine’s Day in, on the one hand, the cultures of Korea and Japan, of which the NNS participants are members, and on the other, American culture. In lines 1-2, K introduces how age is calculated as a new topic, but in a stepwise fashion by stating that “age” in the cultures of the NNS participants is another thing that “is different from here too.” There is, though, some trouble with K’s turn, and one of the NNS participants initiates repair with an open class repair initiator in line 4. K responds by saying “the age is different from here” in lines 6 and 8, but the other NS, M, then initiates repair again by asking “age of what” in line 9. Following some explanation by K of what she is talking about in lines 11-12, 15-16, 18, and 20-21, M says “oh I know what you mean” in line 22, indicating that he has now realized what K has been talking about. He then displays his understanding by repeating part of K’s turn in line 6 that M had targeted for repair, “the age is different.” As with segments (6.16) and (6.19), even though M’s turn in line 23 cannot be coded as a ‘corrective recast,’ by displaying how M understands what K has said, it functions in a manner similar to turns in the other segments that can be so coded, but which do not appear to have a corrective function.

Confirming allusions. Scheglof (1996) discusses an interesting and possibly fairly common interactional phenomenon in which one participant explicitly states something that has been implicit but unstated in another participant’s talk, following which that other participant then confirms the explicit statement by repeating it. Scheglof refers to this phenomenon as confirming an allusion. This type of sequence is not uncommon in the interaction in the conversation club, as can be seen in the following segments.

(6.24) [tape 1, 120; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]
3 T: cuz (. ) Indiana’s all:
4 Caucasian people=
5 ?: =mm[
6 T: [right there’s no Asian
7 [people at all=
8 ?: [oh (yes)?
9 P: =yeah [white people right?
10 T: [yeah
11 T: yeah (I think it’s) all white
12 people so (. ) and I didn- I didn’t
13 mind it I just wanted something
14 else.

In lines 3-4 and 6-7, T states that Indiana, which is where he has lived most of his life, is “all Caucasian people” and “no Asian people.” In line 9, P says “yeah white people right,” with rising intonation. The term “white people,” though synonymous with “Caucasian people,” is a term that has not been used in the prior talk about Indiana. P’s turn in line 9 can be heard as explicitly stating something that up to this point has been left implicit. In lines 11-12, T says “all white people,” using repetition of “white people” to confirm what P has made explicit, while also using a phrase that is structurally identical to his earlier “all Caucasian people.”

Segments (6.25) and (6.26) illustrate the same kind of thing.

(6.25)
[tape 8, 60; L, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 L: and lifestyle is different.
2 M: life[style is different. yea:h
3 L: [yeah

(6.26)
[tape 8, 224; G, NNS, female; L, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 G: fifteen or f (0.6) fifteen or
2 fourtee:n (.) is=
3 L: =(it’s) ille[gal
4 G: [is uh- [how-
5 M: [it’s illegal
6 (0.3) [yeah
7 G: [it’s illegal an:d (0.5) too
8 young to (1.0) [make (0.5) correct?
9 L: [yeah
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Prior to the talk in segment (6.25), M has been explaining why it is unusual for American adults to live with their parents. In line 1, L states, “and lifestyle is different,” emphasizing the word “lifestyle.” This is something that until this point has been implicit in M’s talk. M confirms this by repeating it. Segment (6.26) is an especially interesting example of what can happen when there are more than two participants. Prior to this segment, the talk has been about the practice in some countries of underage girls being recruited or forced into prostitution. In lines 1-2, G starts to say something, but L interrupts and apparently completes G’s sentence in line 3. What L says, “it’s illegal,” or perhaps “is illegal,” is something which until this point has not been explicitly stated in the talk. G continues to talk in line 4, but stops soon after M uses repetition of “it’s illegal” in line 5 to confirm what L has explicitly stated. Then, at the start of her turn in line 7, G also repeats “it’s illegal,” once again confirming what has now been explicitly stated. She continues, though, to say something else, which can be heard as what she was going to say earlier in lines 2 and 4, when she was interrupted by L and M, respectively. G appears to have found herself in a position where she has to confirm L’s completion of her earlier utterance before she can complete it her own way.

It does not appear that the turns in lines 11-12, 2, and 5, in segments (6.24), (6.25), and (6.26), respectively, can be coded as ‘corrective recasts.’ However, in segment (6.27), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.1), the turn in lines 14-15 can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’

(6.27)
[tape 1, 215; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; P, NNS, female]
4 T: =cuz Hawaii used to be: not (.) it
didn’t use to be a part of the US.
6 right,
7 (0.6)
8 T: and then: (0.3) it used to be:
9 Hawaii.
10 F: [right.
11 P: [mm-hm:
12 T: Hawaiians used to live there an’=
13 F: =not belong (. ) \text{United States}
14 T: [it didn’t (. )
15 belong to the United States.
16 P: [oh:
17 T: [an’ then (0.6) like in eighteen-
18 (. ) sorry it’s not a history lesson
19 [but in eighteen: ninety-three or=
20 ?: [hh
21 T: =something: they came an’ they just
22 (0.7) overthrew the government
23 [an’ took it over: an’ (xxx)
24 F: [yeah

In lines 4-6, 8-9, and 12, T is explaining that at one time Hawai‘i was not “a part of the
US,” that it used to be a different country where “Hawaiians used to live.” While T
is producing this explanation, P can be heard as orienting to what T is saying as new
information for her, producing a continuer in line 11 and a change-of-state token in
line 16. F, though, can be heard to be orienting to her own knowledge of Hawaiian
history, confirming what T has said so far in lines 10 and 24 and also reformulating
what he has said in line 13. This reformulation, though synonymous with what T has
said earlier in lines 4-5, can be heard as explicitly stating something that had been left
unsaid. Even before she completes her reformulation, T confirms this in lines 14-15
by saying “it didn’t belong to the United States.” Following this, T continues with
his talk about Hawaiian history. The thing that can be coded as a ‘corrective recast’
functions in the interaction in a manner which is similar to how the repetitions
functioned in segments (6.24), (6.25), and (6.26). There is no evidence in the
interaction, though, that it has a corrective function.

Other functions of ‘corrective recasts.’ One function in interaction of turns
that can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ is to initiate repair. This can be seen in
segments (6.17) and (6.18) above, in which reformulations of questions were used
both to display understanding and target an NNS’s question as a trouble source in need of repair. Something very similar can be seen in segment (6.28), part of which is displayed as segment (6.12) above.

(6.28)
[tape 11, 48; N, NNS, female; A, NS, female; D, NNS, female]
3 N: °I hurt°
4 (0.4)
5 ? : oh
6 A: you’re h you’re sore?
7 (0.4)
8 N: mm=
9 D: =mm
10 (0.5)
11 A: °oh no°

As in segments (6.15) to (6.23) above, A’s turn in line 6 functions as a display of how she understands N’s turn in line 3. It also initiates repair, which N completes in line 8 with the confirmation token “mm.” A then goes on to make an affiliative assessment of N’s physical condition in line 11. Again, there is no evidence in the interaction that line 6 has a corrective function.

In segment (6.28), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.4), the turn that can be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ is used to complete a repair.

(6.28)
[tape 5, 151; M, NS, male; E, NNS, female]
11 M: usually everybody gave to all the students in the [(0.3) class=
12 ]
13 ? : [eh:]
14 E: =all student.
15 M: yeah all the students.=
16 E: !=if you: don’t like hh him?
17 M: no: [but you give to everybody.
18 ? : [°ha ha°
19 E: everybody.
20 M: yeah usually.
21 E: °oh°

In this segment, E initiates repair three times, in lines 14, 16, and 19. After M’s third repair completion, E appears to be content to stop initiating repair and quietly produces
a change-of-state token. In E's first repair initiation, she says "all student." M completes the repair with a confirmation, "yeah all the students." This can be coded as a 'corrective recast,' but neither E nor M appears to orient to this turn as corrective. E goes on to initiate repair again in line 16, which M completes in line 17. During M's repair completion, somebody laughs quietly. In line 19, E initiates repair once again by repeating "everybody." M completes this once more with a confirmation. The participants appear to be completely engaged in repair work regarding how E should understand M's statement in lines 11-12, "usually everybody gave to all the students in the class," and appear to be unconcerned with whether M's repair completion in line 15 is incidentally also a correction.

Segment (6.29), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.13), illustrates one final case of a turn which can be coded as a 'corrective recast,' but does not appear to have a corrective function in the interaction.

(6.29) [tape 11, 116; N, NNS, female; T, NS, male; D, NNS female; O, NNS, male]
1  N: (is it) four- (0.5) forty five
2       minute? "hm? (0.3) mm"
3  T: [yeah (. paradigm forty five (minutes)].
4  D: [is a- (. paradigm yeah forty five minutes
5            mm hm.
6            (0.8)
7  T: wait is it forty five minutes?
8  N: no?.
9  T: it's forty five minute halves
10     right? so I think it's ninety
11     minutes total.
12  O: [yes total
13  D: [yeah total {ninety minutes
14  T: [oh. (. paradigm yeah
15     [right okay
16  N: [mm:
17     (0.7)
18  N: mm
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N asks a yes/no question in lines 1-2 which both T and D answer in the affirmative in lines 3 and 4-5. As the word “minute” in N’s question lacks the obligatory plural morpheme, but both T and D use the word “minutes” in their answer, with the plural morpheme being obligatory for the same reason, both T’s and D’s turns can be coded as ‘corrective recasts.’ However, rather than orienting to the word “minutes” as corrective, all the participants can be heard orienting to the factual accuracy, or rather inaccuracy, of the answer which both T and D have given. T indicates that the answer may not be right in line 7, which N responds to by saying “no” with rising intonation. T then gives the correct information in lines 9-11, which both O and D agree with in lines 12 and 13. T then indexes his certainty that the correction of content is accurate in lines 14-15 by saying “yeah right okay.”

**Summary.** It is possible that the turns discussed in this section which can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ are all members of a particular category of input. On the other hand, the criteria for coding turns as ‘corrective recasts’ do not appear to do a very good job of identifying members of a particular functional category. ‘Corrective recasts’ can function as initiations of repair, completions of repair, displays of understanding and/or hearing, confirmations of explicit statements of what had been left implicit, and even as answers to questions. The argument could be made that, within the interactionist paradigm, this is irrelevant, as interaction is only of interest as a source of input. However, that ‘corrective recasts’ are taken to form a particular functional category in interaction is implicit in research on recasts within the paradigm. A great deal of descriptive research investigates how learners respond to ‘corrective recasts’ and the types of errors which they tend to follow, implying that they occupy certain sequential environments. Research utilizing stimulated recall appears to be concerned with what learners perceive to be the function of turns coded as ‘corrective recasts.’
recasts.’ Finally, even in experimental research, researchers or their collaborators attempt to provide ‘corrective recasts’ following certain types of errors, or even after as many errors as possible, implying that the researchers take such turns as placeable in particular sequential environments. The problem with this implicit assumption is that, even though some turns which can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ do have a corrective function, as will be demonstrated in the next section and in later chapters, the coding criteria used by researchers such as Oliver (1995) do not identify members of a single functional category.

**Other-correction of Language Form**

In four of the segments displayed above, segments (6.2), (6.8), (6.9), and (6.14), the turn which can be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ does appear to function interactionally as correction. In order to distinguish turns which function for participants as correction of language form from turns which can be coded as ‘corrective recasts,’ the former will hereafter be referred to as other-correction of language form. Segments (6.2), (6.8), (6.9), and (6.14) contain turns which are both ‘corrective recasts’ and other-correction of language form. However, each of these turns functions in other ways as well.

**Correcting pronunciation, confirming content.** In segment (6.30), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.2), T’s turn in line 14 functions on one level as correction and on another level as confirmation.

(6.30)

[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female; B, NNS, female; F, NNS, female]

1 T: yeah but we have okay so a:nts,  
2 (0.6) geckos:, cockroaches:, (0.8)  
3 what else.  
4 (0.6)  
5 P: mouse mice. {(xxx)
Prior to this segment, the participants have been discussing the various life forms that inhabit T’s dorm room. In line 13, F says “lizard.” It is somewhat ambiguous here whether she is offering “lizard” as a possible addition to a list of such life forms produced by T in lines 1-2, which consists or “ants,” “geckos,” and “cockroaches,” or as a synonym for “gecko,” a word the meaning of which has been the topic of some of the preceding talk. As she says the word, F not only articulates it with non-target-like pronunciation of the vowel in the first syllable, which is articulated more like [i] than [a], she also displays difficulty, cutting off production of the word after the first syllable and pausing for half a second before producing the complete word. T responds in line 15 by saying, “yeah lizard,” with what is hearable as greater than normal stress on the first syllable. After T has articulated the first syllable of “lizard,” but before he has finished the second syllable, F repeats it in line 17, this time with much more target-like pronunciation and with falling intonation.

As will be discussed in chapter eight, the extra stress that T puts on the first syllable makes it hearable as contrastive with the way F has articulated the same syllable. In her repetition of the word immediately after T has articulated the first
syllable, and the adjustment of her pronunciation, F is hearably orienting to the
pronunciation of this syllable. It is clear, then, that T's turn is functioning as other-
correction of language form, specifically, as other-correction of the pronunciation of a
particular segment. However, before he says "lizard," T also produces the
confirmation token "yeah." Again, it is ambiguous whether F is offering "lizard" as
an addition to the list of life forms inhabiting T's apartment or as a synonym for
"gecko," but whichever she is doing, T confirms the action. If F is heard as offering
an addition to the list, then T can be heard as confirming this addition. (Note that in
lines 6 and 9 and 22, T rejects P's additions in lines 5 and 20.) If F is heard as
offering a synonym, then T can be heard as confirming the synonym.

Segment (6.31), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.8), is quite
similar.

(6.31)
[tape 6, B66; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
2  S:  oh (. ) what does it say Chinese
3  M:  Chinese pars[ley yeah
4  S:  parsley parsley.
6  ((two syllables each time))

In the talk prior to this segment, the participants have been discussing food. In lines
2-3, S asks a question about a certain herb, "Chinese parsley." Her question is
somewhat ambiguous with regard to whether she is asking about the pronunciation,
about whether this is the correct name in English, or something else. S articulates the
word "parsley" in a non-target-like way as three syllables. (The unconventional
spelling of the word in line 3 is intended as a representation of how S syllabifies the
word.) M responds by saying "Chinese parsley yeah." As in segment (6.30), he is
confirming the content of S's prior turn. He does not, though, articulate the word
"parsley" in such a way as to be hearably orienting to how the word is syllabified.
However, even before he completes his articulation of “parsley,” S responds by saying the word twice, each time articulating it as two syllables and with falling intonation. If S’s question is heard to be about whether “Chinese parsley” is the correct word, then M’s turn can be heard as a confirmation of this. It also appears that S takes his turn as a correction of her three-syllable articulation, “parsely.”

**Correcting inflectional morphology, initiating repair.** In segment (6.32), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.9), non-target-like inflectional morphology is targeted for correction.

(6.32)  
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
12 L: .hh I’m [childr(h)en  
13 G: [what?  
14 M: huh?  
15 L: .h I’m a children.=  
16 M: =you’re a child?=  
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [goode (goon)]=  
18 L: [I’m a child.  
19 G: =I have a granddaughter

In line 12, L says, while laughing, “I’m children.” This is targeted as a trouble source in need of repair by M in line 14, who says “huh” with rising intonation. (G’s “what” in line 13 also initiates repair, but it targets an earlier turn belonging to M as the trouble source.) L completes the repair by saying “I’m a children.” One thing that is of interest here is that she self-corrects, changing “I’m children” to “I’m a children.” However, her turn is still non-target-like, as she uses the plural rather than singular form of the noun. In line 16, M says “you’re a child” with rising intonation. With its rising intonation, this functions as another repair initiation, asking L whether “a child” is what she is trying to say. Finally, in line 18, L incorporates the correction, saying “I’m a child.” As will be discussed in chapter eight, L appears to be oriented to language form, first correcting “I’m children” to “I’m a children,” and then taking M’s repair initiation in line 16 as other-correction of language form,
which she incorporates as she produces the target-like form “I’m a child.” M’s turn in line 16 can also be heard, though, as functioning in the same manner as his turn in line 14, as initiation of repair targeting the prior turn belonging to L as the trouble source.

Correcting argument structure, treating something as laughable. Finally, segment (6.33), part of which is displayed above as segment (6.14), shows an example of other-correction of language form which is much more explicit.

(6.33)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female; T, NS, female]
3 D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (.) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 [sh(h)ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12 [can you show
13 T: [ha ha ha

In line 3, D directs a request to A which is non-target-like, but it would appear to be a request to see A’s nametag. Something apparently happens which allows D to see the nametag, as she then says the name in line 5. At this point, this sequence is hearably complete. However, in line 6, A repeats part of what D has said, saying “can I show your” and laughing. In overlap with this, D says something and also laughs, with her talk continuing past the point where A stops laughing. In overlap with the end of D’s talk, A other-corrects, saying “can you show me” while laughing. D then repeats part of the correction by saying “can you show” twice, starting the first repetition even before A has completed the correction. T also laughs in line 13, in overlap with D’s second repetition of “can you show.”
It is pretty obvious that both A and D take A’s turn in lines 9-10 as other-correction of language form. A draws attention to the contrast between the non-target-like argument structure in D’s request and the target-like argument structure by first saying “can I show your” and then saying “can you show me.” D then shows that she recognizes the contrast by repeating “can you show” twice. However, A’s turn in lines 9-10, in conjunction with her earlier turn in line 6, also does something else besides providing a correction. In line 5, D’s request has apparently been fulfilled, given that she is able to state A’s name. The sequence of actions involving D’s request, its fulfillment, and D’s recognition of its fulfillment is hearably complete. However, rather than letting the non-target-like nature of D’s request pass without comment, A repeats part of the request and laughs, treating D’s use of English in line 3 as something to be laughed at. With her correction in lines 9-10, A draws attention to the difference between what D has actually said and what A thinks she should have said, with this contrast being what makes D’s use of English something that can be laughed at.

Conclusion

Based on typical criteria for coding individual turns as ‘corrective recasts,’ such as the criteria used in Braidi (2002), Izumi (1998), Morris (2002a), and Oliver (1995), it is possible to code individual turns as ‘corrective recasts’ produced in response to a range of various error types. Although the interest in such turns within the interactionist paradigm is in how they serve as a particular type of input, research on recasts also implies that they constitute a particular functional category in interaction. However, as demonstrated empirically in this chapter, turns that can be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ are multifunctional, in two different senses. First, several
such turns do not appear to have a corrective function, but rather function primarily in a variety of other ways, for instance, as confirmation of explicit statements of what has been left unsaid, or as answers to questions, or as displays of hearing and/or understanding. Second, those 'corrective recasts' which do function as other-correction of language form may also, simultaneously, function in other ways as well. Treating, even if implicitly, turns coded as 'corrective recasts' as members of a particular functional category, that is, as more-or-less equivalent instances of correction related to language form, results in a distorted and impoverished picture of the nature of other-correction of language form within interaction.
The coding criteria used to identify 'corrective recasts' in descriptive research within the interactionist paradigm often refer to the maintenance of the meaning of NNS turns that are targeted for recasting. For example, in Oliver (1995), “NS responses were coded as recasts if they maintained the central meaning while reformulating the syntactic structure of the NNS error turn” (p. 468, emphasis added). The meaning of a turn appears to be viewed as something that exists independently of context, and in particular of its interactional context, in that the “NNS error turn” and the ‘corrective recast’ can be examined in isolation of the context to determine whether they have the same “central meaning.” This fits in well with the transmentation model of communication, which entails a biplanar structure of language with meaning being separate from and independent of its encoding in language (Harris, 1981). This view of meaning, though, can be argued to be problematic since the meaning of a particular turn, what the participants in interaction take a turn to mean, is the product of negotiation and emerges from the interactive context. In addition, this view of meaning ignores the argument that what a particular turn means depends to some extent on its function (Wittgenstein, 1953). Braidi (2002) appears to recognize that there is a problem with this reliance on the maintenance of a turn’s meaning, in that she coded a turn as a ‘corrective recast’ “if it incorporated the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect NNS utterance, and also changed and corrected the utterance in some way” (p. 20), omitting reference to meaning from the criteria.
The problems with this idea of meaning are nicely illustrated in segment (7.1), which contains a reformulation by an NS of an NNS turn, but one that probably would not be coded as a 'corrective recast.'

(7.1)
[tape 1, 76; B, NNS, female; P, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
1 B: "I live (. .) I live in Pearl City.
2 P: mm-hm
3 (0.9)
4 T: oh: you live all the way out
5 (in Pearl City?)
6 B: [yeah hh (0.7) so I usually get up
7 at six o'clock.
8 P: wow:
9 (1.5) ((loud talk outside group,
10 continues until start of T's turn in
11 line 16))
12 T: wow (0.4) how do- (2.9) how do you
13 get here? by bus?
14 B: yeah
15 (0.8)
16 T: from Pearl City?
17 B: yeah [ha ha
18 T: [ha ha ha [g(h)od
19 P: [wow

In line 1, B makes a statement of fact about where she lives. This is reformulated by T in lines 4-5, with the reformulation being confirmed by B in line 6. As there is nothing in B's turn in line 1 which would appear to be non-target-like, it does not seem that T's turn could be coded as a 'corrective recast.'

Still, there is something very interesting going on here. In her initial turn, B simply states where she lives, without any information about whether there is anything surprising or unusual about this place. P's continuer in line 2 also does not index surprise about where B lives. In his reformulation, though, T adds "all the way out," formulating "Pearl City" as a place that is far away from the school. B's confirmation of the reformulation, "yeah," is produced immediately after this addition, making the confirmation token a confirmation that this addition is
appropriate. In addition, with the use of rising intonation, T is hearably surprised that B lives so far away. B follows this confirmation, after a pause, with a consequence of living so far away, that she gets up “at six o’clock.” P then also indexes her surprise by saying “wow” in line 8. Following a long interturn pause, which may be caused by the distraction of loud talk from a person not in this group, T indexes his surprise once more by also saying “wow” in line 12. Taken alone, B’s turn in line 1 would appear to be just a statement of fact. Within its interactional context, though, it becomes a surprising piece of information which can be commented on and elaborated. In addition, the meaning of T’s reformulation in lines 4-5 is not merely the propositional content of B’s turn plus some extra information about Pearl City being far away. An important component of the meaning of this turn is that it is used to index T’s surprise at B living so far away, with this surprise providing the basis for B to provide the additional surprising information that she usually gets up very early in the morning.

As the segment continues, T asks a question and provides a candidate answer in lines 12-13. This can be heard as a correction invitation, but rather than correct the candidate answer, B confirms it in line 14 by just saying “yeah.” In line 16, T comments on the fact that B comes such a long distance by bus by saying “from Pearl City” with rising intonation, in a manner that, again, hearably indexes surprise. B again confirms this and laughs in line 17, with her laughter showing her own orientation to this information being surprising. T laughs and says “god” in line 18, in overlap with which P again indexes her surprise with another “wow” token. The facts that B lives far away, that she gets up early in the morning, and that she travels a long distance by bus in order to get to school are all pieces of information that the participants take to be surprising and capable of being commented on. Retroactively,
an important part of the meaning of B’s initial turn can be argued to be its function in introducing such surprising information as a topic for a fair amount of talk.

The meaning of any particular turn at talk is something which can be seen, to some extent at least, as emerging from its interactional context. In addition, when it comes to what Oliver calls “NNS error turn(s)” that are followed by ‘corrective recasts,’ the type of error that the NNS makes may also emerge from the interaction. That is, the ‘corrective recast’ itself may play a role in determining what the actual error is. Given that much of the descriptive research on recasting investigates the types of error (e.g., phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic) that recasts are likely to follow (e.g., Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997), and given that much of the experimental research focuses on particular structures (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; Leeman, 2000; Long, et al., 1998), that the identification of error type may sometimes depend on the ‘corrective recast’ itself can also be argued to be problematic for research on recasting within the interactionist paradigm.

This chapter focuses on these problems. The next section looks at cases in which one aspect of the meaning, the propositional content, of an “NNS error turn” followed by a ‘corrective recast’ is ambiguous, with part of the ambiguity being eliminated by the ‘corrective recast.’ The following section then looks at cases in which the ambiguity of the NNS turn has an impact on whether what follows can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ The final section then looks at cases in which a different type of ‘corrective recast’ could have changed the type of error that the NNS has made.
Emergence of Meaning

In segment (7.2), one of the NNS participants asks the NS, M, a question about Valentine’s Day, though it is ambiguous just what she is asking.

(7.2)
[tape 5, 30; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
5 H: is .h (0.4) my topic ise: .h uh .h
6 how often do you Valenti:ne Days
7 mean.
8 (0.4)
9 H: what="
10 M: =the meaning of Valen[tine’s Day?
11 H: { (yeah yeah
12 yeah)

After displaying some difficulty in line 5, H asks her question in lines 6-7, which is “how often do you Valentine Days mean.” This is non-target-like to the extent that it is ambiguous just what the question is. It could be, for example, a question about how often M celebrates Valentine’s Day, or a question about what the meaning of Valentine’s Day is for M. There is no immediate response and H begins to self-initiate repair in line 9. However, before H has the opportunity to reformulate her question, M reformulates part of it in line 10. In this turn, M can be heard to be both checking the meaning of H’s question and displaying what he takes her to be asking. Even before M’s reformulation is complete, H confirms it in lines 11-12.

M’s turn in line 10 can be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ for at least two reasons. First, it corrects “Valentine Days” to “Valentine’s Day.” Second, it provides a target-like, though elliptical, version of H’s question. What M says, “the meaning of Valentine’s Day,” can be heard as an elliptical version of the complete question, “What’s the meaning of Valentine’s Day?” However, that this is indeed the question that H has asked is something which is established in the interaction retroactively through M’s reformulation in line 10 and H’s confirmation of the reformulation in lines 11-12. Using the coding criteria in Oliver (1995), M’s turn
does indeed reformulate “the syntactic structure of the NNS error turn” (p. 468), but rather than maintaining “the central meaning” (p. 468), it would seem to be determining just what that “central meaning” is. If, hypothetically, M said in line 10, “how often do I celebrate Valentine’s Day,” and H confirmed this, “the central meaning” of H’s question would have been completely different.

Something similar happens in segment (7.3), in which the NS participant, T, is talking about certain aspects of Hawaiian history, while one of the NNS participants, F, can be heard orienting to her own knowledge of what T is talking about.

(7.3)
[tape 1, 215; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; P, NNS, female]
4 T: cuz Hawaii used to be: not (. ) it
didn’t use to be a part of the US.
right,
0.6
8 T: and then: (0.3) it used to be:
Hawaii.
10 F: [right.
11 P: [mm-hm:
12 T: Hawaiians used to live there an’=
13 F: =not belong (. ) United States
14 T: [it didn’t ( .)

In lines 4-6, 8-9, and 12, T is discussing the fact that Hawai‘i existed as an independent nation before being annexed by the United States. F can be heard orienting to her own knowledge of this in line 10, when she confirms what T has been saying, and line 12, when she formulates what he has been saying as “not belong United States.” As discussed in chapter six, T’s turn in lines 14-15 can be heard as a confirmation of F’s explicit formulation of what until that point has been left implicit. Also, given that F’s turn is non-target-like, but T’s turn is target-like, and given that they seem to express the same propositional content, or at least that the two turns have the same content words and a negator, T’s turn can also be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ according to typical coding criteria.
However, F’s turn in line 13 can also be heard so that it expresses propositional content quite different from what T says in lines 14-15. F’s turn is non-target-like for a few different reasons. It is missing the definite article before “United States.” It is also missing the obligatory preposition “to.” There is no definite verb, which results in a lack of tense marking. (There is also no subject, but perhaps this could be considered to be target-like ellipsis.) In the ‘corrective recast,’ all of these are corrected, with “not belong” being replaced by “didn’t belong,” marking the verb as being past as well as negative, and implying, by contrast, that Hawai’i now does belong to the United States. Lacking tense marking, though, the propositional content of F’s turn is ambiguous and could also be heard as something such as, “Hawai’i doesn’t belong to the United States.” T’s turn eliminates this ambiguity.

Looking at F’s turn as possibly being an assertion that Hawai’i does not belong to the United States now also casts what T says prior to line 13 in an interesting light. In lines 4-5, he says, “it didn’t use to be a part of the US,” while in lines 8-9, he says, “it used to be Hawaii.” These statements imply that Hawai’i is now “a part of the US” and is no longer the nation/kingdom of Hawai’i. What he says in line 12, “Hawaiians used to live there,” is especially interesting given that, in fact, Hawaiians still live in the Hawaiian Islands and that this interaction takes place in Honolulu, or “here,” rather than “there.” By saying “used to” and by using the distal deictic term “there,” T rhetorically separates the nation/kingdom of Hawai’i that he is talking about from the state of Hawai’i that belongs to the United States and which is where the participants are now. I am not accusing T of intentionally being an apologist for U.S. imperialism, but there are presuppositions in what he says that are absent from what F says in line 13. One result of T’s reformulation in lines 14-15 is to impose those presuppositions onto F’s turn.
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If a transmutation model of communication is assumed, the question arises about what H and F actually meant. However, as argued in chapter five, this is a question that cannot be objectively answered.

**Ambiguous ‘Corrective Recasts’**

There are also cases in which the ambiguity of the meaning of an NNS participant’s turn has an impact on whether or not it can be considered to be non-target-like, with the result that it is ambiguous whether the following NS turn can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ In segment (7.4), the participants are discussing ideas about what a woman’s or mother’s role in the family is taken to be.

(7.4)
[tape 1, B112; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; P, NNS, female]
1 T: an’ so my mom would always be
2 getting rice [(.) an’ then (0.7)
3 F: [yeah
4 T: now that I’m here I’m like (0.6)
5 that is so weird that my mom always
6 got me rice right she’s like my
7 servant or something at dinner
8 (0.6) and so I stopped doing that
9 and I started getting my own rice
10 but
11 P: oh[:
12 T: [like that kind of stuff too
13 [right
14 F: [(but) like serve?
15 (0.4)
16 T: yeah like the servant (.) attitude.
17 F: oh
18 T: of women

In lines 1-2 and 4-10, T is discussing how he stopped expecting his mother to get him rice during dinner. He states that his mother was “like my servant or something at dinner” and that this is something that is “weird.” Then, in lines 12-13, T says “like that kind of stuff too right,” indicating that there may be other examples of the types of things that the mother is expected to do in some families. In line 14, F says “like
serve,” with rising intonation. Following a brief pause, T confirms this with “yeah like the servant attitude.” F’s turn here is ambiguous. She can be heard as offering “serve” as a member of the category that T has set up immediately prior to this as “that kind of stuff.” If she is using this word to mean a person who serves, a servant, then her offering is non-target-like. In this case, if the coding criteria allow for corrections of individual lexical items, then T’s turn can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ However, if she is using this word as an action, as in “like serve, clean, do laundry,” then her turn appears much more target-like, with the result that T’s turn cannot be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ even if the criteria allow for corrections of individual lexical items.

Similarly, in segment (7.5), there is what could potentially be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ of pronunciation.

(7.5)
[tape 11, 61; O, NNS, male; A, NS, female]
6 O: very (hot/hard) ha ha
7 ?: [ha ha ha
8 A: [yeah I thought that was the
9 hardest.

Prior to this segment, the participants have been talking about their experience climbing Diamond Head, which several of the NNS participants did the previous weekend on a school-sponsored activity. Part of the talk has been about the numerous steps that hikers must climb to get to the top. In line 6, O says what sounds like either “very hot” or “very hard,” though it is ambiguous which adjective he is using and, in either case, his pronunciation is non-target-like. If he is saying “hard,” and if the coding criteria allow for correction of pronunciation, then A’s “hardest” in line 9 can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ If, though, he is saying “hot,” then what A says cannot be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’
Each of these cases, segments (7.4) and (7.5), are borderline cases. If different raters code the interaction, in order to allow for the calculation of interrater reliability, these might be the types of cases about which raters disagree. However, what these cases demonstrate is that identifying an NNS turn as target-like or non-target-like may not always be a straightforward process. With a coding and counting methodology, this problem might be solved by either having raters discuss and seek agreement on the coding or throwing out such borderline cases. Such an approach may be reliable, in the statistical sense, but contrary to what sometimes appears to be assumed, it does not make the results of the coding process objective. Rather, the results of the coding process are the product of intersubjective agreement among raters. As segment (7.6) illustrates, reaching intersubjective agreement about whether a particular turn is a correction of a non-target-like form can be a concern of the participants in interaction themselves.

(7.6)
[tape 5, 190; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: oh except .h present .h uh .h (0.5)
2 they feel(ed) (0.3) mm (0.5) they
3 are feel (0.6)
4 ?: mm
5 ?: children
6 M: fear. (0.7) fear ef ee eigh ar?=
7 H: =fear? feel.
8 ?: ha ha ha [.hh
9 M: [fear?
10 H: fear-
11 (0.6)
12 ?: no feel=
13 ?: =feel=
14 ?: =feel=
15 ?: =feel
16 H: feel
17 M: feel.=
18 H: =feel yes=
19 ?: =ha [ha .h
20 M: [oh: okay (I got it) feel okay,
21 ?: mm mm::
22 (2.6)
There are two other female NNS participants in the interaction in this segment, but it was often difficult to determine who was speaking at certain times, particularly in lines 12-15. In this segment, as in many of the other segments analyzed in this study, the NNS participants are asking M questions about Valentine’s Day as part of a class assignment. H is producing talk in lines 1-3, and is displaying trouble with a particular word, which has been transcribed in line 2 as “feel(ed)” and in line 3 as “feel.” M apparently believes that the word H is trying to say is “fear” and says this word, with falling intonation, in line 6. The manner in which he says this makes it hearable as a correction of pronunciation. However, this gets no response, and after a 0.7 second pause he says “fear” again and then spells the word, with rising intonation on the last letter. Immediately, H says “fear” with rising intonation and then a word that sounds much more like “feel” with falling intonation in line 7. In overlap with the end of some laughter by one of the female NNS participants, M says “fear” again in line 9, but with less certainty, as indexed by the rising intonation. In line 10, H repeats “fear,” but cuts off with audible glottalization. Following a pause in line 11, one of the female NNS participants other-corrects M by first contradicting, “no,” and then providing a replacement item, “feel,” a pattern of other-correction discussed in chapter four. In lines 13-15, different female NNS participants repeat the replacement item “feel,” as does H in line 16. In line 17, M also repeats the replacement item, with falling intonation, which is immediately followed by confirmation by H in line 18. In line 20, in overlap with some laughter, M displays recognition that the word H was having trouble with is “feel.” Through this negotiation, the participants come to an intersubjective understanding that “fear” is not the word H was trying to articulate, which entails that M’s “fear,” articulated with falling intonation in line 6, is not a correction of H’s pronunciation. This illustrates participants doing something similar.
to what raters must do with borderline cases such as segments (7.4) and (7.5), which is to come to a negotiated agreement about whether a particular turn counts as correction.

Emergence of Error Type

Just as there are cases in which the meaning of a turn is ambiguous and a 'corrective recast' eliminates some of that ambiguity, there are cases where the type of error that makes a turn non-target-like is ambiguous and a 'corrective recast' determines just what error has been made. In other words, the type of error emerges from the interaction. This can be seen in segment (7.7), in which an NNS participant is explaining why she likes being in Hawai‘i.

(7.7)
[tape 6, 13; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
1 S: andə (0.3) notə so s:tress: (.) in
2 here? (0.8) in Japan (0.5) very-
3 (0.8) I feel very s stress
4 (0.9)
5 M: stressful?
6 S: suhtuh [stressful take a s=
7 H: [oh:
8 S: =stress=?
9 (0.7)
10 H: in Japan?
11 S: in Japan=
11 H: =then: Hawai‘i? (1.4) [no stress.
12 S: [no stress.

In explaining why she prefers living in Hawai‘i to living in Japan in lines 1-3, S says, “not so stress in here,” with rising intonation, pauses for 0.8 seconds, says “in Japan,” pauses for 0.5 seconds, and then says “very,” cutting off with audible glottalization. Following a 0.8 second pause, she appears to self-repair in line 3 by saying “I feel very stress.” After a 0.9 second pause in line 4, M offers the word “stressful” with rising intonation. This could be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ of
“not so stress,” which could be reformulated in a target-like manner as “not so stressful,” or “it’s not so stressful.” It could also be coded as a ‘corrective recast’ of “I feel very stress,” implicitly reformulating this as “I feel very stressful.” However, while target-like, such a reformulation has S asserting the rather unusual proposition that she is “stressful,” or causes others to feel stress. While “I feel very stress” is non-target-like, plausible target-like reformulations include “I feel a lot of stress (in Japan)” and “I feel Japan is very stressful.” By replacing “stress” with “stressful,” M’s ‘corrective recast’ makes the problem in S’s non-target-like turn an error of word class, of using a nominal form rather than an adjectival form. If M said, for example, “a lot of stress,” this could also be coded as a ‘corrective recast,’ but would make the problem with her non-target-like turn an error of the type of modifier that can be used to qualify a noun. Or, if M said “Japan is very stressful,” the problem would be related to the relationship between thematic role and argument structure.

Something similar can be seen in segment (7.8), in which the participants have been talking about a school-sponsored hike to the top of Diamond Head that some of them participated in.

(7.8)
[tape 11, 48; N, NNS, female; T, NS, male; A, NNS, female]
3 N: 0 I hurt 0
4 (0.4)
5 T: oh
6 A: you’re h you’re sore?

In line 3, N says, quietly, “I hurt.” In line 6, A responds to this by, apparently, starting to say “you’re hurt,” if the short outbreath transcribed by the letter “h” is taken to be the start of the word “hurt,” and then changing this to “you’re sore,” said with rising intonation. As “I hurt” is non-target-like, A’s “you’re sore” can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ With this ‘corrective recast,’ N’s turn in line 3 has two
errors: a missing copula and the wrong adjective. However, if A said “you’re hurt,”
it would mean that N’s turn had only one error, the missing copula. This would also
formulate what N says in line 3 as a much more serious matter than just being
“sore.” N’s “hurt” in line 3, though, can also be heard as a verb, and could be
reformulated in a target-like manner as “I hurt myself” or “My legs hurt.” If A
used such a reformulation, the problem with N’s turn would be an error of argument
structure rather than adjective choice and/or missing copula.

Segment (7.9) illustrates one final case of the emergence of error type.\\n
(7.9)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female]
3 D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (.). hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)]
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 [sh(h)ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12 can you show

The NS participants in the conversation club wear name tags, and in line 3, D makes a
request to see A’s name by saying “hey can I show you name,” with a rather long
pause between “show” and “you.” A does not immediately respond verbally, but
something apparently happens that allows D to see her name, as D says the name in
line 5. A then draws attention to the non-target-like nature of D’s turn by saying “can
I show your,” laughing, and then saying “can you show me.” This last part, in lines
9-10, can be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ In overlap with this turn, D repeats part of
it, “can you show,” twice in lines 11-12.

Note first that one error in D’s turn in line 3 is that she says “you name”
rather than “your name.” As A uses the target like “your” in line 6, this could also
be coded as a ‘corrective recast.’ However, this is not the error that A is drawing
attention to, as she does not say, for example, “you name (laughter) your name.” In fact, she does not even say the word “name” and only says “can you show me” in the ‘corrective recast’ in lines 9-10.

Also, though, with the ‘corrective recast’ in lines 9-10, which, as argued in chapter six, is taken as correction of language form by the participants themselves, the error that attention is being drawn to is an error related to the argument structure of the verb “show.” The target-like request is not “can I show your name,” but rather, “can you show me your name.” However, A could also have corrected the grammar of the request by saying, for example, “can I show (laughter) can I see your name.” Such a correction would have preserved the argument structure of D’s request while replacing the verb “show” with a verb that takes such an argument structure. If A made such a correction, the problem that attention was drawn to would be an error of lexical choice.

Conclusion

The purpose of the last three chapters has been to illustrate certain problems with the approach taken to the study of interaction within the interactionist paradigm. More specifically, the purpose of chapters six and seven has been to focus on certain problems with the use of a coding and counting methodology in research on corrective recasts within this paradigm. Chapter six demonstrated that, while ‘corrective recasts’ may be a particular type of input, turns that can be so coded do not form a functional category. On the one hand, many ‘corrective recasts’ do not function as correction, while on the other, those which do function as correction, or other-correction of language form, may have various other functions as well. The multiple functions of ‘corrective recasts’ can only be discovered by analyzing specific examples of turns...
that can be so coded within their interactive contexts. With the coding and counting methodology, aspects of sequential organization are used to identify 'corrective recasts,' but upon identification they are extracted from the interaction and treated as equivalent to every other 'corrective recast.'

This chapter has focused more on possibly borderline cases, but the problems that have been discussed strike at the heart of the coding and counting methodology, that is, at the criteria that are used to identify 'corrective recasts' in the first place. There are cases in which it is ambiguous whether there is an error, which results in ambiguity with regard to whether there actually is a 'corrective recast.' There are also cases in which the number and type of error(s) depend on the 'corrective recast' itself. This raises problems for research which investigates the types of error that are likely to be followed by 'corrective recasts,' as well as for research which investigates whether 'corrective recasts' are more likely to follow turns containing only one error than turns containing multiple errors.

Finally, there are serious problems with the conceptualization of meaning that is often used in the criteria for identifying 'corrective recasts.' In this conceptualization, meaning is seen as simply propositional content and is taken to be encoded in each particular turn. This is the same conceptualization found in research within the interactionist paradigm on negotiation of, or rather, for, meaning, the idea that the meaning of a particular turn or utterance exists inside the speaker's head, is encoded into language, and then transmitted to the hearer's head to be decoded. This conceptualization allows the meaning of an NNS turn containing one or more non-target-like forms to be maintained in the 'corrective recast' that follows. One problem with this is that meaning is more than propositional content. The function or functions of a particular turn can also be argued to be an important component of meaning.
Another problem, as illustrated in this chapter, is that even the propositional content of meaning, rather than being encoded in a particular turn, is something that emerges through interaction. The meaning of a particular turn is the product of negotiation and renegotiation on the part of the participants. Even when the meaning of a turn is limited to propositional content, there are cases in which the 'corrective recast' plays an important role in determining just what the propositional content of a particular "NNS error turn" (Oliver, 1995, p. 468) actually is.

While chapters six and seven have focused on turns that can be coded as 'corrective recasts,' whether or not treated by participants as corrective, the next three chapters focus on cases in which the participants orient to a turn as having a corrective function, or turns that may be labeled as *other-correction of language form*. 
CHAPTER 8
THE INTERACTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF
OTHER-CORRECTION OF LANGUAGE FORM

This chapter investigates the interactive accomplishment of other-correction of language form through analysis of both the sequential and intra-turn organization of cases which not only could be coded as 'corrective recasts,' but also appear to be oriented to by participants as having a corrective function. As discussed in chapter two, roles such as NS and NNS appear to be omnirelevant in the interaction in the conversation club. At times, this involves an orientation to English as a language which the NNS participants have an imperfect command of. As discussed in chapter four, part of this orientation can be seen in the way that participants sometimes orient to language form as a source of trouble in need of repair. The first section of this chapter also illustrates this orientation through the analysis of cases of self-correction of language form and cases in which NNS participants appear to invite correction of or appeal for help with language form. The next section then illustrates different types of sequential organization of the interaction in which other-correction of language form occurs. As with other-correction of content, this often involves invitation of correction. The third section then analyzes the organization of the correction turns themselves. This intraturn organization was in at least one important respect found to be somewhat different from the organization of correction turns related to content that were discussed in chapter four. The fourth section then illustrates how the sequential organization and the intraturn organization fit together as participants interactively accomplish other-correction of language form. What happens following other-correction of language form is then discussed in chapter nine.
Orientation to Language Form

It was argued in chapter two that roles such as NS and NNS are omnirelevant in the interaction that takes place in the conversation club. In other words, while these roles are not always relevant, they are always available for the participants to orient to. Part of the argument was based on particular participant behavior, such as vocabulary teaching and recourse to the L1 of the NNS participants. In addition, in chapter four, it was argued that difficulties with the language are often taken by participants to be the underlying cause of trouble which is targeted for repair. This section discusses two additional ways that the role of NNS is relevant through an orientation on the part of the participants to language form. This same orientation can also be seen in the cases of other-correction of language form discussed in the next section.

Self-correction of language form. It is not unusual for participants to self-correct some aspect of language form, as can be seen in segment (8.1).

(8.1)
[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; P, NNS female]
1  T: yeah but we have okay so a:nts,
2   (0.6) geckos:, cockroaches:, (0.8)
3   what else.
4   (0.6)
5   P: mouse mice. [(xxx)
6   T:  [no. no mice.
7   P: oo
8   (0.5)
9   T: no mice.

In this segment, the participants have been discussing the various life forms that inhabit T's room. In lines 1-3, T gives a three-part list followed by "what else," an indication that the list is incomplete. In line 5, P suggests another addition to the list, but T rejects this addition in lines 6 and 9. Each of the members of T's three-part list are stated in the plural form, "ants," "geckos," and "cockroaches." There is something else that is interesting to note about this list with regard to the three
allomorphs of the regular plural morpheme, which is that this list is not only an incomplete list of the creatures that inhabit T’s room, but also a complete list of the three different realizations of the regular plural -s morpheme, the voiceless alveolar fricative in “ants,” the voiced alveolar fricative in “geckos,” and the syllabic allomorph in “cockroaches.” When P makes her suggested addition to the list, she first uses the singular form “mouse,” but immediately self-corrects this to the irregular plural form “mice.” In his rejection of this addition, T also uses the irregular plural form. In her self-correction, P displays orientation to form by treating the singular form “mouse” as inadequate and in need of correction. Finally, even though T rejects this addition to the list, it makes a nice addition to the list of English plural forms, adding an irregular plural to the list of allomorphs of the regular plural morpheme.

This orientation to language form can also result in a target-like form being changed to a non-target-like form, as illustrated in segment (8.2).

(8.2)
[tape 5, 505; H, NNS, female]
1  H: many people: .h mm (0.8) a many
2   people: (0.6) uhn (0.5) don’t
3   know:

In this segment, which comes from talk about the possibly confusing nature of the Seoul subway system, H says “many people,” briefly inhales, produces a filled pause, and then pauses for 0.8 seconds. She then reformulates “many people” as “a many people,” pauses again, produces another filled pause, pauses once more, and finally continues the sentence she is constructing by saying “don’t know.” In grammatically modifying the subject of the sentence she is producing by adding the indefinite article, H displays an orientation to form, but also ends up producing something which is non-target-like.
There are also instances of self-correction which are more interactive in nature, such as in segments (8.3) and (8.4).

(8.3) 
[tape 6, B108; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male] 
1  H: .h uh you: understand they?
2  (0.9)
3  M: they?
4  H: uh them.
5  (0.4)
6  H: understand them?

In segment (8.3), H produces the non-target-like form "understand they," which is not immediately responded to, resulting in a 0.9 second pause in line 2. In line 3, M initiates repair by repeating "they" with rising intonation. In attempting to complete the repair, H self-corrects by changing "they" to "them" in lines 4 and 6. As discussed in chapter four, H can be heard as treating language form as the source of the trouble targeted by M for repair. The same type of thing happens in segment (8.4). After L says "I'm children," M initiates repair in line 14 by saying "huh" with rising intonation. L then self-corrects by saying "I'm a children." This is still non-target-like, but if a target-like formulation of L's turn in line 12 is assumed to be "I'm a child," then L has successfully corrected one of the two errors in that turn.

Even though there is only one speaker, segment (8.5) also illustrates how self-correction can be interactive.

(8.5) 
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female] 
27 L: .h ha ha but- I already (1.5) aunt
28  (1.8) I'm already aunt ((clear one-
29  word-at-a-time articulation)) (0.6)
30  aunt?
In line 27, L says "I already aunt." As she says this, though, she displays some difficulty, producing a rather long 1.5 second pause between "already" and "aunt."

Following a slightly longer pause in line 28, L reformulates this as "I'm already aunt," which is articulated one word at a time, making it a hearably careful articulation. By changing "I" to "I'm," L once again corrects one of the errors in what she initially says, though "I'm already aunt" remains non-target-like.

The interactive nature of this self-correction can be seen in (8.5α), which displays the same data in a slightly different format, with pauses that follow a hearably complete turn which is not responded to in their own lines.

(8.5α)
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female]
L: .h ha ha but- I already (1.5) au:nt
(1.8)
L: I'm already aunt ((clear one-word-at-a-time articulation))
(0.6)
L: aunt?

After L has said "I already aunt," her turn is hearably complete. However, it gets no response, resulting in a 1.8 second pause. L’s self-correction can be heard as a response to this lack of response. Finally, she does something similar in saying "aunt" with rising intonation, which follows another lack of response.

Segment (8.6) shows the most interactive instance of self-correction of language form found in the data.

(8.6)
[tape 6, 30; E, NNS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
13 E: [thirty]:  [(0.4) thou:and?]
14 S: [thirty] (0.5) [thousand]
15 (0.8)
16 M: thirteen thousand?
17 E: [thirty: thou [s:a:nd,
18 S: [(mm m) (0.7)] [(thir) thirty
19 E: thirty.
20 S: (thir[ty)
21 M: [thirty. [thirty thousand. =
In this segment, E is trying to answer a question about how much her electronic dictionary cost by giving the price in yen. She first says “thirty thousand” in line 13, which M understands as “thirteen thousand” in line 16. The confusion over whether E is trying to say “thirty thousand” of “thirteen thousand” is cleared up in lines 17-25, with M displaying his understanding that it is “thirty thousand” in lines 21 and 25. However, E is not finished and adds “fifteen fifty hundred” in lines 26-27, which M understands as “five hundred” in line 28. Following a brief pause in line 29, E tries to self-correct this, eventually reformulating it to “thirty fifty thousand” in line 32. Following a 0.9 second pause and some laughter, E self-correts this again to the target-like “thirty-five.” This is understood as an elliptical version of “thirty-five thousand” by M in lines 39-40. E then repeats “thirty-five” in line 41. Throughout this segment, another NNS participant, S, provides help in lines 14, 18, 20, 22, and 31. All three participants, E through her repeated attempts at self-correction, S through the assistance she provides, and M through displays of his changing understanding of
what E has said, can be heard as orienting to a particular aspect of language form, namely, how to state multidigit numbers in English.

Inviting correction. In chapter four, it was argued that other-correction of content in the data is often invited. NNS participants can also be heard inviting correction when it comes to language form, as in segment (8.7).

(8.7)

[tape 5, 513; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
7 H: yes become (.) another line.
8 M: oh[
9 [: [mm:=
10 H: =come? com:e
11 [: "come"  
12 H: become?
13 M: become (. ) [mm-hm
14 H: [(yes)
15 (and) (0.4) another line make

In this segment, H is talking about how the subway system in Seoul is becoming more difficult to understand through the construction of new lines. In line 7, she says “become another line.” She displays uncertainty with this formulation, though, and says “come” twice in line 10, the first time with rising intonation and the second time with an elongation of the final nasal. In line 12, she says “become” again, this time with rising intonation. In displaying uncertainty over which lexical item to use, “come” or “become,” and in her use of rising intonation in lines 10 and 12, H can be heard as inviting correction of her choice of lexical item. Another way to put this is that she can be heard as appealing for help in choosing the correct verb. M responds in line 13 by repeating “become,” thus confirming her verb choice in lines 7 and 12. Note that, just as self-correction may result in a non-target-like form, an NS may also confirm a non-target-like form, as “become another line” would not appear to be target-like.
In segments (8.8) and (8.9), the NNS reuses the form that has been confirmed by the NS.

(8.8)
[tape 1, 313; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
37 F: front door (0.4) and upstairs is
38 (. .) it is (0.8) a: landlord?
39 {{deliberate pronunciation}} (. .)
40 landlord?=
41 T: =yes
42 (0.5)
43 F: mom and landlord's daughters

In segment (8.8), F invites correction of the lexical item “landlord.” She first displays difficulty finding this word, pausing 0.8 seconds before saying “a landlord.” She also elongates the indefinite article and the second syllable of “landlord.” Her pronunciation of the word the first time sounds very deliberate, as if it is a word that she is unsure of, and she articulates it twice, each time with rising intonation. In response, T confirms the word by simply saying “yes” in line 41. Then, following a 0.5 second pause, F reuses the word, this time without indications of difficulty, as she continues her talk in line 43.

In segment (8.9), S also invites correction of a lexical item. She says “army” in line 6, but ends it with audible glottalization. She then says “arm” and the sound “m,” both of which she cuts off, again with audible glottalization. M then confirms the word by saying “the army” in line 7 and S reuses the word, without any display of difficulty, as she continues her talk in line 8. One thing that is interesting here, though, is that “army and woman” is a rather strange collocation, outside a discussion of, perhaps, the Trojan War. This segment comes from talk in which S is relating the
Valentine story that she got from the internet. A major plot element of the story is that a priest, against the king’s orders, marries men and women together, with the result that the men do not want to go fight in the king’s war. On the basis of this, it would seem that a more appropriate lexical item for S to use in line 8 would be “soldier” or “warrior,” rather than “army.”

**Letting it pass.** In segments (8.7) and (8.9), the NNS participant seems to be more oriented to language form than is the NS participant, with the NS confirming a lexical item which, in the context, does not seem to be correct. That participants are not always oriented to form can also be seen in segment (8.10).

(8.10)  
[tape 5, 137; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  E: if you have a (. ) girlfriend, what 
2   do you do Valentine Day? 
3  (0.7) 
4  M: oh: (0.7) maybe buy something for 
5   her, 
6  E: [oh: 
7  M: [like buy maybe a ca- candy: 
8  E: [oh: mm: 
9  M: [some candy chocolate, (0.7) 
10    flower:s, 
11  E: [present mm[: 
12  M: [yeah some kind of 
13    present. Valentine’s present.

In her question in lines 1-2, E uses the non-target-like form “Valentine Day” rather than the target-like form “Valentine’s Day.” However, there is no orientation to form on the part of either E or M. For example, E does not display any difficulty with her use of “Valentine Day” and M responds by answering the question in lines 4-5, 7, 9-10, and 12-13.

However, M can be argued to treat E’s question as problematic in another sense. Rather than answer immediately, M begins his answer following a 0.7 second pause. He then prefaces his answer with a change-of-state token, which is followed by
another 0.7 second pause. Heritage (1998) has argued that using the change-of-state token “oh” to preface answers to questions indicates a problem with the question, such as the answer being obvious or already given. Such problems force the answerer into an unexpected refocusing of their attention, which is indexed by the change-of-state token. In the talk prior to segment (8.10), M has already mentioned that people give such things as flowers and candy to their girlfriend or boyfriend on Valentine’s Day, so in general terms this question has already been answered. In addition, M has also mentioned that he does not have a girlfriend, so E could be considered to be behaving insensitively in drawing attention to this fact. With the pause in line 3, the change-of-state token, and the additional pause in line 4, M may be orienting to the question as problematic, but not because of anything that has to do with language form. Letting problems with language form pass seems to be quite common in the data, in spite of the possible omnirelevance of roles such as NS and NNS.

Doing being an NNS. In self-correcting language form and in appealing for help by inviting correction of particular lexical items, the NNS participants can be heard to orient to the role of NNS in the interaction. As discussed in chapter two, this role is constituted, in part, as involving imperfect command of English. NNSs may make mistakes when they use the language, mistakes which they may attempt to self-correct. They may also appeal for help from the NS participants, who are constituted as having superior command of English. In their roles as NS and NNS, the participants sometimes, though not always, orient to language form. This is explored further in the next section on other-correction of language form, which itself is often invited and which may occur in conjunction with self-correction.
Sequential Organization of Other-correction of Language Form

Ten fairly clear instances of other-correction of language form, in which the participants can be heard as orienting to a particular turn as functioning, at least in part, as correction, were identified in the data, along with a handful of somewhat ambiguous cases. The sequential organization of the interaction within which each of these instances of other-correction is found is analyzed in detail in this section.

Correction invitation. As with several of the instances of other-correction of content analyzed in chapter four, other-correction of language form often appears to be invited. By inviting correction, constraints on other-correction, possibly related to such things as face concerns, may be relaxed. This is well-illustrated by segments (8.11) and (8.12), which involve the same participants, occur within a few minutes of each other, and even involve the same form, a particular lexical item.

(8.11)
[tape 5, 41; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 S: n:o: he's a: (0.9) uh (2.7) I don't
2 know=
3 M: ==o:==
4 S: =fath father?
5 M: oh: yeah yeah [yeah
6 S: [puri?
7 M: oh the priest?
8 S: priest?
9 M: yeah

(8.12)
[tape 5, 70; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 S: but (0.7) this fah- father pris?
2 M: yeah priest
3 S: priest (1.0) mm:: ((ends with
4 creakiness)) (1.7) (sink some uh)

Both of these segments are told during the Valentine story analyzed at length in chapter two. Prior to segment (8.11), M has suggested that the hero of the story was in love with somebody. In line 1, S contradicts this, but then explicitly indicates that she does not know how to categorize the hero by saying "I don't know." That her
difficulty in categorizing him is language-related, that it results from uncertain knowledge of the correct lexical item, can be seen in her behavior in lines 4 and 6. In line 4 she attempts the word “father” twice, the first time failing to say the complete word and the second time saying it with rising intonation. In line 6, she says what sounds like “puri,” apparently an attempt at the word “priest,” again with rising intonation. If this is an attempt at the word “priest,” it is a non-target-like pronunciation as it is articulated as two syllables rather than one and is missing the final [st] consonant cluster. With the rising intonation on “father” and “puri,” S indexes uncertainty as to whether these lexical items are target-like, though it is unclear whether this is uncertainty about pronunciation, meaning, or whether these are actually valid lexical items. This uncertainty can be heard as inviting correction, or even appealing for help with the lexical item from the NS. The correction is provided by M in line 7.

A few minutes later, in segment (8.12), S again displays difficulty with the words “father” and “priest.” She makes two attempts to say “father,” the first of which is incomplete, and then says “pris” with rising intonation. Assuming that her target is “priest,” her pronunciation is much more target-like than it was in line 6 of segment (8.11). It is missing the final [t] consonant, but is articulated as one syllable. With the rising intonation, she can be heard again as inviting correction, or even appealing for help. The correction is provided by M in line 2. (The actual turns that perform other-correction of language form are discussed in the next section. How NNS participants respond to other-correction of language form is discussed in more detail in the section after that and in chapter nine.)

In segments (8.11) and (8.12), the NNS uses repetition and rising intonation to invite correction. In addition, the statement in lines 1-2 of segment (8.11), “I don’t
know,” can be taken as an explicit statement that the lexical item S needs is problematic. In segment (8.13), the NNS uses a question to invite correction.

(8.13)
[tape 6, B66; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
1 M: [yeah
2 S: [oh (.) what does it say Chinese
3 parsley? ((three syllables))
4 M: Chinese pars[ley yeah
5 S: ](parsley parsley.
6 ((two syllables each time))

In lines 2-3, S invites correction of a particular lexical item by asking the question, “what does it say,” and then producing the compound, “Chinese parsely,” with the second word articulated as three syllables, as displayed iconically through the spelling. This can be understood not only as part of the question, but also as a candidate model of how to say the compound. This is similar to invitations of correction of content that were analyzed in chapter four, such as in segment (8.14), in which M asks a question and then produces a candidate answer.

(8.14)
[tape 4, 518; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female]
1 M: yeah (.) when is it.
2 (.) [this summer?
3 ?; [(xx)
4 Y: [no is a
5 R: [Ju- June?
6 Y: no not June. May.

In segment (8.13), the question itself is ambiguous as to whether it refers to, for example, the pronunciation of “Chinese parsely” or whether this is an actual lexical item in English. In addition to the question, S uses rising intonation with the candidate model, which again is similar to M’s use of rising intonation in segment (8.14). The question and the rising intonation together serve to invite correction, with the correction provided by M in line 4.
Statements or questions that explicitly indicate that something is problematic are not necessary to appeal for help by inviting correction, as can be seen in segment (8.12) above and in segment (8.15).

(8.15)
[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; B, NNS, female]
12 T: a:n' you [guys wanna hear-
13 F: [lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))
15 T: [yeah liza[rd.
16 B: [oh::
17 F: [lizard. yeah

In this segment, F produces the word “lizard” in a manner that is hearably tentative. This involves cutting off with glottalization after the first syllable, pausing for 0.5 seconds, and then producing it again in a manner that does not index confidence. (This can be heard on the recordings, but is captured in the transcript only to the extent that the vowels are elongated.) Her pronunciation of the first syllable is non-target-like, in that the vowel is pronounced more like [i] than like [i]. The tentativeness of the non-target-like pronunciation can be heard as an invitation of correction, with the correction provided by T in line 15.

Finally, segment (8.16) shows how subtle displays of tentativeness or problems with the language can be used to invite correction with things other than the pronunciation of individual lexical items.

(8.16)
[tape 8, 80; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female]
7 G: o:h it’s’ really looks like Keiko.
8 (1.3)
9 M: looks l(h)ike ha ha [ha
10 L: [.h you
11 [you: remi:nd
12 G: [you think so.
13 (0.5)
14 M: it might remind me of (0.4) Keiko
15 L: [°remind me of° (0.4) °(x)°
16 G: °(xxxx) mm° (0.4) [Keiko hh ha
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In lines 10-11, L appears to be reformulating what G has said in line 7. In this reformulation, she says “you” twice and then the word “remind.” The second “you” is elongated, as is the second syllable of “remind.” The possible difficulties indexed by the repetition and elongation in lines 10-11, and possibly the incompleteness of the turn, can be heard as inviting correction, which is provided by M in line 14.

As seen in the previous section, invitations of correction and/or appeals for help can be followed by confirmation rather than other-correction. There is also one interesting case found in the data in which repeated appeals for help with a particular lexical item are not responded to. This case is displayed in segment (8.17).

(8.17)
[tape 4, 208; R, NNS, female; Y, NNS, female; C, NNS, male; M, NS, male]

1 R: .hh (wait) do you speak (0.4) English in (.) at ho:me?
2 (0.7)
3 Y: no.
4 R: mm
5 Y: yeah [my my father and my mother=
6 R: but
7 Y: =ha .h never speak Engli(h)sh ha ha ha
8 C: ha ha ha ha ha
9 R: but (.) [but (.) your fah (0.3)=
10 M: [yeah (0.4) kay
11 R: =father is American:=
12 Y: =yeah is a juste (0.6) ha ha ha ha
13 ha .hh yeah just get a
14 (citilinship) yeah citi[zen what=
15 R: [mm
16 Y: =is a civilization? .h (0.6) yeah
17 just is a American ci- (0.4)
18 civilist (0.6) what is it.
19 R: (xxxxxxx)
20 (0.6)
21 Y: yeah [is a (0.3) can speak English=
22 M: [(yeah alright)
23 Y: =is a little (0.4) [just
24 R: [mm
25 (1.0)
26 R: [mm:
In lines 1-2, one NNS, R, asks another NNS, Y a question, to which Y responds, after some delay, by saying "no" in line 4. Y then goes on to account for her answer, which is that she does not speak English at home, in lines 6 and 8, giving the fact that her father and mother "never speak English" as the reason. R appears to find something problematic in Y’s answer of "no" in line 4 and starts to produce talk in line 7 by saying “but.” However, finding herself in overlap with Y, R does not immediately continue. Following Y’s explanation of why she does not speak English at home, and the laughter produced by Y and C, in lines 10 and 12 R indicates difficulty with the explanation since she is under the impression that Y’s father (actually, stepfather) “is American.”

Meanwhile, M, the one NS in this group, does not appear to be part of this interaction. Rather, he seems to be interacting with somebody outside the group, to whom his “yeah... kay” in line 11 is directed. Unfortunately, what this person says, or perhaps signals non-verbally, is not discernable in the recording. As discussed in chapter two, the participants in the conversation club form institutionally-ordained groups, the composition of which is relevant to the participants themselves, but these groups are also somewhat permeable. As in two of the cases analyzed in chapter two, M appears to have temporarily moved out of the group.

Getting back to the discussion between R and Y about Y’s stepfather, in lines 13-15 and 17-19, Y goes on to explain the apparent anomaly of an American who
“never speaks English” with his wife, Y’s mother, by stating that he is an American because he has American citizenship. As she does this, though, she displays a great deal of difficulty with the word she appears to be attempting, “citizenship.” She says what sounds like “citilinship” in line 15, “citizen” in line 15 also, “civilization” in line 17, “American ci,” with the start of the second word cut off with glottalization, in line 18, and what sounds like “civilist” in line 19. These displays of difficulty with the word that she wants can be heard as invitations for correction, but with the one NS in the group, M, apparently not participating in the interaction at the moment, no correction or help is forthcoming. This is the case even though Y appears twice to explicitly ask for correction, saying “what is” in lines 15 and 17 and “what is it” in line 19. Then, in lines 22 and 24, Y states that somebody, presumably her stepfather, is a limited proficiency speaker of English.

As Y says this, M still appears to be removed from this interaction, talking to somebody else in line 23. However, following a 1.0 second pause in line 26, M asks a question about who Y is talking about, and provides a candidate answer, by saying “who your mother” with rising intonation. Given that the talk between R and Y in lines 10 to, at least, 19 is about Y’s stepfather, M’s question and candidate answer provide further evidence that he has not been paying attention to most of the talk in this segment so far. However, rather than correct M, Y confirms in line 29 that she is talking about her mother. In lines 30-31, M reaches the conclusion that Y’s stepfather can speak Korean, which Y then confirms in line 33. The conversation continues as M reaches another conclusion in line 35, "so they speak Korean together," and then asks a question about Y’s parents in line 36 which is unrelated to language. As M reenters the interaction in this group with his question in line 28, he immediately positions himself in the participation framework as a primary participant, taking on the
interactional role that was discussed in chapter two as being an interactional pivot and, apparently, moving R into a role as peripheral participant.

At no time in this segment does Y receive the correction that she appears to be inviting. Nor does she receive a confirmation of the lexical item she is displaying trouble with, as happened in some of the cases analyzed in the previous section. Other-correction of her apparent attempts at the word “citizenship” is noticeably absent in the talk from line 15 to the pause in line 21. Further evidence that M was not a participant in the interaction in most of segment (8.17), and therefore was unavailable to other-correct, can be found in segment (8.18), which displays interaction that took place a short time after the interaction in segment (8.17).

(8.18)
[tape 4, 234; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; R, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 M: where is he your stepfather where
2 is he from.
3 (1.5)
4 Y: where’s from?
5 M: yeah=
6 Y: =Korea. (0.9) what?
7 M: your stepfather.
8 Y: my stepfather yeah Korea.
9 (0.8)
10 M: he’s from Korea?
11 Y: yeah
12 M: I thought he’s American.
13 (0.8)
14 Y: (is he) he’s got American citizen.
15 (1.3)
16 M: [oh:
17 R: [from (0.8) thirty (.)] [(years ago)
18 Y: [yeah thirty
19 years ago, yeah
20 C: mm
21 M: he got oh he got °American
22 (citizen)° [but he’s Korean.
23 Y: [mm
24 Y: yeah
25 (0.6)
26 M: oh: I thought he was American.
27 Y: is not (. ) is American but is a
In lines 1-16 of this segment, the participants discover and repair a lack of intersubjective understanding with regard to Y’s stepfather. In lines 1-2, M asks Y a question about where her stepfather is from. There is a 1.5 second pause, and then Y initiates repair by saying “where’s from” with rising intonation. M completes the repair by saying “yeah” and Y answers “Korea” in line 6. Following another pause, she initiates repair again by saying “what” with rising intonation. M completes the repair by indicating that he is asking about Y’s stepfather and Y confirms her previous answer by saying “my stepfather yeah Korea” in line 8. Following another pause, M initiates repair by seeking confirmation of the answer in asking “he’s from Korea” with rising intonation. Y confirms this in line 11, to which M responds by indicating what he takes to be the source of confusion by saying “I thought he’s American.” Following another pause, Y states “he’s got American citizen” in line 14. Here, she uses a version of the lexical item that she repeatedly indicated trouble with a few minutes earlier in segment (8.17). Her use of this lexical item is again non-target-like. Following a 1.3 second pause, M indicates that this information about Y’s stepfather is news for him with a change-of-state token. It appears that the participants have reached, through repeated repair sequences, an intersubjective understanding that had earlier been absent.

In line 17, another NNS participant, R, indexes her knowledge regarding Y’s stepfather by adding further information about how long he has had American citizenship. Y confirms this information in lines 18-19. Finally, in lines 21-22 and 26, M once more formulates what he takes to have been the source of the lack of intersubjectivity. M’s lack of knowledge that Y’s stepfather is a naturalized American citizen and the indications, when he does learn that this is the case, that this is new
knowledge for him provide further evidence that he was not a participant in the interaction in much of segment (8.17).

In chapter four, several cases were analyzed which illustrated how correction may be invited. When it comes to language form, NNS participants at times invite correction as a means of appealing for help, especially with particular lexical items. Such an appeal for help often elicits other-correction of language form, though it may also elicit confirmation, as illustrated in the previous section. When an appeal for help through an invitation of correction related to language form is not responded to, with either confirmation or other-correction, it may be noticeably and relevantly absent, as illustrated in segment (8.17).

**Problematic comprehension of NNS forms.** In other cases, a particular non-target-like form produced by an NNS, which may be an individual lexical item or a longer turn, is treated as a trouble source and targeted for repair. When this happens, other-correction of language form is sometimes found following or within the repair sequence, as illustrated in segment (8.19).

(8.19)
[tape 1, 481; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]

1 F: in my house (. ) now (0.8) my
2 roommate (0.8) left (3.3) bunch of
3 tomatoes.
4 T: oh
5 F: case of tomato (0.8) but (0.3)
6 they're (1.0) "foo"
7 (0.8)
8 T: [foo:
9 F: [(fruit) (1.2) fruit
10 T: fruit flies?
11 (0.8)
12 F: "(fruit)"
13 (1.0)
14 T: hh
15 (8.3)
16 F: rot
17 (1.0)
18 T: rot: (0.4) oh yeah (. ) they're
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In this segment, F is discussing a problem that she has had with her roommate. She gives background to the problem in lines 1-3 and 5-6, but displays trouble continuing in line 6. After she says “they’re,” apparently referring to the tomatoes that her roommate left out, she pauses for 1.0 seconds and then says, quietly, what sounds like “foo.” Following a 0.8 second pause, T initiates repair by repeating “foo.” This is, though, in overlap with more talk produced by F in line 9, who says, apparently, though it is not clear, “fruit,” pauses for 1.2 seconds, and then says “fruit” again. In line 10, T provides help, and initiates repair, by suggesting “fruit flies,” said with rising intonation. In line 12, F apparently repeats “fruit” again, this time quietly, but does not continue. Following a 1.0 second pause and an extremely lengthy 8.3 second pause in line 15, F says something completely different, the word “rot.” If her target is the adjectival form, then this is non-target-like. T does not respond immediately, resulting in a 1.0 second pause in line 17, and when he does, he does not display comprehension of what F is trying to say, simply repeating “rot” with falling intonation. Then, following a brief pause, T indexes recognition of what F is trying to say by saying “oh yeah” and then provides other-correction of language form. In her displays of trouble coming up with the lexical item she wants, including the long pauses, particularly in line 15, F can be analyzed here also as appealing for help, perhaps even inviting correction. This is help which T attempts to provide in lines 10 and 18-19. In addition, though, T orients to what F is saying as difficult to comprehend, indexing his lack of comprehension by repeating the non-word “foo” in line 8 and simply repeating “rot” with falling intonation at the start of line 18, with nothing in either case that would seem to index comprehension, before going on to
index newly arrived at recognition by saying "oh yeah." This lack of comprehension brings about an initiation of repair in line 10 and other-correction in line 19.

Segment (8.20) illustrates that other-correction in response to problematic comprehension of an NNS form can also occur when the problematic form is longer than a single lexical item.

(8.20)
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
12 L: .hh I’m [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I’m a children.=
16 M: =you’re a child?=
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [good’ (goon)=
18 L: [I’m a child.
19 G: =I have a granddaughter.

In line 14, M initiates repair and indexes a lack of comprehension by saying "huh" with rising intonation. As discussed in the previous section, L responds by self-correcting, changing "I’m children" to "I’m a children." However, this is still non-target-like. In line 16, M initiates repair by saying "you’re a child" with rising intonation. Rather than targeting a single lexical item for repair, such as by saying just "child" with rising intonation, M targets the entire sentence. This other-correction of language form is provided within an extended repair sequence that indexes M’s problematic comprehension of what L is trying to say.

It was mentioned at the beginning of this section that there were a handful of ambiguous cases of other-correction of language form. Three of these, segments (8.21), (8.22), and (8.23), also appear to involve problematic comprehension of an NNS turn.

(8.21)
[tape 1, 296; T, NS, male; B, NNS, female]
3 T: you never go to Wai{kiki really?
4 B: [yes (0.4)
5 and norse (0.4) nors:e, (0.6)
6  *(norse) norse*=
7 T: =the North Shore?=
8 B: =yes.

(8.22)
[tape 6, 213; E, NNS, female; K, NS, female]
1 E: do you want to go abroad? (.) for
2 study(y)?
3 (1.8)
4 K: do I wanna study in other
5 countries?
6 E: mm
7 (0.8)
8 K: I think it would be interesting,
9 E: mm mm
10 K: but hard.

(8.23)
[tape 6, 323; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male; K, NS, female]
13 H: we:- (1.8) .h (0.3) we two:- (0.5)
14 toon years.
15 M: two years?
16 K: oh:
17 H: (yes)
18 M: oh wow.

Each of these cases is considered to be ambiguous because it is not clear in the NNS behavior that they orient to the NS participant’s reformulation as being other-correction of language form. (That the NNS participants behave in such a way as to show an orientation to the clear cases of other-correction of language form as corrective is illustrated in the section after next.) In segment (8.21), B says what sounds like “norse” several times in lines 5-6. T initiates repair in line 7 by saying “the North Shore,” with the rising intonation indexing uncertain comprehension. If this is the name of the place that B is attempting to say, then her pronunciation of “north” is non-target-like and T’s repair-initiation could be heard as other-correction of pronunciation. However, B responds by simply confirming the place name in line 8 and it is ambiguous whether she takes T’s turn as other-correction.
In segment (8.22), E asks K the question “do you want to go abroad for study” in lines 1-2, to which K does not respond immediately. When she does respond, she does so by reformulating the question as “do I wanna study in other countries.” As in segment (8.21), she indexes her uncertain comprehension with rising intonation. In addition, as E’s “for study” is non-target-like, this could be heard as other-correction of language form, but rather than treating this as other-correction, E simply confirms the question by saying “mm” in line 6. K then goes on to answer the question in lines 8 and 10. Note here that, if K’s turn is heard as other-correction of language form, it does not seem to be the most straightforward of possible corrections. K could have, for instance, preserved much more of the structure of E’s question by reformulating it as, “do I wanna go abroad to study.”

In segment (8.23), H says “toon years” in line 14, to which M responds by initiating repair by saying “two years.” As with the previous segments, M’s use of rising intonation indexes uncertain comprehension. Again, though, rather than showing an orientation to this as correction by, for example, adjusting her pronunciation, H responds by confirming the content of M’s turn, saying, apparently, “yes.”

**Other-correction of perception.** Also related to repair is one case in which other-correction of language form appears to function as correction of an NNS participant’s perception of something that an NS has said. This case is displayed as segment (8.24).

(8.24)  
[tape 5, 60; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]
1 M: oh he married he married them?
2 (0.3)
3 S: marry dam dam?
4 M: married them?
5 S: marry them? (.) yeah.
As discussed in chapter four, S initiates repair in line 3 by attempting to repeat what M has said in line 1, saying “marry dam dam” with rising intonation. In her repetition, S displays her understanding or perception of M’s “married them.” Her turn also contains non-target-like pronunciation of the word “them.” (In the transcript, the past tense morpheme is also missing. This was transcribed in this way as it is clearly missing in S’s turn in line 5. However, there is a [d] sound, so the turn could also be transcribed as “married dam.”) In completing the repair, M takes S’s turn as indicating that she has not comprehended what he has said and he completes the repair by simply repeating “married them,” with the rising intonation possibly indexing uncertainty over whether S will comprehend. (For a different way of analyzing this rising intonation, see segment (8.41) below.) S then says “marry them” with rising intonation, adjusting her pronunciation of the word following “marry,” and then indexes her comprehension by confirming the content. In adjusting her pronunciation, S takes M’s turn as other-correction of her pronunciation in line 3. Or rather, as this earlier pronunciation is a display of her perception of what M has said, S takes M’s turn as correction of this perception.

Segment (8.25) is an interesting case for comparison.

(8.25)
[tape 5, 37; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female]
1 M: I can’t remember everything but I think he was in jail right?
2 (0.5)
3 H: jay:?
4 M: n- (.) understand jail?
5 H: [no
6 M: [prison?
7 ?: prison
8 ?: ah [(praps)
9 ?: [(m-)
10 (1.7)
11 S: prison. yes.
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In line 4, H displays how she has perceived M’s “jail” in line 2 by saying “jay” with rising intonation, which also functions to initiate repair. Rather than simply repeating the word “jail,” M asks H, and perhaps other participants in the group, whether they understand the word he has used. In line 6, H responds that she does not know this word, but without even waiting for this answer, M goes into vocabulary instruction, providing a synonym for “jail,” using rising intonation which indexes his orientation to the possibility that the word “prison” may also cause problems. In responding to H’s repair initiation with vocabulary instruction, M takes the problem with the word “jail” to be one of vocabulary knowledge, rather than perception. Also, there are no indications that H or the other participants take M’s turn in line 5 as other-correction of H’s pronunciation or perception of the word “jail.”

**Finding humor in a non-target-like form.** In two cases, other-correction of language form involves attention being drawn to a non-target-like form as a source of humor or something to be laughed at. In the first case, segment (8.26), it is ambiguous whether the source of humor is the non-target-like form or the content of the turn containing the form.

(8.26)
[tape 5, 350; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1   H: in Korea (1.0) uh some peopl:e (.).
2       is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
3       underway.
4   (0.4)
5   S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
6   [ha ha ha ha ha
7   H: [underwear.
8   M: [underwear.
9   H: yes.

Prior to this segment, the participants have been discussing typical Valentine’s presents. In lines 1-3, H mentions a present that “some people” give in Korea. As she does this, she displays trouble finding the word for the present, with a 1.7 second
pause after the word "present" in line 2, followed by what may be an attempt at articulating the lexical item. This attempt gets no response, resulting in a 1.2 second pause, after which H attempts the word again, saying "underway." This gets no immediate response, resulting in a 0.4 second pause in line 4, after which S, another NNS, says "underwear" in smiley voice and laughs. In overlap with the laughter, H repeats "underwear" in line 7, in overlap with which M displays recognition of the lexical item by also saying "underwear" in line 8. H confirms this in line 9.

Even though she does not use rising intonation when she says "underway" in line 3, one way to analyze H's behavior is that she is appealing for help, given the difficulty she displays in finding the word. Such help is not immediately forthcoming from M. In addition, though, S's use of smiley voice and her laughter draw attention to the contrast between "underway" and the target-like form "underwear." That H orients to this as other-correction of language form, even though the corrector is another NNS participant, is evidenced by her repetition in line 7. In delaying a display of recognition of the word until line 8, M also orients to "underwear" as being the correct form.

It is ambiguous, though, as to whether the source of humor is the non-target-like form "underway," the fact that some people give underwear as a Valentine's present, or both. Segment (8.27), which is a continuation of segment (8.26), provides evidence that the source of humor is the content.

| (8.27) |
| [tape 5, 350; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female; H, NNS, female] |
| 10 M: really |
| 11 ?: ha ha ha |
| 12 ?: (hufpa) |
| 13 S: underwea(h)r?= |
| 14 H: =underwear. yes. |
In this segment, M expresses surprise in line 10, somebody laughs in line 11, and S again says “underwear.” She says this while laughing and indexes surprise through the use of rising intonation. The source of humor here appears to be the fact that some people give “underwear” as a Valentine’s present.

Segment (8.28) displays a case where it is much clearer that the source of humor is an NNS participant’s non-target-like form, rather than the content.

(8.28)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
1 D: uh- uh: I forgot you name (. ) is
2 (1.8)
3 D: hey can I (. ) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (. ) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (. )
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 sh(h) ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12 [can you show
13 T: [ha ha ha

As discussed elsewhere, D makes an indirect request to see A’s nametag in line 1.

When this gets no response, she makes a more direct request in line 3 and, apparently, something happens that allows her to see the nametag, as she says the name in line 5. D does not do anything to invite correction or appeal for help. Then, in line 6, A orients to the non-target-like nature of “can I show you name” as humorous by repeating part of it and laughing. In overlap with this, D also orients to the humor, or perhaps to embarrassment, by also laughing. A then provides a target-like reformulation, which D takes as other-correction of language form, as evidenced by her double repetition of “can you show” in lines 11-12. (The structure of A’s other-correction will be analyzed in more detail in the following section.)
Correction of form or content? In segment (8.26), it was ambiguous whether the source of humor was form or content. Segment (8.29), which was analyzed in chapter four, is ambiguous with regard to whether the correction is of language form or content. This is one of the handful of ambiguous cases mentioned at the beginning of this section.

(8.29)
[tape 4, 195; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 M: how old is your daughter now?
2 (1.1)
3 Y: [(nineteen)
4 C: [nine months.
5 (0.3)
6 Y: nineteen=
7 C: =ninetee:n months.
8 M: oh nineteen months.

As discussed in chapter four, it would be rather strange for C not to know whether his daughter is nine months or nineteen months old. By orienting to Y’s turn in line 6 as other-correction of language form rather than content, the participants avoid the implication that C is an uncaring father. This possible orientation is accomplished by the extra stress placed on the second syllable of “nineteen” by all three participants.

Relative occurrence and relative frequency of other-correction. In some descriptive research on recasts, such as Izumi (1998), the relative frequency of ‘corrective recasts’ has been calculated as the frequency of non-target-like NNS turns followed by a ‘corrective recast’ as a proportion of the total number of non-target-like NNS turns. An unstated assumption of such an approach is that each non-target-like turn creates an environment of relevant occurrence for a ‘corrective recast’ (see Schegloff, 1993). However, it is much more plausible that not every non-target-like turn creates a sequential environment in which other-correction of language form is relevant. One way in which such an environment may be created in the interaction is through the invitation of correction which may function as an appeal for help. In fact,
in segment (8.17), it is because such an environment of relevant occurrence of other-correction has been created by repeated invitations of correction that its absence becomes noticeable. Other sequential environments found in the data in which the occurrence of other-correction becomes relevant are during or immediately following certain repair sequences in which the cause of trouble is taken to be related to language and when a non-target-like form is oriented to as humorous.

**Doing being an NNS.** These cases in which certain turns function as other-correction of language form, as will be demonstrated below, provide further illustration of how participants orient to roles as NS and NNS in the interaction. The role of NNS is constituted as involving the making of language errors, while the role of NS is constituted as involving the ability to discover such errors and correct them. It should also be noted, though, that the other-correction in segments (8.26) and (8.29) was provided by NNS participants, indicating that not every member of the NNS category is taken by participants as having equal command of the language. Some NNS participants have sufficient command of the language to correct other participants.

**Structure of Correction Turns**

The turn-internal structure of other-correction of language form was in one way quite different from the turn-internal structure of other-correction of content, in that contradiction tokens, which were not uncommon in other-correction of content, were not found in turns functioning as other-correction of language form. In order to illustrate how correction turns related to language form are structured, this section analyzes the individual correction turns in the segments discussed in the previous section.
**Replacement item.** Regardless of other features of other-correction of language form, correction turns always contain a replacement item. This is to some extent tautological, given that none of the instances of other-correction of language form were found to contain a contradiction token and it is difficult to imagine how a turn could function as other-correction if it contained neither a contradiction nor a replacement item. Segment (8.30) (segment (8.16) above) is an example.

(8.30)
[tape 8, 80; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
10 L: .h you
11 [you: remi:nd
12 G: [you think so.
13 (0.5)
14 M: it might remind me of (0.4) Keiko

In this segment, L’s non-target-like, and apparently incomplete, “you you remind” is replaced by M’s “it might remind me of Keiko” in line 14. This replacement involves a change in the argument structure of the verb, the addition of the modal verb “might,” and a completion of the sentence with the addition of the preposition phrase “of Keiko.” This example is fairly simple in that it does not contain any features which emphasize the contrast between the non-target-like turn and the correction or which are related to other functions of the correction turn. As will be illustrated below, though, the other instances of other-correction of language form do contain such features.

**Emphasizing contrast.** One way in which the contrast between a non-target-like form and the target-like form in the correction is emphasized is through the use of stress, as shown in segments (8.31) (segment (8.15) above) and (8.32) (segment (8.26) above).

(8.31)
[tape 1, 430; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
13 F: lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))
In segment (8.31), the first syllable of “lizard” in line 15 is stressed, which emphasizes the contrast between the target-like pronunciation [I] in line 15 and the non-target-like pronunciation [i] in line 13. In segment (8.32), the third syllable of “underwear” is stressed in line 5, which emphasizes the contrast between the non-target-like “way” and the target-like “wear.”

This emphasis of contrast is accomplished somewhat differently in segment (8.33) (segment (8.19) above).

In this segment, the non-target-like, in this context, “rot” is replaced by “they’re rotten” in line 19. The first segment of the second syllable of “rotten” is pronounced as the voiceless alveolar stop [t], rather than as, for example, a glottal stop. Also, the second syllable is pronounced as containing a vowel, rather than a syllabic nasal. While this may be an unusual pronunciation, it has the effect of making T’s “rotten” hearable as being deliberately and clearly articulated, in a manner that makes it sound as if it has been intentionally modified to make it more easily understood by someone with limited proficiency in English, or as what has been called foreigner talk.
It also has the effect of emphasizing the contrast between the one-syllable form “rot” and the target-like two-syllable adjective form “rotten.”

Finally, segment (8.34) (segment (8.28) above) shows another way in which this contrast is emphasized.

(8.34)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NNS, female]
3 D: hey can I (. ) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (. ) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
8 (xxxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 sh(h)ow m(h)e

In this segment, the replacement item, “can you show me,” comes in lines 9-10. Prior to this, in line 6, A repeats, with a slight modification, part of the non-target-like form used by D, saying “can I show your.” This repetition of the non-target-like form followed by the replacement item has the effect of placing the two forms sequentially within the same turn, which emphasizes the contrast between the non-target-like and the target-like argument structure. This is similar to the type of ‘corrective recast’ used deliberately by the teacher after certain types of grammatical errors produced by students in Doughty and Varela (1998), which involved a repetition of the non-target-like form with rising intonation followed by a target-like reformulation. The repetition of the non-target-like form in segment (8.34) does not involve rising intonation, but the contrast that is produced is similar.

**Confirmation of content.** As discussed in chapter six, turns which function as other-correction of language form may have other functions as well. In the conversation club interaction, one such function that was found was the confirmation of the content of the turn containing the non-target-like form, as in segments (8.35), (8.36), and (8.37) (segments (8.15), (8.12), and (8.13) above, respectively).
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The correction turn in segment (8.35) consists of the confirmation token “yeah” and the word “lizard,” with the confirmation token serving to confirm F’s contribution in line 13 as either an addition to the list of life forms that inhabit T’s room or as a synonym for gecko. The correction turn in segment (8.36) consists of the confirmation token “yeah” and the word “priest,” with the confirmation token serving to confirm that “priest” is the correct lexical item, even though the pronunciation of the word is corrected. Finally, the correction turn in segment (8.37) consists of the compound word “Chinese parsley” followed by the confirmation token “yeah,” which apparently serves to confirm that “Chinese parsley” is a lexical item in English, even though the syllabification of “parsley” is corrected. With confirmation tokens being used to confirm content, these three examples of other-correction of language form look quite different from the examples of other-correction of content containing a contradiction token analyzed in chapter four.

**Display of recognition.** Two of the instances of other-correction of language form also contain features that display recognition of what the NNS participant is trying to say. These are shown in segments (8.38) and (8.39) (segment (8.11) and (8.19) above, respectively).
In the correction turn in line 7 of segment (8.38), the replacement item “the priest” is preceded by a change-of-state token, which functions to display recognition by M of the word that S is trying to use. In this segment, S is trying to find a lexical item to label the vocation of the hero of the Valentine story. In line 4, she uses the word “father,” which M displays recognition of in line 5 with a change-of-state token followed by “yeah yeah yeah.” By saying “oh the priest” in line 7, M displays recognition that S’s “puri” is the word “priest,” a less ambiguous synonym, in this context, of “father.”

In line 18 of segment (8.39), T at first displays no recognition of the word that F is trying to use. He simply repeats “rot” with falling intonation. However, following a 0.4 second pause, he then does display recognition by saying “oh yeah.” This is followed by the replacement item, “they’re they’re rotten” and then the token “yeah,” which also appears to display recognition of what F is trying to say.

*Display of tentativeness.* In segment (8.38) in the previous subsection, M’s turn in line 7 is a display of recognition of the word S is trying to use, but it is also a somewhat tentative display, as indexed by the use of rising intonation. This contrasts with T’s display of recognition in segment (8.39), in which such tentativeness is not
indexed. Segment (8.40) (segment (8.20) above) also illustrates a display of tentativeness.

(8.40)
[tape 8. 5; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NNS, male]
12 L: .hh I’m [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I’m a children.=
16 M: =you’re a child?

By saying “you’re a child” in line 16, M displays his understanding of what L is trying to say in lines 12 and 15. That M initially does not understand what L is trying to say in line 12 is indexed by his use of the repair initiator “huh” with rising intonation in line 14. Following L’s self-correction in line 15, the tentativeness of M’s display of understanding is indexed by his use of rising intonation. In this segment, M moves from a display of non-understanding to a display of tentative understanding, but not to the level of non-tentativeness eventually displayed in T’s turn in segment (8.39) in the previous subsection.

The turns which function as other-correction of language form in segments (8.38) and (8.40) also function as displays of tentative recognition and/or understanding. That is, they function as what, in the interactionist paradigm, has been labeled as confirmation check (e.g., Gass, 1997). Just as turns which function as other-correction of language form may have other functions as well, such as confirmation of content, so-called confirmation checks may also have other functions, such as, in these two cases, other-correction of language form. However, as segment (8.41) (segment (8.24) above) illustrates, rising intonation can also be used with other-correction of language form which does not function as a tentative display of understanding, or a confirmation check, of the particular NNS turn which contains the non-target-like form targeted for correction.
(8.41)  
[tape 5, 60; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]  
1 M: oh he married he married them?  
2 (0.3)  
3 S: marry dam dam?  
4 M: married them?  

In line 1, using a change-of-state token and his own formulation of what the hero of the Valentine story did, M displays a newly-acquired understanding of a certain plot element of the story that S has been telling. This display of understanding is indexed as tentative through the use of rising intonation. Rising intonation is also found in M’s correction turn in line 4. However, what is possibly being indexed as tentative is M’s understanding of the plot element of the story that S has been telling, the same thing that is indexed as tentative in M’s turn in line 1. In fact, the rising intonation in line 4 can be heard as a simple repetition of the rising intonation in line 1. As S’s turn in line 3 is her own tentative display of how she has heard the end of M’s prior turn, the rising intonation in line 4 cannot be heard as indexing tentativeness on M’s part as to how he understands S’s turn. (One other way in which the rising intonation can be heard to function is as tentativeness about S’s ability to understand what M is saying. See the analysis of segment (8.24) above.)

Finally, segment (8.42) (segment (8.12) above) illustrates how a display of understanding or recognition that was once tentative may become non-tentative.

(8.42)  
[tape 5, 70; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
1 S: but (0.7) this fah- father pris?  
2 M: yeah priest  

Whereas in segment (8.38), which occurred a short time prior to this segment, M displayed a tentative recognition of the word that S was trying to use by saying “oh the priest” with rising intonation, there is nothing in M’s turn in line 2 of segment (8.42) that indexes tentativeness, as it has already been established in the interaction.
that one of the words which S has been trying to use to refer to the hero of the
Valentine story is the word “priest.” The other-correction turns in segments (8.38)
and (8.42) are similar in that they both correct S’s pronunciation of the same word. A
major difference between the two turns is that one is also indexed for tentativeness,
while the other is not.

**Laughter.** As discussed in the previous section, two instances of other-
correction of language form involve attention being drawn to a non-target-like form as
a source of humor or something to be laughed at. Part of this involves the use of
smiley voice and/or laugh tokens within the correction turn, as illustrated by segments
(8.43) and (8.44) (segments (8.26) and (8.28) above, respectively).

(8.43)
[tape 5, 350; S, NNS, female]
5 S: underwea:r. {(smiley voice)}
6 ha ha ha ha ha

(8.44)
[tape 11, 120; A, NS, female; D, NNS, female]
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 sh(h)ow m(h)e

In segment (8.43), S articulates the replacement item in smiley voice. That is, her tone
of voice indicates that she is smiling even though there is no visual record of this. The
replacement item is also said with falling intonation and nothing to index tentativeness.
This is then followed by several laugh tokens. In segment (8.44), A begins laughing
while she is repeating part of D’s error. This repetition is followed by several laugh
tokens. Finally, she continues laughing while she produces the replacement item in
lines 9-10. The main thing to note here is that, while there are separate laugh tokens,
the laughter is to some extent fused with the replacement item, the correction, in both
of these segments. In segment (8.44), A laughs as she says “can you show me.” In
segment (8.43), though S does not laugh while she says “underwear,” her use of
smiley voice anticipates the laugh tokens that follow.

Summary. A major difference between other-correction of content and other-
correction of language form appears to be the absence of contradiction tokens in turns
that function as other-correction of language form. In fact, there may be confirmation
tokens, which serve to confirm content. Aside from the common absence of
contradiction tokens, the turn-internal organization of turns that function as other-
correction of language form was found to be quite varied.

Other-correction of Language Form as an Interactive Accomplishment

Problems with ‘corrective recasts’ as input. There are at least two problems
with the idea that ‘corrective recasts’ provide language learners with a particular type
of negative or corrective input. One is a problem of reliability, as discussed by
Bowerman (1987, 1988) and Marcus (1993). The other is a problem of identifying
what exactly is being corrected, or the problem of blame assignment (Grimshaw &
Pinker, 1989). The reliability problem is illustrated in segments (8.45), (8.46), (8.47),
and (8.48).

(8.45)
[tape 8, 186; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1  G: it’s so sad. ((creaky voice))
2  M: it’s sad uh ((nasalized uh))

(8.46)
[tape 6, 341; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
4  M: how long will you stay? (. ) in
5  Ha[waiti?
6  H: one month.
7  (0.5)
8  M: one month.
9  H: yes about yes.
10 M: one month more.
Repetition of what other people say is common in conversation and serves a variety of functions (see Norrick, 1987; Tannen, 1987a, 1987b, 1989). Such repetition may also involve slight changes, as in segment (8.45), in which G’s “it’s so sad” is changed by M to “it’s sad.” In this particular segment, the repetition functions as a form of agreement. In segment (8.46), M’s repetition of “one month” in line 8 functions as an answer receipt that displays his understanding of H’s answer to his question. M then makes a move to eliminate ambiguity in the answer by reformulating this as “one month more” in line 10. In segment (8.47), both G and M are talking to a third participant, an NNS. G tells the other participant to “be honest.” M then shows agreement with this request by repeating “be honest” in line 3. Finally, in segment (8.48), Y says about a certain kind of alcoholic drink that it “looks like milk” in lines 49 and 51. M initiates repair by repeating “like milk” (possibly “looks like milk”) with rising intonation in line 53. Y confirms this by saying “yeah like milk” in line 54.

If raters are coding interaction for ‘corrective recasts,’ they can achieve a high degree of interrater reliability by only coding particular turns as ‘corrective recasts’ if they follow a non-target-like NNS turn. That is, they rely on their knowledge of what
is and what is not grammatical in the language to identify 'corrective recasts.'
However, in order for language learners, either first or second, to rely on such knowledge, it would seem that they would already have to have enough knowledge to make such 'corrective recasts' unnecessary. Put another way, how can the NNS participants know that the repetitions in segments (8.45) to (8.48) are not corrections, particularly when they involve changes, such as in segments (8.45) and (8.46)? Bowerman (1987, 1988) argues that if language learners modified their grammars on the basis of slightly altered repetitions, then they would be constantly modifying their grammars even when this was not necessary. Even for more-or-less exact repetitions, how can language learners know that they do not include some subtle correction? It would seem that language learners, being language learners, do not have the knowledge necessary to distinguish 'corrective recasts' from non-corrective instances of repetition or reformulation.

Even if language learners could reliably identify certain turns as corrective feedback, there is still the problem of how they identify the error, or of to what aspect of their turn they assign the blame for making it non-target-like. As an example, consider segment (8.49).

(8.49)
[tape 1, 481; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
16 F: rot
17 (1.0)
18 T: rot. (0.4) oh yeah (.) they're
19 they're rotten ((clear t)) yeah

In this segment, F is describing the state of the tomatoes that her roommate has left out. On what basis can F decide that the problem here is that the word "rot" is the form used for the noun or verb, but "rotten" is the adjective, the form that she needs in this context? What would prevent her, for example, from deciding instead that
“rot” is not a word in English? Or from deciding that the problem is with her pronunciation of [t]?

Bowerman (1987, 1988), Grimshaw and Pinker (1989), and Marcus (1993) have drawn attention to such problems in arguing against the possibility that language learners, specifically first language learners, can benefit from corrective feedback as a source of negative evidence. Such problems can also be treated as problems for participants, to be solved by the participants themselves as they interactively accomplish other-correction of language form.

**Highlighting non-target-like forms.** When the sequential placement and the turn-internal structure of other-correction of language form are analyzed together, it becomes possible to see the different ways in which certain non-target-like forms, and the corresponding target-like forms in the correction turns, are highlighted within the interaction. Through the interaction, the participants themselves treat certain turns as corrections and collaboratively accomplish the assignment of blame to particular errors. The ten clear instances of other-correction of language form that were identified in the data are analyzed below to see how participants do this in each case. (This involves combining observations made in the previous two sections, which results in some repetition. However, it is important to see how the sequential organization of other-correction of language form and the turn-internal organization of correction turns operate together to highlight particular forms as non-target-like.)

The first instance is shown in segment (8.50).

(8.50)
[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; B, NNS, female]
12 T: a:n’ you [guys wanna hear-
13 F:     [lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14     (non-target-like pronunciation))
15 T: [yeah _liza[rd.
16 B: [oh::
17 F:      [lizard. yeah
In this segment, both F and T behave so as to highlight the first syllable of "lizard," the syllable that contains the non-target-like pronunciation of the vowel in line 13. In her first attempt to articulate the word in line 13, F articulates only the first syllable, cutting off with glottalization, and then pauses for 0.5 seconds before she articulates the entire word. This highlights the first syllable as possibly problematic. As discussed in the previous section, T articulates the word "lizard" with extra stress on the first syllable in line 15, which has the effect of emphasizing the contrast between the vowel sounds. F then articulates the word again, adjusting her pronunciation of the vowel, almost immediately after T has finished the first syllable, before he has articulated the entire word. This also has the effect of highlighting the first syllable as the part of the word that F allows T to articulate in the clear. In repeating the word "lizard," with adjusted pronunciation, immediately after T has articulated the first syllable, F can be heard taking T's turn in line 15 as other-correction of the pronunciation of the vowel in the first syllable.

In segment (8.51), a particular non-target-like form is highlighted through the difficulty the NNS has in searching for the form and the difficulty the NS has in understanding it.

(8.51)
[tape 1, 481; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male]
5 F: case of tomato (0.8), but (0.3)
6 they're (1.0) "foo" (0.8)
7 T: [foo:
8 F: [(fruit) (1.2) fruit
9 T: fruit flies?
10 (0.8)
11 F: "(fruit)" (1.0)
12 T: hh (8.3)
13 (1.0)
14 F: rot (1.0)
17 (1.0)
Through long pauses, including the 1.0 second and 8.3 second pauses in lines 13 and 15, and through her use of the non-word “foo,” which T apparently does not understand in line 8, F displays a great deal of difficulty in finding the word that she wants before she comes up with “rot” in line 16. In articulating this word, she does not display confidence that this is the word she wants, as someone might when, for example, searching for a name and then, as if by sudden insight, recalling it with a subjective feeling of certainty. The result is that the problems that F has had during her word search are not dispelled and this word itself is highlighted as being possibly problematic. In failing, at first, to recognize the word, and then displaying recognition of what it is that F is trying to say, T also highlights “rot” as a problematic form. As discussed in the previous section, T’s pronunciation of “rotten” also emphasizes the difference between the two words. F’s repetition of the word “rotten” in line 20, imitating T’s possibly unusual pronunciation, provides evidence that she takes T’s turn as providing other-correction of the word “rot.”

In segment (8.52), the uncertainty which both the NNS and the NS display plays a part in highlighting a particular problematic form.

(8.52)
[tape 5, 41; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
4 S: =fath father?
5 M: oh: yeah yeah [yeah
6 S: [puri?
7 M: oh the priest?
8 S: priest?
9 M: yeah

In lines 6, 7, and 8, both participants use rising intonation to index uncertainty or tentativeness with regard to the word S is trying to use. In line 6, the rising intonation highlights the form “puri” as possibly problematic. In line 7, the rising intonation
highlights M’s understanding of the form as “priest” as also problematic. In line 8, S responds to M’s turn by adjusting her pronunciation of the word “priest,” articulating it as one syllable and with the final [st] consonant cluster. This provides evidence that she takes his turn as other-correction of her pronunciation. Finally, in line 8, S’s use of rising intonation as she adjusts her pronunciation indexes tentativeness calling for confirmation, which M provides in line 9.

In segment (8.53), a repair sequence highlights the corrected form.

(8.53)
[tape 5, 60; M, NS, male; S, NNS female]
1 M: oh he married him married them?
2 (0.3)
3 S: marry dam dam?
4 M: married them?
5 S: marry them? (.) yeah.

As discussed above, in line 1 M is displaying his understanding of the actions of the hero of the Valentine story which S is telling. In line 3, S targets M’s “married them” as a trouble source in need of repair by saying “marry dam dam” with rising intonation. This has the effect of highlighting “married them” as something which S has difficulty comprehending. M completes the repair in line 4 by repeating “married them,” which S responds to by saying “marry them,” with adjusted pronunciation of “them,” and then confirming that this is what the hero of the story did. The form “them” is isolated as a form that S cannot at first understand, but comes to understand after M has completed the repair. Evidence that S treats M’s turn as correction of her perception is provided by her repetition in line 5 and then by her ability to confirm M’s understanding of the hero’s actions, which functions as a claim that she now comprehends M’s turn in line 1.

In segment (8.54), the NNS’s tentativeness about a certain form interacts with the NS’s lack of tentativeness to highlight it.
In line 1, S indexes uncertainty or tentativeness with regard to the form "pris" through the use of rising intonation. As seen in segment (8.52), the word "priest" has already, on the one hand, been highlighted as a problematic form for S, while, on the other, established in the interaction as one of the words that S can use to label the vocation of or to refer to the hero of the Valentine story. The lack of anything which would index uncertainty or tentativeness on M's part in line 2 has the effect of indexing that the lexical item "priest" has already been established as the correct word. S's repetition of the word, adjusting the pronunciation by adding the final [t], provides evidence that she takes M's turn as other-correction of her pronunciation.

There is nothing in S's turn, such as rising intonation, that indexes uncertainty or tentativeness as she adjusts her pronunciation. The lack of uncertainty displayed by S also indexes that "priest" has already been established as the correct word. S's continued display of uncertainty in line 1 interacts with the form's treatment as already having been established to once again bring the pronunciation of the word into focus as something to be corrected.

Segment (8.55) shows two NNSs highlighting a particular form for correction.
H first highlights the non-target-like form “underway” as possibly problematic through a word search. Following the word “present” in line 2, there is a long pause, then what may be an attempt to articulate the word she is searching for, then another long pause before the word is actually articulated. The lack of response to the first possible articulation in line 2 and the 0.4 second pause in line 4 also highlight “underway” as problematic. As discussed in the previous section, S’s extra stress on the third syllable emphasizes the contrast between the third syllables of “underwear” and “underway,” while her use of smiley voice and laughter possibly highlights the form “underway” by marking it as humorous, though the source of humor is ambiguous. H’s repetition of “underwear” in line 7 provides evidence that she takes S’s turn in line 5 as other-correction of language form.

In segment (8.56), the NNS’s question serves to highlight a form as problematic.

(8.56)
[tape 6, B66; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
2 S: oh (.) what does it say Chinese parsely? ((three syllables))
3 M: Chinese pars[ley yeah
4 S: Chinese parsley parsley. (((two syllables each time)))

The question highlights the entire compound “Chinese parsley” and is ambiguous about what is problematic, but S’s response in line 5 focuses on the syllabification of the specific word “parsley,” as S repeats the word twice, adjusting the number of syllables from three to two. This response also provides evidence that she takes M’s turn as other-correction of her syllabification. It is also interesting to note that she starts to repeat “parsley,” with the adjusted syllabification, even before M has completed the word.
In segment (8.57), it is again a repair sequence which highlights a particular form as problematic.

(8.57)
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
12 L: .hh I'm [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I'm a children.=
16 M: =you're a child?=
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [goode (goon)=
18 L: [I'm a child.
19 G: =I have a granddaughter

M's repair initiation in line 14 targets L's turn in line 12 for repair, highlighting the turn as problematic. After L self-corrects in line 15, M's more specific repair initiation, "your a child," creates a contrast between "children" and "child." His use of rising intonation indexes uncertainty or tentativeness in his understanding of what L is saying. Finally, in her response in line 18, L changes "children" to "child," indicating that she takes the non-target-like form "children" to have been the trouble source targeted for repair and M's turn in line 16 as other-correction of language form.

In segment (8.58), part of the argument structure of a verb is highlighted in the interaction.

(8.58)
[tape 8, 80; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female]
9 M: looks l(h)ike ha ha ha [ha
10 L: [.h you
11 [you: remi:nd
12 G: [you think so.
13 (0.5)
14 M: it might remind me of (0.4) Keiko
15 L: [°remind me of° (0.4) [°(x)°
16 G: [°(xxxx) mm° (0.4) [Keiko hh ha

The argument structure of "remind" is first highlighted as possibly problematic by the difficulty L displays in lines 10-11. She says "you" twice, elongating it the
second time, elongates the vowel in the second syllable of “remind,” and then does not complete her sentence, stopping her talk before reaching a hearable completion point. It is possible that she stops talking because she finds herself in overlap with G, but she does not attempt to reclaim a turn after G’s turn in line 12 is hearably complete. Following the pause in line 13, M chooses to respond to what L, not G, has said, reformulating it with a target-like argument structure and as a complete sentence. L then focuses on part of the reformulation, repeating quietly, as if to herself, only “remind me of.” This provides evidence that she takes M’s turn in line 14 as other-correction of language form.

Finally, segment (8.59) illustrates how the behavior of an NS participant highlights a particular NNS form as problematic.

(8.59)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NNS, female]
3 D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name.
4 (0.4)
5 D: Ally (.) hm
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9 A: [can you
10 [sh(h)ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12 can you show

In D’s turn in line 3, there is nothing that would highlight her request as in any way problematic. Also, as discussed above, something apparently happens that allows D to see A’s nametag, as she states the name in line 5, so the request has been fulfilled. However, in line 6, A draws attention to the non-target-like form used by D in her request by repeating part of it and laughing. This highlights the form as problematic. D’s double repetition of “can you show” in lines 11-12 provides evidence that she takes A’s turn in lines 9-10 as other-correction of language form. Finally, in her response in lines 11-12, D repeats only part of the correction, saying “can you show”
twice, indicating that what she takes to be the problem with her original turn is her use of “I” rather than “you.”

Summary. Deciding whether a particular repetition or reformulation counts as other-correction of language form is something which the participants collaboratively and interactively accomplish in different ways in particular instances. The accomplishment of blame assignment involves the highlighting through the interaction of particular forms as problematic, often even before a correction has been made. Finally, it sometimes happens that only certain components of the correction turn are focused on, with other components that could potentially be corrective being ignored, something which is discussed in more detail in chapter nine. Whether a particular turn functions as other-correction of language form is a problem for participants, as is exactly what a particular instance of other-correction of language form is a correction of. This is not something which the analyst or researcher can decide without taking the participants’ perspective into account.

Conclusion

Other-correction of language form is an interactive accomplishment. It is accomplished through the use of various resources, such as inviting correction, asking explicit questions, initiating repair when something is difficult to comprehend, using contrastive stress, and laughter. Other-correction of language form is not something that one participant, whether NS or NNS, produces on his or her own, but rather it involves work by the participants as they isolate a particular form as something to be corrected.

As illustrated in this chapter and chapter two, an orientation to language form is often displayed by participants in the interaction in the conversation club. It is
through such an orientation that the roles of NS and NNS within the interaction are in one way constituted. When the participants accomplish other-correction of language form, the role of NS is constituted as involving the ability to decide whether something related to language form is in need of correction and the ability to provide that correction. The role of NNS is constituted as involving imperfect command of the language and of being able to receive assistance from the NS participants. However, orientation to language form even within the conversation club, a place where NNS participants go in order to practice English, is of limited strength, in that non-target-like language use often does not result in such things as self- and other-correction.iii

Finally, NNS participants may also provide other-correction of language form, which along with other actions on the part of NNS participants, such as providing help in a shared L1, indicates that not all NNS participants are treated as having the same command of the language.

The next chapter focuses more explicitly on what happens following other-correction of language form. One thing that is illustrated is the limited strength of participants' orientation to language form that is displayed in how other-correction is incorporated. In addition, it is also illustrated how an error and/or a correction may at times be something that participants treat as accountable.
CHAPTER 9
INTERACTION AFTER OTHER-CORRECTION OF LANGUAGE FORM

In research within the interactionist paradigm, something that is often of interest is whether 'corrective recasts' are followed by incorporation. That is, whether NNSs respond by using the target-like corrected form in a subsequent utterance. A typical means of investigating this is to calculate the number of 'corrective recasts' which are followed by incorporation as a proportion of the total number of 'corrective recasts.' On the other hand, the details of how corrected forms are incorporated are generally not the focus of investigation. In this study, it would make no sense to calculate the proportion of instances of other-correction of language form which are followed by incorporation, given that a response involving attempted incorporation to a potentially corrective turn was one of the main pieces of evidence used to show that a particular turn was taken by participants as corrective, as shown in the previous chapter. However, it does make sense to analyze the details of how incorporation is accomplished by participants. In addition, as discussed in chapters three and four, other-correction is often followed by such interactional work as accounting for the error that is corrected. It is of interest in this study whether such accountings can be found in the data and, if so, how such accountings are put together.

This chapter explores these issues. In the first section, research on incorporation following 'corrective recasts' is briefly reviewed and critiqued, followed by analyses of the details of how incorporation following other-correction of language form is accomplished by participants in the conversation club. The second section then investigates the phenomenon of accounting for an error following other-correction of language form.
Incorporation

*Incorporation of *corrective recasts*.* In research within the interactionist paradigm, incorporation seems to be interesting as it may provide somewhat indirect evidence that *corrective recasts* do indeed provide beneficial input, in spite of the problems of reliability and blame assignment discussed in chapter eight. There is also the possibility that learning from the input provided by *corrective recasts* is facilitated by attempts at incorporation. However, the picture that emerges from research on incorporation is rather murky.

For example, Izumi (1998), by coding transcripts of interaction in NS/NNS dyads, found that when NNSs incorporated the correction in *corrective recasts*, they were more likely to use the form correctly later in the interaction than when they did not incorporate. This provides evidence that NNSs can use *corrective recasts* as a beneficial type of input and that attempts at incorporation may facilitate learning. However, in a study of teacher feedback in French as a foreign language classroom, Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998), by coding classroom interaction for various types of corrective feedback moves in addition to *corrective recasts*, found that *corrective recasts* generally did not result in attempts at incorporation and that other types of corrective feedback, such as teacher elicitation of a student’s correction, were much more likely to result in students adjusting their utterances to make them more target-like. This provides evidence that the potential corrective input available in *corrective recasts* is too implicit to be very useful. Mackey and Philp (1998), on the other hand, claim that incorporation is, in their phrase, a “red herring.” Based on coding of interaction in NS/NNS dyads, during which all non-target-like questions produced by the NNSs were recast, they found that NNSs who were developmentally ready to acquire a particular question type showed improvement on that type of
question, as measured by a posttest, regardless of whether or not they attempted incorporation. This seems to provide evidence that incorporation is not a useful indicator of whether ‘corrective recasts’ provide beneficial input and successful learning does not seem to be facilitated by attempts at incorporation.

It was argued in the previous chapter that treating a particular turn as other-correction of language form involved an orientation on the part of the participants to language form. It seems likely that when incorporation of ‘corrective recasts’ is found, its presence indicates that the NNS participants are oriented to language form. For example, Lin and Hedgcock (1996), in a study comparing the amount of incorporation of what they term “negative feedback,” which would seem to be indistinguishable from ‘corrective recasts,’ between a group of dyads composed of an NS and a highly proficient NNS of Spanish and a group of dyads composed of an NS and a less proficient NNS of Spanish, found that incorporation was much more common in the dyads containing a highly proficient NNS. There were, though, important differences between the more and less proficient NNSs besides their proficiency in Spanish. Namely, the more proficient NNSs were students studying Spanish in Spain for the purpose of becoming translators of Spanish as a foreign language teachers in the future and had studied Spanish extensively before coming to Spain, while the less proficient NNSs were immigrants to Spain who lived and worked primarily within their own L1 speech community and used Spanish in a limited range of contexts. A strong possibility is that the more proficient NNSs had a much stronger propensity to orient to form, treating the interviews in which the data were collected as another language learning opportunity, while the less proficient NNSs did not treat the interviews in this way. This possibility is supported by Lin and Hedgecock’s finding that the more proficient NNSs sometimes made explicit requests
for assistance with some aspect of language form, something which the less proficient NNSs never did.

If incorporation reflects an orientation on the part of NNS participants to certain aspects of language form, this leads to some interesting possibilities for the apparently contradictory findings of the studies discussed above. In Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998), it is possible that the students displayed orientation to language form to the extent that this would satisfy the teacher and that a greater display of such orientation was necessary in response to such things as elicitation of correction. In Mackey and Philp (1998), it is possible that some participants realized that their question forms were constantly being corrected, with the result that they devoted extra effort to producing correct question forms on the posttest. In Izumi (1998), it is possible that the NNS participants were oriented only to certain aspects of language form and that it is these particular aspects that they attempted to incorporate and made efforts to use correctly later in the interaction.

These are, though, only speculative possibilities which, unfortunately, the authors of these studies do not pursue. In addition, by investigating incorporation by classifying 'corrective recasts' into two discrete categories, followed by incorporation or not followed by incorporation, the methodology loses information about the details of what is incorporated and how this incorporation is accomplished.

**Incorporation of other-correction of language form.** As noted above, as participants' responses provided a major source of evidence that a particular turn was taken to be other-correction of language form, it would make no sense to calculate the number of such turns followed by incorporation as a proportion of the total number of other-correction turns. However, it does make sense to analyze each individual case to look at what is incorporated and how this incorporation is accomplished. In doing
this, one thing that is immediately apparent is that incorporation often involves the
repetition of only a single word, as can be seen in segment (9.1).

(9.1)
[tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; F, NNS, female; B, NNS, female; P, NNS, female]
12 T: a:n' you [guys wanna hear-
13 F: [lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))
15 T: [yeah liza[rd.
16 B: [oh::
17 F: [lizard. [yeah
18 T: [something like
19 that
20 P: and centipedes

In this segment, F incorporates the correction of the pronunciation of the vowel in the
first syllable by repeating the word, in overlap with T’s correction turn and with falling
intonation. As discussed in chapter eight, F’s repetition of the word even before T has
finished articulating it displays how she takes the correction as being concerned with
the first syllable. F does not go on to try to say anything else using this word, making
no attempt, other than appending a confirmation token, to use the word in a larger turn,
and the interaction moves on.

Incorporation in segment (9.2) also involves the repetition of a single word, but
by more than one participant.

(9.2)
[tape 1, 481; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]
16 F: rot
17 (1.0)
18 T: rot. (0.4) oh yeah (. ) they’re
19 they’re rotten ((clear t)) yeah
20 F: rotten ((clear t))
21 P: oh: [rotten ((clear t)) (they’re)=
22 T: they’re getting old.
23 P: =yeah then
24 T: ro[ten. ((clear t))
25 F: [and
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In line 20, F repeats the one word “rotten,” with the same, possibly unusual, pronunciation of the second syllable. She makes no attempt to use the word in a larger turn. However, the interaction in the next few lines is also concerned with this word. In line 21, another NNS participant, P, displays recognition of this word. She produces the change-of-state token “oh” and then repeats the word, using the same pronunciation as in the correction. She then starts to produce more talk in lines 21 and 23. In line 22, in overlap with P’s turn, starting after she has produced only the change-of-state token, T enters into some vocabulary instruction, providing an explanation of what the word “rotten” means by saying “they’re getting old.” He then repeats the word “rotten” in line 24, with the same pronunciation. As in segment (9.1) there is no attempt by F, or by any other participant, to use the word within some larger unit, but unlike in segment (9.1), the interaction does not immediately move on to things unrelated to the corrected form.

In segment (9.3), incorporation also involves the repetition of a single word, but intonation is used in such a way as to give the turn a specific function.

(9.3)
[tape 5, 41; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
6 S: puri?
7 M: oh the priest?
8 S: priest?
9 M: yeah

As discussed in chapter eight, in repeating only the word “priest,” and in adjusting her pronunciation, S takes M’s turn in line 7 as correction of her pronunciation in line 6. Using rising intonation, she also indexes uncertainty, possibly with regard to whether her pronunciation of the word is correct. In any case, her repetition of “priest” with rising intonation serves to elicit a confirmation token from M in line 9.
The same word is corrected in segment (9.4). While the incorporation in this case also involves the repetition of one word, this is done rather differently than in segment (9.3).

(9.4)  
[tape 5, 70; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
1 S: but (0.7) this fah- father pris?  
2 M: yeah priest  
3 S: priest (1.0) mm:: ((ends with creakiness)) (1.7) (sink some uh)

The repetition of this word is without rising intonation, or anything else indexing uncertainty or tentativeness, and it does not elicit any response, confirmatory or otherwise, from M. Rather, there is a 1.0 second pause following the repetition. Though she does not display difficulty with “priest” in line 3, neither does S attempt to use the word within a larger turn, but rather displays difficulty in how to continue. After the 1.0 second pause in line 3, she produces a filled pause, produced in a creaky voice that hearably indexes uncertainty in how to continue. There is then a 1.7 second pause before S produces more talk. S continues to hold the floor after responding to the correction by repeating the word “priest,” but does not appear to know what she should say next.

In segment (9.5), as in segment (9.2), different participants repeat the corrected form.

(9.5)  
[tape 5, 350; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
1 H: in Korea (1.0) uh some peopl:e (.)  
2 is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)  
3 underway.  
4 (0.4)  
5 S: underwea:r. ((smiley voice))  
6 [ba ba ba ha ha  
7 H: [under[wear.  
8 M: [underwear.
In line 7, H repeats the word “underwear,” in overlap with S’s laughter. Again, she does not attempt to use the word within a larger turn. In overlap with H’s repetition, M also repeats the word in line 8. This repetition serves to display recognition of the word H was trying to use in lines 2-3, recognition which was not forthcoming earlier, such as during the pause in line 4, and as he is an NS, while S is an NNS, it can also be heard as a confirmation that “underwear” is an English lexical item.

Incorporation in segment (9.6) involves double repetition by a single participant.

(9.6)  
[tape 6, B66; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]  
2  S: oh (.) what does it say Chinese  
3   
4  M: Chinese pars[ley] yeah  
5  S: parsley parsley.  
6   

In line 5, in overlap with the correction, S repeats the word “parsley” twice. As discussed in chapter eight, this shows her orientation to M’s turn in line 4 as a correction of this particular word, with S ignoring the word “Chinese.” As in the other segments above, there is no attempt on S’s part to use the word within a larger turn.

The other four clear cases of other-correction of language form are followed by repetition of more than one word, but in three of these there again is no attempt to use the corrected form within a larger turn, as shown in segment (9.7)

(9.7)  
[tape 5, 60; M, NS, male; S, NNS, female]  
1  M: oh he married he married them?  
2   
3  S: marry dam dam?  
4  M: married them?  
5  S: marry them? (.) yeah.
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In line 5, S repeats “married them” as “marry them,” with rising intonation. As discussed in chapter eight, this displays that she takes M’s turn in line 4 as a correction of her pronunciation, or rather her perception, of the word “them.” In addition, with the same intonation as in the repair initiation in line 3, it functions to reinitiate repair, targeting M’s “married them” as the trouble source. However, the completion of this repair becomes unnecessary as, following a micropause, S confirms that this is what the hero of the Valentine story did by saying “yeah.”

In segment (9.8), incorporation involves a double repetition of part of the correction.

(9.8)
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female]
3  D: hey can I (. ) show (0.9) you name.
4   (0.4)
5  D: Ally (. ) hm
6  A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
7  D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (. )
8   (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
9   A: [can you
10  [sh(h)ow m(h)e
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:
12   can you show

In lines 11-12, D repeats part of the correction twice. This shows that D takes the correction as being related to the choice of subject, ignoring the “me” that A includes in her correction turn in lines 9-10. D makes no attempt to repeat her earlier request with the corrected form, but as discussed earlier, there is no interactional reason why she should, as the request for A to show her nametag has apparently already been fulfilled, given that D says the name in line 5. D does, though, produce other talk between the two repetitions, producing a brief inbreath, saying “is it,” and displaying recognition with the token “ah.” This other talk indexes her recognition that she should have said “can you show” rather than “can I show.”
Segment (9.9) also shows a partial repetition, but one which may not have any interactional function at all.

(9.9)
[tape 8, 80; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female]
9 M: looks l(h)ike ha ha [ha
10 L: [.h you
11 [you: remi:nd
12 G: [you think so.
13 (0.5)
14 M: it might remind me of (0.4) Keiko
15 L: [o(remind me of) (0.4) [o(××)o
16 G: [o(××××) mm? (0.4) [Keiko hh ha

In line 15, L repeats “remind me of,” again without any attempt at using the corrected form in a larger turn. In addition, she repeats it quietly, and in overlap with G, making it hearable as talking to herself, rather than as part of the interaction.

Finally, segment (9.10) shows one case in which the incorporation is adjusted in such a way as to make it hearable as more than a mere repetition.

(9.10)
[tape 8, 5; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
12 L: .hh I'm [childr(h)en
13 G: [what?
14 M: huh?
15 L: .h I'm a children.=
16 M: =you're a child?=
17 G: =yeah I (have) a [goodœ (goon)=
18 L: [I'm a child.
19 G: =I have a granddaughter

Rather than just repeating “child” or “a child,” or repeating the whole correction verbatim as “you’re a child,” in line 18, L responds to the correction by saying “I’m a child.” This functions as a repair completion in the second of two consecutive sequences of other-initiated self-repair targeting her non-target-like turns in lines 12 and 15. The first repair sequence is initiated by M in line 14 and completed by L in line 15 as she changes “I’m children” to “I’m a children.” The second repair sequence is initiated by M in line 16, which also functions as other-correction of
language form, and L completes this by repeating what she has said in line 15, but with "children" changed to "child." The outcome is a target-like version, on her third attempt, of what she has been trying to say all along. It also serves to confirm M's tentative display of understanding in his repair initiation in line 16.

**Limited orientation to form.** The general lack of attempts to use a corrected form in a larger turn may indicate that the orientation to language form at times displayed by the NNS participants is of limited strength. NNS participants may orient to language form as they treat a particular turn as other-correction of language form, but they do not appear to be too concerned with trying to use the corrected form on their own. In addition, when other-correction of language form is elicited through an invitation or an appeal for help, the invitation and the correction also tend to be concerned with single lexical items.

An interesting comparison is possible by looking at segments (9.11) and (9.12), which do not come from the conversation club, but rather from a conversation between the author and a fairly fluent NNS.

(9.11)
1 M: but after, (1.6) like (0.5) previous
2 system?
3 E: mm
4 M: jus (1.4) I think. (0.5) next
5 semester we have to take one more
6 class, (0.5) and uh we can (0.4) next
7 next semester we can take like ee es
8 el one hundred,
9 E: yeah.=
10 M: =an' we can (0.3) like (. ) take any
11 kind of (. ) subject?

(9.12)
1 M: so if I (0.3) can (0.5) if I can go
2 (. ) like (0.7) high- higher level?
3 E: yeah
4 M: next next semester?
5 E: oh the seme[ster after next?]
6 M: [I can take ]
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M: yeah (0.9) (xx) ha ha ha ha .hh ha
ha .hh the next the-
[ semester (0.5) ] after=
E: [the semester after next.]
M: =next semester?
E (1.0)
M: the semester after next.
E: the next (0.4) the semester next (0.3)
after semester. (. ) [no.
E: [(oh)
M: (1.1)
E: da semester: (. ) after next semester.
M: =is that right?
E: [you- you don't need the last
M: semester.
E: (0.8)
E: the semester after next.
E: right (. ) [hh
M: [(will I use?)
E: (1.2)
M: h .hhh=
E: =is that confusing?
M: confusing [ha ha ha ha ha .h da year=
E: [ha ha ha
M: =after: (0.5) next.
E: yeah.
E: (1.3)
M: oh. (0.6) da year next huh- (. ) da year
after next.
E: right.
M: oka(h)y ha .hhh may[be
E: [oh so if you get
M: into the higher level class (. )
M: tomorrow,
E: mm hm
E: then the semester after next you can
take (0.5) ee es el one hundred.
E: (1.8)
M: da next (1.1) semest (. ) the semester
next [af (0.4) ]ter next
E: [the semester af[ter next
E: yeah (0.3) oh okay

Even though these segments come from interaction which may be considered similar
to the interaction in the conversation club, in that one of the purposes for the
participants to meet was to allow M, the NNS, opportunities to practice English, both participants show a much stronger orientation to form than was found among the conversation club participants. In lines 6-7, M produces the non-target-like form "next next semester," with no indications, such as a cut-off, that the second "next" is recycled. This is allowed to pass for the time being, but when she uses the same form again in line 4 of segment (9.12), approximately two minutes after using it the first time, E corrects it in line 5 by saying "oh the semester after next" with rising intonation. This sets off a rather long sequence as the participants work with this phrase. In line 6, M begins to start a new turn, in overlap with the correction, but abandons this and responds to the correction by saying "yeah" in line 7. There is then a pause and laughter produced by M before she attempts the target-like form in lines 8-9. She has problems producing the target-like form and in overlap with this first attempt E says "the semester after next" again in line 10. Immediately after this, M completes her first attempt by saying "after next semester" with rising intonation in lines 9 and 11.

The participants do not, however, then shift their orientation away from form. Instead, following an interturn pause in line 12, E repeats "the semester after next" in line 13, following which M makes another unsuccessful attempt in lines 14-15. She can be heard orienting to her lack of success as she says "no" at the end of line 15. Following another interturn pause, she makes a third attempt in line 18, which is not completely target-like, as she says "the semester after next semester," but which E confirms by saying "yeah" in line 19. In line 20, M explicitly asks whether she has now said the form correctly. In overlap with this, E explicitly and metalinguistically corrects by saying "you don't need the last semester." Following another interturn pause, E once more provides a model in line 24, which M repeats in line 26.
Following E's confirmation of the form in line 27, and some other talk, E then asks a question about M's perception of the form, "is that confusing," in line 31. After M answers the question, she then goes on to practice the form in lines 34 and 37-38. Part of this practice involves productive use of the form as she says "the year after next." E confirms her use of the form in line 39 and M responds to this confirmation in line 40.

E's next turn, starting in line 41, can be heard as an attempt to shift orientation away from form and back to the topic of what they were talking about earlier. In doing this though, he uses "the semester after next" again in line 45. In response, rather than doing something such as confirming what E has said, M makes another attempt to say the form in lines 48-49, which shifts orientation back to form. In line 48, M first displays trouble with the form, saying "the next," which is followed by a pause, and "semest." She then says "the semester next af," saying only the first syllable of "after" before pausing. In overlap with this first syllable of "after," E corrects again, saying "the semester after next." In overlap with the end of this correction, M says "ter next," producing the second syllable of "after."

While it is possible to speculate about why these participants seem to be so oriented to form, the important thing to note is that they show a much stronger orientation to form than was found among the participants in the conversation club interaction.

**Summary.** A close look at what is said as a correction is incorporated reveals what the participants take the correction to have been related to. In the majority of the cases found in this data, the correction is taken to have been related to a single word. In other cases, in segments (9.8) and (9.9), the correction appears to be taken to have been related to more than a single word, but parts of the correction are also ignored.
This illustrates again that other-correction of language form is an interactive accomplishment, with the NNS participant deciding what aspects of their interlocutor's correction turn to focus on. Finally, it seems that the term incorporation is not, with the possible exception of segment (9.10), really appropriate, as repetition of the correction does not involve attempts to use the corrected form within a larger turn. However, in a few cases, other-correction of language form has more interesting sequential implications for what follows, as will be discussed in the next section.

**Accounting for an Error**

Research on 'corrective recasts' within the interactionist paradigm does not appear to be concerned with whether or how participants account for errors that are corrected. This is not really surprising, as research within this paradigm is concerned with interaction primarily as a source of input to the language learner's internal processes and/or mechanisms of acquisition, rather than as an object of study in its own right. However, as this type of input is usually described as implicit, it is implied that accounting for an error does not typically occur following a 'corrective recast.' In some of the cases found in the data of this study, though, participants perform interesting work as they account for why either an error or a correction has occurred. One way of understanding such work is that it indexes a concern with face maintenance.

*Stimulated recall as a source of accounts.* Before going into how accounting is accomplished by participants in this study, though, mention should be made of a recent line of research within the interactionist paradigm that utilizes the methodology of stimulated recall (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Such research purports to investigate
how NNSs perceive 'corrective recasts' (e.g., Mackey, et al., 2000; Morris, 2002b; Nabei & Swain, 2002) or other potential sources of input in interaction (e.g., Mackey, 2002). This is accomplished by showing NNSs a videotape of interaction in which they were participants, stopping the videotape at certain points of interest and asking the NNSs a question such as, "What were you thinking about then?" This type of question is supposed to orient the NNSs to the there and then, as opposed to the here and now, while the videotape stimulates their memory of what they were thinking, thus providing information about how the participants perceived certain turns to function during the interaction.

This line of research has the potential to provide interesting information, but not the sort of information that it has been claimed to provide. Working squarely within the interactionist paradigm, researchers using this methodology have been interested in interaction as a source of input for learner-internal mental mechanisms or processes of language acquisition. Arguing that the videotape and the questions asked can orient participants to the there and then, researchers such as Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) appear to take the participants' answers as primarily straightforward descriptions of what the participants remember thinking at the time. This shows a rather surprising lack of understanding about the nature of interaction on the part of these researchers.

Like any other question, the question, "What were you thinking about then?" is not without presuppositions, which in this case include that the participants were thinking about something, that they can remember what they were thinking about, and that the particular point where the researcher has paused the videotape is a recording of a point in the interaction that is significant enough to prompt the question. Answering the question requires more than a mere description of what was going through a
particular participant's head at that particular time. As with any answer to any question, it also requires the participant to make decisions about why he or she is being asked that question. Finally, this particular question, "What were you thinking about then?" is, to use a vernacular term, loaded. It resembles a question such as, "What were you thinking?" asked by a father to a twelve-year-old son after he has concocted a sticky, flammable mixture of gasoline and Styrofoam.\textsuperscript{bvi} It is a question that calls for a justification of one's behavior.

What researchers using this methodology are getting, then, are not mere descriptions of what the participants were thinking about at a particular point in the interaction, but rather justifications or accounts by the participants of how they were behaving. There may be various sources for the information that is included in any particular account, such as actual episodic memory of the point in the interaction that is being asked about, or a general recollection of what the interaction was like, or some general ideas about how they are supposed to behave during interaction with NSs of their second or foreign language, but whatever the source(s), the answer that a participant gives is designed for the recipient, based on what the participant takes to be relevant, including the presuppositions of the question and the reasons that the researcher is assumed to have for asking the question. The information that is provided by this line of research has the potential to be interesting if it is treated as information about how NNS participants account for their behavior during interaction in their second or foreign language. Treated as more-or-less straightforward descriptions of what they remember, though, it lacks validity. (For discussions of the relationship between discourse and cognition, see Bilmes (1986) and Edwards (1997).)
**Politeness as an account.** The rest of this section looks at how participants account for making errors and providing corrections, not after the fact, but during the interaction itself. In segment (9.13) (segment (9.8) above), an NNS participant accounts for making an error by appealing to her desire, or the necessity, to speak politely.

(9.13)  
[tape 11, 120; D, NNS, female; A, NS, female; T, NS, male; O, NNS, male]  
1 D: uh- uh: I forgot you name (.) is  
2 (1.8)  
3 D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name.  
4 (0.4)  
5 D: Ally (.) hm  
6 A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha  
7 D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)]  
8 (xxx) yeah yeah [yeah  
9 A: [can you  
10 [sh(h)ow m(h)e  
11 D: [can you show .h is it ah:  
12 [can you show  
13 T: [ha ha ha  
14 (0.4)  
15 D: .h (.) is a can you is- I always  
16 use could you. (.). yeah:=  
17 T: =yeah=  
18 D: =I use could. cou- could you show is  
19 a .h=  
20 ?: =(yeah)?=  
21 D: =can I: (0.3) keh could you;  
22 [sometimes very (.). very confuses.=  
23 A: =yes yes yes  
24 O: =[o(h)h]h  
25 A: =[yeah:  
26 (1.1)  
27 D: ah Ally  
28 (0.6)  
29 O: °(Ally)°  
30 (1.0)  
31 T: hey so are you: gonna be back in  
32 Korea?

In lines 1 and 3, D makes two requests for information about A’s name. The first one is an indirect request in which D merely states that she has forgotten A’s name. After
this gets no response, D reformulates her request in a more direct fashion, though still in the form of a question, in line 3. The first request can be heard as more polite, as it is indirect and also places the blame for D’s lack of knowledge on her own memory, rather than on, for example, A not having told D her name or not making her nametag visible. As discussed earlier, the request is apparently fulfilled in line 5, but A then goes on to draw attention to the non-target-like nature of the second request by repeating part of it, laughing, and then providing a correction. D repeats part of the correction in lines 11-12 and T joins the interaction by producing his own laughter in line 13.

Following a brief pause in line 14, D then accounts for her error by referring to her knowledge of a contrast between “could you” and “can I.” After repeating “can you” in line 15, she says “I always use could you” in lines 15-16. T produces a continuer in line 17, following which D again says “I use could cou- could you,” then adding the verb used in the second request in line 3, “show.” D then says “can I” and “could you” in line 21, which has the effect of placing these two phrases in contrast to each other. In drawing this contrast, D appears to be claiming that she believes that “could” is a more polite form than “can,” with “could” being the appropriate word to use when it is followed by “you,” but “can” being the appropriate word to use when it is followed by “I.” After she draws this contrast, she refers to the inadequacy of her knowledge of it by saying “sometimes very very confuses” in line 22. In overlap with what D says in line 22, A confirms the presence of a contrast between “can I” and “could you,” or possibly between “can” and “could,” by saying “yes yes yes” in line 23. She then agrees that it is confusing by saying “yeah” in line 25. As discussed in chapter five, the participants then move out of this sequence, following the 1.1 second pause in line 26, by repeating A’s name
(a pseudonym), the information that was originally requested, in lines 27 and 29, and then, following the 1.0 second pause in line 30, by T asking a completely unrelated question.

In this segment, D can already be heard in line 1 to possibly be oriented to the importance of polite language use as she first uses an indirect form to make her request, only changing this to the more direct question form after the indirect request gets no response. In the form of a question, this more direct request is still more polite than, for example, a request in the form of an imperative, such as, “Hey. Show me your name.” In giving her account, she draws what appears to be a politeness-based distinction between the use of “could you” and “can I” and then refers to her incomplete knowledge, as an NNS, of when she should use which form, with this being formulated as a source of confusion which has caused her to make the error that A finds to be humorous. In terms of Brown and Levinson’s (1978) politeness theory, this segment shows D’s concern with, first, negative face, as she uses indirect request forms, and, second, positive face, as she accounts for her error. This illustrates one reason that the strength of orientation to form may be rather limited, which is that, even though the conversation club exists for the purpose of providing the NNS participants with opportunities to practice English, the participants themselves have concerns other than language learning.

**Limited lexical knowledge as an account.** In segment (9.14) (segment 9.2) above, the NS participant indirectly accounts for an NNS error by indexing the limited lexical knowledge possessed by NNSs.

(9.14)
[tape 1, 481; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]
16 F: rot
17 (1.0) 18 T: rot. (0.4) oh yeah (.) they’re
19 they’re rotten ((clear t)) yeah
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As mentioned in the previous section, T follows up on his correction of “rot” to “rotten” by engaging in vocabulary instruction in line 22, saying "they're getting old." He then repeats the word “rotten” in line 24, in overlap with which F starts to produce more talk by saying “and” in line 25. Following a 0.5 second pause, T provides more vocabulary instruction in lines 27 and 29, saying "like smell bad ... and fruit flies." In overlap with part of this, F starts again to produce more talk by saying “yeah and,” but then stops, resulting in a long 2.1 second pause in line 30. F finally produces what is hearable as a complete turn, and moves the talk away from the word “rotten,” by saying “we have mold” in line 31.

As discussed in chapter two, vocabulary instruction involves an orientation to roles as NNS and NS, with the role of NNS constituted as involving limited vocabulary knowledge and the role of NS constituted as involving the ability to recognize limited vocabulary knowledge and provide instruction. In this segment, T’s vocabulary instruction indexes these roles and the degree of vocabulary knowledge associated with each. This behavior on T’s part can also be understood as providing an indirect account both for F’s error in line 16 and for T’s finding it necessary to provide a correction. F’s error is accounted for as the result of limited vocabulary knowledge, which is perfectly understandable as she is an NNS, while T’s correction...
Treating as something else. In chapter four, it was argued that in one particular instance, a turn that is hearable as an error of factual content was treated by participants as an error of language form. This case is displayed here as segment (9.15).

(9.15) [tape 4, 195; M, NS, male; Y, NNS, female; C, NNS, male]
1 M: how old is your daughter now?
2 (1.1)
3 Y: ([nineteen])
4 C: [nine months.]
5 (0.3)
6 Y: nineteen=
7 C: =nineteen:n months.
8 M: oh nineteen months.

By stressing the second syllable of “nineteen” in her correction in line 6, Y can be heard to be treating C’s error as one involving the pronunciation of “nineteen” rather than one of factual content. By repeating “nineteen months” with the same extra stress on “teen,” both C and M can be heard to also treat the error as involving language form. In addition, none of the participants follow this repair sequence by questioning C’s knowledge of his daughter. What is in one way hearable as an error of factual content is accounted for by treating it as something else.

Segment (9.16) displays a case in which laughter associated with other-correction of language form is treated retroactively as something else.

(9.16) [tape 5, 350; H, NNS, female; S, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: in Korea (1.0) uh some peopl:e (.)
2 is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
3 underway.
4 (0.4)
5 S: underwea:r. ((smiley voice))
6 [ha ha ha ha ha
7 H: [under[wear. 302
In her correction in line 5, S says the word “underwear” in smiley voice. She then laughs in line 6. The use of smiley voice and laughter is hearable as treating H’s non-target-like form “underway” as humorous because it is non-target-like. However, after it has been established by H’s confirmation in line 9 that people do give underwear as a present in Korea, and after the surprising nature of this has been indexed by M’s “really” in line 10, S repeats the word “underwear” while laughing in line 13. Her use of rising intonation indexes surprise that people give underwear as a present and the laughter is hearable as related to the factual content of what H has said, rather than to her use of a non-target-like form. As discussed in the previous chapter, one result is that S’s laughter in lines 5-6 becomes ambiguous as to whether what is being treated as humorous is H’s non-target-like form or the factual content of what she has said. Indirectly, S’s laughter in lines 5-6 is accounted for by retroactively making it hearable as not having been one NNS’s laughter at another NNS’s use of the language. Finally, following H’s confirmation that people give underwear as a present in line 14, the talk in lines 15-22 continues to focus on the factual content of what H has said as surprising and a source of humor, rather than focusing on her use of a non-target-like form as a source of humor.
Summary. In this section, a few of the sequences involving other-correction of language form were analyzed as involving accounts for the error and/or for the correction. While it could be argued for segment (9.13) that D is deliberately accounting for why she has made a particular error, this argument cannot really be made for the other segments. Rather, the way the interaction proceeds sometimes results in accounts for why a particular error has been made, or why a particular error has been corrected, or even why a particular correction has involved laughter, regardless of whatever intentions, goals, or beliefs participants may have had. In interaction involving NNSs, whether, when, and how errors and/or corrections of language form are accounted for is a generally unexplored area in need of further microanalytic research.

Conclusion

This chapter has investigated the sequential implications of other-correction of language form through analyses of what happens following a correction turn. Incorporation of a correction was found to be minimal, often limited to the repetition of one corrected word. It could be argued that, while treating a turn as other-correction of language form indicates the participants’ orientation to form, the general lack of attempts to use a corrected form in a larger turn indicates that this orientation to form is of somewhat limited strength. It was also found that accounting for an error, or even a correction, may occasionally become, to use Jefferson’s (1987) terminology, interactional business that the participants then occupy themselves with. This raises the possibility that things that get coded as ‘corrective recasts’ in research within the interactionist paradigm may not always be as implicit a form of correction as is generally assumed.
A CA Approach to SLA

*Chapters six to nine, summary.* A variety of findings and arguments were presented in the last four chapters with regard to 'corrective recasts' and other-correction of language form. In chapter six, it was argued that, even though 'corrective recasts' are explicitly conceptualized within the interactionist paradigm as a particular type of input, it is also implied that they are found, or can be intentionally placed, in particular sequential environments and that NNSs may perceive them as having a corrective function. However, when analyzed in terms of interactive function, it was found that turns that could be coded as 'corrective recasts' often did not have any corrective function. Instead, they functioned in various ways and turns which could not be coded as 'corrective recasts' were found that had similar interactive functions. Even when something that could be coded as a 'corrective recast' did have a corrective function, it could have other interactive functions as well. In chapter seven, the criticism of the concept of 'corrective recast' was extended by showing how it relies on an inadequate notion of meaning, not recognizing meaning as emerging through interaction or as related to function, and that even the type of error that has been made may emerge through interaction.

*In chapter eight, the interactive accomplishment of other-correction of language form was described.* This accomplishment was found to involve such behaviors as, on the part of the NNS participant who received the correction, the invitation of correction, possibly as a means of appealing for assistance, initiating repair targeting something as difficult to understand, and even responding to being laughed at. On the part of the participant who provided the correction, not necessarily an NS participant, it was found
to involve such behaviors as displaying problematic comprehension of an NNS turn and the use of stress or other means to create a contrast between the non-target-like form and the corresponding target-like form. Together, the participants accomplished other-correction of language form through various actions that highlighted particular forms as problematic. The presence of other-correction of language form was also argued to illustrate an orientation to language form on the part of the participants, which is related to how they fulfill their roles as NS and NNS in the conversation club. However, the propensity of the participants to orient to language form was found to be of somewhat limited strength, which is illustrated by the fact that problems with language form were often, perhaps usually, allowed to pass, as well as by the fact, as shown in chapter nine, that incorporation of a correction was often limited to merely repeating a single word. Chapter nine also illustrated how an error and/or a correction may be treated as accountable by the participants. How such things are accounted for is something that has generally remained uninvestigated within research on correction in SLA.

**Exploration of CA approach to SLA.** One of the purposes of this study was an exploration of the possibilities of applying CA to the study of SLA. This is certainly not the first study to attempt to draw connections between these two growing fields. Just to choose a few examples that indicate the range of research that can be understood as drawing connections between CA and SLA, Brouwer (2000) applied CA to the investigation of the interactive accomplishment of listening comprehension when one participant is an NNS; Egbert (1998) applied CA to investigate how beginner German as a foreign language students using German in oral proficiency interviews initiate repair when they do not understand something, contrasting this with how German NSs tend to initiate repair when they do not understand something;
Golato (2002) applied CA to investigate the transfer of a common L1 German strategy for responding to compliments by a highly proficient NNS of English and the resulting interactional problems; and Wong (2000b) applied CA in the investigation of a type of other initiation of repair, delayed next turn repair initiation, that seems unusual in English among NSs, but more common when at least one of the participants is an NNS. Where this study is somewhat different from these is in its attempt to apply CA to the study of something, corrective recasting, that has been a major focus of research within SLA, particularly within the interactionist paradigm.

The rest of this concluding chapter discusses some the results of this exploration. The following section looks both at problems that were encountered and connections that can be made between the findings of this study and the broader field of SLA. The final section then takes a step further, looking at what the data from the conversation club reveal about possible avenues of future research involving the application of CA in the study of interaction involving NNS participants. These are avenues of research which have traditionally not been of interest, or have been of only limited interest, within SLA.

CA and SLA, Problems, Limitations, and Connections

**Analyst’s and participants’ categories.** The epistemological commitments of CA and the epistemological commitments of the interactionist paradigm, within which most research on corrective recasting has been conducted, are quite different. Within the interactionist paradigm, and SLA more generally, there is a commitment to a mentalist view of the language learner as an entity that builds a mental linguistic system on the basis of, or at least partially on the basis of, input received during interaction. With such a commitment, it becomes necessary to find some way of 1)
measuring the nature of the input and 2) measuring the development of the learner’s linguistic system. One result has been to treat ‘corrective recasts’ as a particular type of input, to be investigated by trying to determine the relative frequency of ‘corrective recasts’ and trying to establish a relationship between the presence of ‘corrective recasts’ and development of the linguistic system. CA, though, as well as being empirically and emically oriented, has very non-mentalist, even anti-mentalist, epistemological commitments, including an insistence that the analysis of interaction must be grounded on what can be shown to actually occur in the interaction itself, rejecting the use of such things as participants’ intentions which are not made hearable or visible in the interaction and the use of presupposed and predetermined analyst’s categories to analyze interaction.

The conflict between the epistemological commitments of CA and the interactionist paradigm created a problem in this study, which is that the coding category, the analyst’s category, of ‘corrective recast,’ used to identify instances of a particular purported input type, does not reflect an orientation on the part of participants to the function of particular turns as corrective. This problem was illustrated in chapter six, in which it was shown that turns which could be coded as ‘corrective recasts’ did not necessarily have a corrective function for participants and that, even when such turns did have a corrective function for participants, they had other functions as well. It was for this reason that it was decided to use the term other-correction of language form to label turns for which there was evidence that they were treated by participants as being corrective of language form. That is, other-correction of language form was used as a participants’ category.

Treating other-correction of language form as a participants’ category distinct from the analyst’s category of ‘corrective recasts,’ it was possible to show,
particularly in chapter eight, that this type of correction was a collaborative, interactive accomplishment. The analyst's category of 'corrective recasts,' though, collects together instances of correction of language form without regard to how participants treat them, with one result being that the collaborative nature of correction is obscured. It was only by rejecting the analyst's category of 'corrective recasts' and refocusing the investigation on a participants' category that this study could proceed to the investigation of how the participants themselves accomplish other-correction of language form.

Learning. In order for research in SLA to actually be research about second language acquisition, it would seem necessary to have some means of measuring learning. Markee (2000) argued that by applying CA to the investigation of interaction in English language classrooms, he could demonstrate cases of short term learning and non-learning. However, in my study, the lack of a means of satisfactorily investigating learning was found to be a limitation of applying straight CA, without bringing in some other theoretical framework, to the study of SLA. It seems that what Markee (2000) actually demonstrated was that opportunities for learning or behaviors that could be associated with learning could be revealed in interaction through the application of CA. He also demonstrated that the application of CA could reveal the lack of such opportunities or behaviors in other cases.

The fundamental problem with trying to use CA to investigate learning is that within CA there is no theory of learning. This is not a problem with CA itself, but rather with the attempt to apply straight CA to SLA. One possible solution is to make use of the methodology of CA within a theoretical framework of language learning that places emphasis on learning within and through interaction. This would necessarily involve compromises, particularly with the epistemological commitments
of CA, and the result, if done properly, would be a microanalytic approach to the study of language learning through interaction that made use of CA techniques, and was as close as possible to straight CA, but which itself would not be CA.

While compromises would seem to be inevitable, there are some important elements of the CA framework which it would be prudent to preserve. One of the major strengths of CA is its strong emic perspective, its insistence on looking at how participants orient to what is happening in the interaction. In bringing CA techniques within a theoretical framework of language learning, one compromise that certainly should not be made is the abandonment of this emic perspective. In addition, if a theory is to be a theory of language learning, this entails, with the possible exception of a simplistic behaviorist theory of learning as the development of stimulus-response associations, some conceptualization of cognition. The conceptualization of cognition in the theoretical framework within which CA is to be applied should be one which is compatible with the non-mentalist orientation of CA.\textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{x} Within the interactionist paradigm, the language learner is conceptualized as an information processor receiving input from the environment and producing output, with language learning viewed as the development of a learner-internal linguistic system (e.g., Gass, 1997). This is a mentalist view of cognition which is incompatible with the non-mentalist orientation of CA. Also, within the interactionist paradigm, there does not seem to be a concern with adopting an emic perspective. For these reasons, it seems unlikely that satisfactory results could be obtained by applying the microanalytic methodology of CA, stripped of its emic perspective and non-mentalist orientation, within the interactionist paradigm.

A theoretical framework of (language) learning that seems more compatible with the emic perspective and non-mentalist orientation of CA is sociocultural theory,
though the application of CA within a sociocultural theoretical framework would still involve compromises. Ohta (2000a, 2000b, 2001) provides excellent examples of how this application of CA can be accomplished. Unfortunately, my command of sociocultural theory is limited. I lack the ability to apply CA within a sociocultural framework in a very satisfactory manner. However, I will try to give a few examples of how CA may be applied in the study of private speech, talk which is apparently produced solely for the speaker him or herself (Ohta, 2000b, 2001), which appears to play an important role in learning within sociocultural theory.

A particular turn was treated in the analysis as being a potential instance of private speech if it was produced quietly, apparently received no response from other participants, and this lack of response was not treated as problematic. Only a few potential instances of private speech were found, though it is possible that it was more common but was not captured by the recording equipment. Segment (10.1) shows a nice example.

(10.1)
tape 1, 430; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female; B, NNS, female; F, NNS, female
1 T: yeah but we have okay so a:nts,
2 (0.6) geckos:, cockroaches:, (0.8)
3 what else.
4 (0.6)
5 P: mouse mice. [(xxx)
6 T: [no. no mice.
7 P: oo
8 (0.5)
9 T: no mice.
10 B: "mouse" hh
11 (0.8)
12 T: a:n' you [guys wanna hear-
13 F: [lee- (0.5) lee:za:rd
14 ((non-target-like pronunciation))

As discussed earlier, in line 5, P offers "mice" as an addition to the list of life forms that inhabit T's room, but T rejects this in line 6 and again in line 9. Following this
rejection, B says “mouse” quietly, as if to herself. As it has already been established that there are no mice in T’s room, and as this gets no response itself, B’s turn here does not appear to be treated by participants as part of the interaction. Rather, in lines 12 and 13, both T and F start new turns unrelated to what B has said, or to anything about mice. It seems, then, that B’s turn can be considered a case of private speech, regardless of whether other participants actually heard her or not. It appears that she is using private speech to practice a particular word used by P in line 5. It also appears, though, that unlike P, she is interested only in the singular form, not the plural form.

Another instance of potential private speech, one that is associated with other-correction of language form, is displayed in segment (10.2).

(10.2) [tape 8, 80; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female; G, NNS, female]
9 M: looks l(h)ike ha ha [ha
10 L: [.h you
11 [you: remi:nd
12 G: (you think so.
13 (0.5)
14 M: it might remind me of (0.4) Keiko
15 L: [°remind me of° (0.4) [°(x)°
16 G: [°(xxxx) mm° (0.4) [Keiko hh ha
17 M: ha ha ha

Following M’s other-correction of language form in line 14, L repeats, quietly as if to herself and in overlap with G, “remind me of.” G’s talk in overlap is also quiet, and may also be a case of private speech, though it is unclear what she actually says. L also produces more quiet talk, following a 0.4 second pause, which may be private speech as well. M does not appear to respond to the quiet things L and G say in lines 15 and 16. Instead, he produces laughter in line 17, possibly in response to G’s laughter at the end of line 16 (Jefferson, 1979). A possibility is that L is using private
speech to practice the form "remind me of." It is also possible that G is doing something similar in line 16.

That NNS participants may use private speech to practice something they hear in the interaction is an interesting possibility. However, it is difficult to recognize when private speech is being used, both because it may often not be captured by the recording equipment and because an instance of quiet talk may not be a case of private speech. For example, in segment (10.3), M uses quiet talk in a way that does not appear to be private speech.

(10.3)
[tape 5, 331; E, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 E: uh (.) when you were a (0.5) child?
2 M: [un
3 E: [what did you have any special
4 things on Valentine’s Day.
5 (1.8)
6 M: "an any special things on
7 Valentine’s Day" uh:m (1.4) just in
8 school (0.9) in school

In this segment, M does not answer E’s question immediately, resulting in a 1.8 second pause. In lines 6-7, he then prefaces his answer by repeating, quietly as if to himself, “an any special things on Valentine’s Day,” following which he produces a filled pause and then pauses for 1.4 seconds. After this pause, he begins his answer to E’s question. As a question and answer produce an adjacency pair, with a question making an answer conditionally relevant, it would be problematic for M not to answer E’s question, especially as he has given an indication that he is listening to her with his continuer in line 2. There are, though, fairly long silences, in lines 5 and 7, before he begins to give his answer. The quiet talk in lines 6-7 functions to display that M has heard the question and is thinking of an answer. Even though it is quiet, it has an important interactive function. This illustrates that just because talk is quiet, it does not mean that it is not produced as part of the interaction.
The absence of a theory of learning within CA is a major limitation on the applicability of straight CA to the study of SLA. However, as illustrated briefly in this subsection, and much more substantially in the work of Ohta, the potential for adopting the microanalytic techniques of CA within a sociocultural theoretical framework is promising.

**Orientation to language form.** One theme that was returned to frequently throughout this study was the propensity of participants to orient to language form. Most importantly, the interactive accomplishment of other-correction of language form showed, on the one hand, that there are times within the interaction that participants oriented to language form, but also, on the other, that the strength of this orientation may be limited. As participants do such things as invite correction of language form, treat a particular turn as correction, adjust how they say something in response to correction, take limited proficiency with the language as the cause of troubles in need of repair, and even treat non-target-like language use as humorous or something to be accounted for, they display within the interaction an orientation to language form. However, as participants let problems with language form pass and as they respond to correction with only minimal incorporation, if it can be called incorporation at all, they display that the strength of this orientation is limited and variable. As they do such things as orient to their knowledge or lack of knowledge of what another participant is saying and work to maintain face, the participants also display that they have concerns other than learning English.

One strand of research within SLA involves the study of motivation and its possible relationship to language learning (e.g., Dömyei, 2002). A possible criticism of this research is that motivation seems rather static. Though it is recognized that learners may become more or less motivated over time, they are basically viewed as
possessing a generally stable degree of motivation, with an orientation that is more or less integrative or more or less instrumental. Their level of motivation and their degree of integrative and instrumental orientation are assumed to be things that can be measured at some point in time and then associated with their language learning behavior and language learning or language classroom success in general. Though language learning motivation and related concepts were not explored in this study, the analysis of participants’ behavior as displaying a greater or lesser degree of orientation to language form at particular times in the interaction adumbrates how motivation and orientation may be reconceptualized as dynamic phenomena that can be investigated microanalytically.

**Summary.** This study illustrates the problems, the limitations, and the possibilities of applying CA to the investigation of topics that have been of interest within SLA. The problems and limitations may require changes and compromises regarding epistemological commitments, but they are not insurmountable. The possibilities extend beyond the study of correction.

**Conclusion: Unexplored Territory**

One of the things that makes CA a fascinating, and even exciting, field of inquiry is its ability to uncover and elucidate things that happen in human interaction that would be, for lack of a better term, unimaginable without the detailed analysis of such interaction. For example, Schegloff (1996) looks at how people use repetition to confirm something that had been left implicit in their talk, but that their interlocutor has just explicitly formulated. As Schegloff argues, this can be considered a particular speech act, which he calls *confirming an allusion*, but unlike traditional speech acts such as requests, it is not one that anyone was able to come up with based solely on
intuition, or that prior to Schegloff (1996) even had a name in English. Its discovery as a speech act could only be made through the detailed analysis of particular instances of interaction. As another example, Heritage's (e.g., 1984; 1998) work on the change-of-state token "oh" has revealed previously unknown, even unimaginable, details about how it is used, in spite of the fact that it is extremely common in conversation. When it comes to interaction involving NNSs, one of the most surprising findings of CA research is presented in Carroll (2000), who shows that low proficiency L2 speakers of English, who Carroll refers to as novice speakers, are able to precisely time their turn taking in spite of their limited proficiency. This section discusses possibilities for future research in a CA approach to SLA that were revealed in the interaction of the conversation club, but which have generally not been a concern of SLA researchers.

**Change-of-state tokens in interaction with NNS participants.** Quite often in the analyses of segments of interaction in the conversation club, reference was made to the use of the change-of-state token "oh." One reason that the use of change-of-state tokens formed part of the analysis so often is that they were ubiquitous in the data. Segment (10.4) illustrates one use of "oh" that appeared to be fairly common in the interaction in the conversation club.

(10.4)  
[tape 4, 505; M, NS, male; C, NNS, male; Y, NNS, female]  
1 M: how bout you (0.3) what's your  
2 hobby.  
3 (0.6)  
4 C: oh hh I'm: (0.3) compter ((two  
5 syllables)) game.  
6 (0.5)  
7 Y: oh:::  
8 M: [huh? (0.9) what?]  
9 C: [compute game  
10 Y: [computer game.  
11 M: oh computer game.=  
12 C: =ye::s
In lines 1-2, M asks C a question, which he answers following a 0.6 second pause. There is an “oh” token preceding C’s answer, but it is not clear exactly what he is using it for. Following another pause, Y responds with a change-of-state token in line 7, which indexes that what C has said about his hobby is new information for her. In overlap with this, though, M initiates repair in line 8. Actually, as discussed in chapter four, he initiates repair twice, first saying “huh” with rising intonation, and then, after this gets no response, saying “what” with rising intonation. This use of open class repair initiators with rising intonation indexes a lack of comprehension of C’s answer. In response, C and Y complete the repair simultaneously in lines 9 and 10 by repeating C’s answer. Just as Y’s use of “oh” in line 7 indexes that she has understood C’s answer, her ability to complete the repair in line 10 provides further indication that she has understood it. Then, in line 11, M responds by saying “oh computer game.” C responds by saying “yes,” in overlap with which M produces another “oh” before producing more talk.

What is interesting about this, and what appears to be a fairly common use of “oh” in the conversation club interaction, is that the change-of-state token that M uses in line 11 indexes that he has just come to understand what C has said in his answer in lines 4-5. M apparently does not understand C’s answer at first, which is what prompts him to initiate repair with “huh.” When this gets no response, he indicates once more that he does not understand by initiating repair again. After C and Y both complete the repair, he then uses “oh” as a signal that shows his change from a state of non-comprehension to a state of comprehension. He then appears to index this change once more with the additional “oh” in line 13.

Segment (10.5) shows another example.
As in the previous segment, T indicates lack of comprehension of F's turn by
initiating repair in line 4. However, whereas M's repair initiation indexed that he just
did not understand what C had said, T's "moving" with rising intonation not only
initiates repair, it also functions as a display of how he has heard or understood the
final word in F's turn. After F completes the repair by repeating "movie," T says
"oh movie" in line 7, using a change-of-state token. After F confirms "movie" in
line 8, he says "oh I see," using another change-of-state token. T's use of these
change-of-state tokens is pretty much identical to M's use in segment (10.4). They
index that T has just come to understand what F has said in lines 1-2, signaling that he
has moved from a state of non-comprehension, or possibly mis-comprehension, to a
state of comprehension.

Segment (10.6) shows a more complex instance.

(10.6)
[tape 5, 256; H, NNS, female; M, NS, male]
1 H: why (i(h)s th(h)is
2 M: [why,
3 H: [do you think why yes .h w .h why
4 follow .h uh .h (0.3) I didn't
5 (0.4) buy:: (0.3) °mm° chocolate
6 cr: expensive jewelry
7 [yes but .h (0.3) we: uh save=
8 M: [°mm
9 H: =make a money? (0.2) for: °mm°
10 (0.4) for for my: (0.2) boyfriend?
11 M: uhn
12 H: yes .h uh (0.2) uh: save money
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In line 1, H appears to ask M a question. In line 2, M appears to orient to H’s prior turn as a question, but possibly in need of repair, by repeating the question word. However, in overlap with this, H starts to produce more talk, which at first also seems to be a question, as she starts in line 3 with “do you think why” and just a moment later in lines 3-4 “why follow.” She continues producing talk in lines 3-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 18-20. As she does this, M does not try to take the floor and produces only continuers in lines 8, 11, 14, and 17. At this point, there is a pause in line 21, which is followed by M saying “oh” quietly in line 22. Immediately after this, H produces more talk in lines 22-23, which ends with laughter. Then, in lines 25-26, M says “oh you want to buy a special…special present” with rising intonation. After this is confirmed, he then says “for boyfriend,” also with rising intonation.

Though it is not clear what M is doing with “oh” in line 22, it appears that in line 25 he is using “oh” to index that he has just come to understand what H has been trying to say. However, as he then proceeds following the change-of-state token to formulate his understanding of what H has said, he uses rising intonation in lines 26 and 30, which indexes a degree of tentativeness in how he understands H. He
appears to be using "oh" to signal that he has moved from a state of non-comprehension to, not a state of comprehension, but a state of tentative comprehension.

In research on negotiation of meaning, two things that have been of interest are clarification requests, which index a lack of comprehension, and confirmation checks, which index tentative comprehension. This use of the change-of-state token indexes something much more complex, that there is now comprehension where before there was non-comprehension. It seems to be used by the NS participants in this capacity quite often in the conversation club interaction. It also seems likely to be quite common in interaction in which at least one of the participants is of limited proficiency in the language. This particular use of "oh" is something which seems to have gone unnoticed in SLA research on negotiation of meaning and which could be something interesting to pursue in a CA approach to SLA.

Repetition of NNS talk. At times, NNSs incorporate words or phrases used by an NS in their own talk, as shown in segment (10.7).

(10.7)
[tape 1, 313; F, NNS, female; T, NS, male; P, NNS, female]

28 F: yes and (0.3) I mean (1.4) I live
29 in (.) a house,
30 T: yeah
31 F: and (0.5) we have (4.2) upstairs
32 and (0.8)
33 T: downstairs
34 F: downstai(h)r ha ha (.) but
35 different doors
36 T: oh[
37 F: [front door (0.4) and upstairs is
38 (.) it is (0.8) a: landlord?]
39 «deliberate pronunciation» (.)
40 landlord?=
41 T: =yes
42 (0.5)
43 F: mom and landlord's daughters
44 (0.4)
45 T: oh:
46 F: and (0.3) downstairs for rent
47 (0.9)
48 P: oh: I see

In this segment, F is giving a description of the house that she lives in. In line 31, there is a long 4.2 second pause following “we have” as F searches for the word she needs. It turns out that this word is “upstairs.” She then says “and” in line 32, which is followed by another pause, at which point T provides help in line 33 by saying “downstairs,” which is immediately incorporated by F as she says “downstairs” and laughs. It is interesting to note that T provides help by saying “downstairs” following the 0.8 second pause in line 32, but does not provide any help during the much longer 4.2 second pause in line 31. One way to explain this is that T has no way of knowing how F may plausibly continue her turn after she says “we have,” while “downstairs” is an obvious way to continue F’s “upstairs and” in lines 31-32. Of course, there is no way of knowing whether F’s intention is to say “we have upstairs and downstairs.” Another possibility, given what she says in lines 37-40, is something such as “we have upstairs and that is where the landlord lives.”

As is shown in segments (10.8), (10.9), and (10.10), an NS may also make use of words from an NNS’s turn.

(10.8)
[tape 4, B50; M, NS, male; R, NNS, female; Y, NNS, female]
1 M: a lot of Hawaii people right? (.)
2 in sumo
3 R: yeah=
4 Y: =mm=
5 M: =Akebono:,
6 Y: Akebono Konishiki[::
7 M: [Konishiki:,
8 Musashi- Musashimaru:,

(10.9)
[tape 5, 347; M, NS, male; H, NNS, female]
1 M: uh::m (1.6) what else (1.3)
sometimes people give uh jewelry
(0.4)
?: oh:::
?: [oh
M: (ring) () but not
(0.8)
H: especially () close
M: [not-
M: it has to be very close yeah

(10.10)
[tape 8, 207; G, NNS, female; M, NS, male; L, NNS, female]
G: they have to do=
M: =they have to [do it
G: [for: () living
M: expense=
M: =(living) right
L: =[yeah () (for) helping

In each of these segments, the NS, M, takes one or more words from talk produced by
an NNS and uses them in his subsequent turn. In each of these cases, the repetition
can be understood as an example of confirming an allusion (Schegloff, 1996).

Something that up until this point has been left unsaid is explicitly stated in the NNS
turn, which is then confirmed by M through repetition. In segment (10.8), this is the
name of a sumo wrestler from Hawai'i, which Y states in line 6 and M confirms in line
7. In segment (10.9), this is the fact that people have to be “close” in order to give
something such as “jewelry” as a Valentine’s Day present. In line 8, H says
“especially close,” which M confirms by saying “it has to be very close yeah” in
line 10. And then in segment (10.10), prior to which the talk has been about young
women being forced into prostitution, G makes explicit that “they have to do,” which
M confirms by saying “they have to do it.” In lines 3-4, G then says “for living
expense,” which M may be confirming in line 5 by saying “living right,” though it is
not clear exactly what he is saying. Finally, L appears to incorporate G’s use of
“for” plus a gerund by saying “for helping” in line 6.
Again, each of these may be understood as, possibly borderline, cases of using repetition to confirm an explicit statement of something that until the prior turn has been left implicit or unsaid. When it comes to SLA research on negotiation of meaning, such repetition could function to index that the NNS has comprehended what has been left unsaid in talk produced by the NS. This, too, is unexplored territory in SLA.

_Deploying metalinguistic knowledge as a resource._ In chapter nine, there was an analysis of the way that an NNS participant deployed a politeness distinction between “can I” and “could you” to account for an error. Part of this segment is shown again here as segment (10.11)

(10.11)  
15 D: .h (. ) is a can you is- I always  
16 use could you. (. ) yeah:=  
17 T: :=yeah=  
18 D: =I use could. cou- could you show is  
19 a .h=  
20 ?: = (yeah) ?=  
21 D: =can I: (0.3) keh could you:  
22 [sometimes very (. ) very confuses.=  
23 A: [yes yes yes  

The distinction between “can I” and “could you” that D draws would appear to be incorrect, though “could” may be considered more polite than “can,” and there is no way of knowing whether this distinction is something that D has thought about before or whether she has just invented it at this moment. What is interesting, though, is that in drawing this distinction to account for her error, she is deploying it as if it is metalinguistic knowledge. It is possible that NNSs, as well as even NSs at times, make use of metalinguistic knowledge in deciding how to say something and in trying to understand what others have said. A CA approach to SLA, though, offers a different angle on the use of metalinguistic knowledge, allowing the investigation of
how NNSs deploy metalinguistic knowledge, even if this knowledge is not completely accurate, as a resource to accomplish specific interactive objectives, such as, in this case, accounting for an error. This is also something that does not seem to have been explored in SLA research.

**Summary.** Just as CA has been used to illuminate previously unknown or even unimaginable aspects of human interaction, a CA approach to SLA has the potential to illuminate currently unknown aspects of interaction involving NNSs. This section illustrates three possible lines of future research that I noticed as I was working with the data from the conversation club. What may be learned by pursuing these lines of research, as well as other discoveries that may be possible, cannot be predicted in advance. However, just as sociologically oriented conversation analysts have found interaction to be an extremely rich source of data for the study of the moment-by-moment construction of social order, a CA approach to SLA is likely to find interaction involving NNSs to be an unbelievably rich source of data, data which is of interest as much more than merely a source of input.
### APPENDIX A
### TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>period, falling, declarative intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>question mark, rising, question intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>comma, falling-rising, continuing intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>colon, sound elongation, more colons indicate longer elongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>hyphen, cut-off with glottalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>equal signs, latched turns with no gap or overlap, or continuation by same speaker from non-adjacent line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>underlining, greater than normal stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>left bracket, beginning of overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>right bracket, end of overlap (rarely used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>period within parentheses, micropause, hearable pause of less than 0.2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>number within parentheses, pause greater than 0.2 seconds, measured to nearest tenth second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>laugh token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>laugh token within word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>audible outbreath, more letters indicate longer outbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.h</td>
<td>audible inbreath, more letters indicate longer inbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxx)</td>
<td>incomprehensible speech/sounds, number of letters indicates best guess at number of syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yes)</td>
<td>word inside parentheses, best guess at practically incomprehensible speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>double parentheses, analyst’s description of something in the transcript, or description of problem with the transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°xxx°</td>
<td>words inside degree signs, extra-quiet talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.schwa</td>
<td>schwa, non-native-like epenthesis of reduced vowel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B
### PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape #</th>
<th>Group participation</th>
<th>Pseudonym (if in the transcript)</th>
<th>(Parentheses indicate non-member of group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T, NS, male</td>
<td>Taka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B, NNS, female</td>
<td>Boram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T, NS, male</td>
<td>Taka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B, NNS, female</td>
<td>Boram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M, NS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C, NNS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M, NS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K, NS, female</td>
<td>Emiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E, NNS, female</td>
<td>Setsuko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q, NS, Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M, NS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K, NS, female</td>
<td>Emiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E, NNS, female</td>
<td>Setsuko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J, NS, male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M, NS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L, NNS, female</td>
<td>Taka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T, NS, male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T, NS, male</td>
<td>Taka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A, NS, female</td>
<td>Ally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O, NNS, male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N, NNS, female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
CONVERSATION CLUB TRANSCRIPTS

Segments are listed by tape number and counter number. The places where the
segment, or part of the segment, appears in the text is listed by segment number to the
right of the counter number.

tape 1, 76 (7.1)
1 B: °I live° (. ) I live in Pearl City.
2 P: mm-hm
3 (0.9)
4 T: oh: you live all the way out
5 [in Pearl City?
6 B: [yeah hh (0.7) so I usually get up
7 at six o’clock.
8 P: wow:
9 (1.5) (loud talk outside group,
10 continues until start of T’s turn in
11 line 16))
12 T: wow (0.4) how do- (2.9) how do you
13 get here? by bus?
14 B: yeah
15 (0.8)
16 T: from Pearl City?
17 B: yeah [ha ha
18 T: [ha ha ha (g(h)od
19 P: [wow

tape 1, 120 (2.18) (5.2) (5.3) (6.24)
1 T: I came out here just because I
2 wanted to try something different.
3 (0.3) cuz (. ) Indiana’s all:
4 Caucasian people=
5 ?: =mm[:
6 T: [right there’s no Asian
7 [people at all=
8 ?: [oh (yes)?
9 P: =yeah [white people right?
10 T: [yeah
11 T: yeah (I think it’s) all white
12 people so (. ) and I didn- I didn’t
13 mind it I just wanted something
14 else.
15 P: num=
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T: =so (. ) I came over here cuz (0.6)
17 I have a bunch of friends that go
to school in Indiana: , (. ) but are
from Hawaii:. (0.6) and so they’re
like (. ) oh you should go to Hawaii
[you should go to Hawaii=
22 ?: [ha ha ha ( . ) . hh
23 ?: =[oh: [(xx)
24 T: [so that’s why I'm
25 over here (0.8) and=
26 P: =that’s nice
27 T: I got this job just cuz (0.7) I
don’t know I sorta: know: how you
guys feel
30 ?: [mm
31 T: [just because (. ) you know like I
32 have f:our older brothers and
33 they’re all (0.7) really old yeah,
34 (. ) [so
35 ?: [mm
36 T: when they came here they they were
37 like you guys
38 ?: yeah
39 ?: [mm
40 T: 'n' so I like trying to help (. )
41 people out (. ) I guess (. ) to (0.4)
(you know) to try to speak better
42 English (or whatever) [so
44 P: [ye:s
45 T: that’s why I’m [her:e
46 P: [(that’s) nice

tape 1, 215 (6.1) (6.27) (7.3)

T: like um:
(0.7)
3 ?: h=
4 T: =cuz Hawaii used to be: not (. ) it
didn’t used to be a part of the US.
right,
7 (0.6)
8 T: and then: (0.3) it used to be:
9 Hawaii.
10 F: [right.
11 P: [mm-hm:
12 T: Hawaiians used to live there an’=
13 F: =not belong (. ) Uni[ted States
14 T: [it didn’t ( . )
15 belong to the United States.
P: [oh:
T: [an' then (0.6) like in eighteen-
(. ) sorry it's not a history lesson
but in eighteen: ninety-three or=
?: [hh
T: =something: they came an' they just
(0.7) overthrew the governmen:t
an' took it over: an' (x[xx)
F: [yeah
P: 

tape 1,296 (8.21)

1 B: Waikiki.
2 (0.6)
3 T: you never go to Wai[kiki really?
4 B: [yes (0.4)
and Norse (0.4) nor:se, (0.6)
6 "(norse) norse°=
7 T: =the North Shore?=
8 B: =yes.
9 P: North Shore? yeah.

tape 1,304 (4.2) (4.28) (4.40) (4.47)

1 T: just haven't had ti:me or the
2 [energy.]
3 P: [oh too] fah: don't you think?
4 (0.3)
5 T: huh?
6 P: too fah:?
7 (0.6)
8 T: [it's pretty far. (.) I heard it's
9 like
10 P: [how long it take like two houwa:
11 ((final r of hour sounds like wa))
12 T: no just an hour. (.) to get- (0.3)
13 up to North Shore.

tape 1,313 (2.6) (4.18) (4.24) (4.55) (8.8) (10.7)

1 T: do you live alone?
2 (0.8)
3 F: no
4 (1.3)
5 T: host family?
6 F: no I- I have (. ) roommate
T: oh you have roommates
F: [right
T: [an' you- (. ) knew them from (.4)
(1.8)
T: Japan?
F: my roommate?
T: mm-hm
F: she's local girl (.4) she's Chinese
though.
T: oh:
F: [and
T: [so how'd you know her
F: uh:: (. ) no- (. ) we're we are not
friend.
F: just a roommate=
T: [oh:
F: =we're [not (. ) just roommate
T: [oh just
T: just roommates
F: yes and (.3) I mean (.4) I live
in (. ) a house,
T: yeah
F: and (.5) we have (.2) upstairs
and (.8)
T: downstairs
F: downstairs ha ha (. ) but
different doors
T: oh:
F: [front door (.4) and upstairs is
(.) it is (.8) a: landlord?
((deliberate pronunciation)) (. )
landlord?:
T: =yes
F: mom and landlord's daughters
T: oh:
F: and (.3) downstairs for rent
T: oh:
P: oh: I [see
F: [so (.2) and and (.3) we
have (. ) three- (. ) bedrooms
T: oh:
F: and (.3) she and I stayed
T: in two
F: two: rooms (. ) [and
two bed and one room. the same room.

F: yes o (0.4) no (0.3) no (0.7)
each room
B: mmm
F: and=
P: =oh
F: one room is still empty.
T: oh:
F: so we have to share kitchen, and
bathroom, and (0.9) the living
room.

tape 1, 375 (4.13) (4.30) (10.5)

F: uh (.) tomorrow I will (.) I think
(1.1) I watch movie.
(0.7)
T: moving?
(0.4)
F: movie.
T: oh movie.
F: yeah=
T: =oh I see.

tape 1, 430 (3.21) (6.2) (6.30) (8.1) (8.15) (8.31) (8.35)
(8.50) (9.1) (10.1)

T: yeah but we have okay so ants,
(0.6) geckos:, cockroaches:, (0.8)
what else.
(0.6)
P: mouse mice. [(xxx)
T: [no. no mice.
P: oo
(0.5)
T: no mice.
B: mouse hh
(0.8)
T: a:n' you [guys wanna hear-
(0.5) lee:za:rd
((non-target-like pronunciation))
T: [yeah liza[rd.
B: [oh:
F: [lizard. [yeah
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tape 1, 481 (8.19) (8.33) (8.39) (8.49) (8.51) (9.2) (9.14)

1 F: in my house (.) now (0.8) my
2 roommate (0.8) left (3.3) bunch of
3 tomatoes.
4 T: oh
5 F: case of tomato (0.8) but (0.3)
6 they’re (1.0) °foo°
7 (0.8)
8 T: [foo:
9 F: [((fruit) (1.2) fruit
10 T: fruit flies?
11 (0.8)
12 F: °(fruit)°
13 (1.0)
14 T: hh
15 (8.3)
16 F: rot
17 (1.0)
18 T: rot. (0.4) oh yeah (.) they’re
19 . they’re rotten ((clear t)) yeah
20 F: rotten ((clear t))
21 P: oh: [rotten ((clear t)) (they’re)=
22 T: [they’re getting old.
23 P: =yeah then
24 T: ro[tten. ((clear t))
25 F: [and
26 (0.5)
27 T: like smell ba:d (0.4) [(and fruit)=
28 F: [yeah and
29 T: =flies
30 (2.1)
31 F: we have (0.7) mold?
32 T: yeah (.) [oh:::
33 P: [oo: that is

tape 1, 538 (4.39) (4.46) (4.54)

1 T: well it can be just for your own
2 measure of how (0.3) well you’re
3 doing?
\textbf{tape 1, B112 (7.4)}

1 T: an' so my mom would always be getting rice [().] an' then (0.7)
2 F: [yeah]
3 T: now that I'm here I'm like (0.6)
4 that is so weird that my mom always
got me rice right she's like my servant or something at dinner (0.6) and so I stopped doing that and I started getting my own rice but

P: oh::
T: [like that kind of stuff too [right
F: [(but) like serve? (0.4)
T: yeah like the servant (.) attitude.
F: oh
T: of [women
F: [so is (0.3) yours (0.3) mom (.)
always ask you: [(0.3) more rice
T: [yeah okawari iru? (.).[or something like that right
F: [yeah right right right

Tape 2, 42 (2.21) (4.3) (4.33)

T: will the Korean government give you a scholarship or something? (2.1)
B: yes (.). some (0.3) can but (1.0) I don't know (0.8) how to get a scholarship.
T: yeah: (0.5) I don't know how to get a scholarship too. but=
B: =ha ha .hh [ha
F: [I wanna I wanna get scholarship (xx) (1.6) I want to.
T: yeah (2.6) where would you get a scholarship from the Japanese government?
(0.5)
F: hm?
T: if you got a scholarship, it would be from Japan right?
(1.8)
F: but- (0.7) uh:: if they:

Tape 2, 166 (2.17) (2.20)

F: if I- (0.4) just spea- (.) speak Japane:se here. (1.0) not (1.6)
no:::
4 (1.2)
5 T: point=
6 F: = same as - no point.
7 T: yeah
8 (0.5)
9 F: just same as (. . .) Japan.
10 T: yeah yeah
11 F: *(so)* (0.5) why: why did I come
12 here.
13 T: yeah (0.6) especially like in
14 Hawaii it's really easy to do that.
15 (. . .) [cuz there's a lot of Japanese=
16 F: [right
17 T: = [people.
18 F: [°(yeah)°
19 (1.0)
20 T: how bout you (. . .) Boram (0.7) you
21 speak Korean and stuff? outside?
22 (1.0)
23 B: °(yep)° (2.0) uh (0.7) but (0.9)
24 (at scone) my classmate. (0.4)
25 (is). (. . .) Japanese. (0.3) so I have
26 to (0.4) I have to speak English.
27 (0.3) but (0.5) good for me (2.2)
28 now (0.6) I (won't/want) make (0.7)
29 local people or, (. . .) UH
30 students=but I am . h= 
31 T: [yeah
32 B: =but- (. . .) I don't know how to make
33 T: yeah it's really hard huh.
34 F: yeah:
35 (0.6)
36 T: it was hard for me to make like I
37 was lucky because my roommate?
38 (1.0) is from Kauai. (. . .) which is
39 another island?
40 B: °oh°
41 T: in Hawaii right?
42 B: °Kauai°
43 T: so he knew a lot of people. (. . .) so
44 I got to know all of his friends.

tape 4, 64 (8.48)

1 Y: wow- (0.4) is uh: m (0.8) I-I
2 wonder the (. . .) most American
3 students [is college students is=
4 M: [mm-hm
5 Y: = a like to drink alcohol?
M: [a lot.
Y: [oh? .hh yeah Korea students
t(h)oo
C: [ha ha ha ha ha [ha ha
M: [(yeah)
R: [really
Y: [(is a
M: first time is uhm (0.6) uh: (.)
like this is a- (0.3) a bi:g bowls
is a- drunken beer or drunk is=
M: [mm-hm
Y: =uhm (0.6) Korean traditional (0.4)
alcohol [is a soju soju?
M: [mm?
M: mm
Y: is a- (0.4) drunk is a- (0.4) one
time.
(0.6)
M: oh yeah?
Y: yeah so is a- (0.5) uh: (.) like is
a traditional cust(h)om: [in is a=
M: [mm
Y: =in [(0.3) yeah entrance.
R: [mm
M: for [university oh:
Y: [um (0.4) yeah (0.3) for
univer[sity.
M: [oh you have to drink (0.3)
all of it.=
Y: =yeah:
M: ha ha=
Y: =all of it is a just one time.
M: oh my [god
Y: [ha ha ha [ha .hh ha ha
M: [(and you don’t die
Y: [.hh ha ha ha (0.4) .hh
C: [muh- (0.9) (muhcuhlee) no?
Y: [ha ha ha
Y: [yeah (muhcuhlee- muhcuhlee) too,
(.) is a (muhcuhlee) is um (.). a
very (0.8) yeah it’s a- (0.3)
delicious (0.3) alcohol,
M: mm
Y: and so [(.) like is a (.)) looks=
C: [(x) (0.3)[a:nd (xxx).
Y: =like milk.
C: ha ha ha ha [ha
M: [(ks) like milk?
Y: yeah like milk, (.]) is a but (0.3)
is (. ) there is alcohol. ha ha ha
R: I know (a) bomb bomb alcohol. ha
Y: yes right ha ha
C: [ha ha ha yeah yeah yeah
[bomb alcohol]
Y: [(xxx) bomb alcohol
R: [(bomb alcohol)
C: [ha ha [ha
M: [bomb]
Y: alcohol
R: [(x)
Y: [yes so) mix the: [three or: =
R: [the- (.4)
bee bee)
Y: =five=
C: =beer and
R: beer and [whiskey[:,
C: [and so-
Y: [whiskey:
C: [and soju: [ha ha ha
M: [oh my god
Y: [soju ha ha
M: and you drink i-
Y: [yeah:
M: [oh my god) (. ) [tchu
Y: [terrible)
C: [ha ha [ha ha ha
Y: [hang over:
M: go to hospital I think.
C: yeah [right yes [ha ha ha=
R: [yeah
Y: [but is a=
M: =how bout in (. ) Japanese students?
R: oh: (.3) same as (. ) Korean but
I think (0.6) Korean people
(0.3) much more [drink. ((one-word-
at-a-time articulation))
Y: [mm
Y: mm I think so:
R: (than Japanese)
M: more than Japanese.
R: yeah
laughter; others laughing also, but
more quietly))
C: yeah yeah?
M: how often.
(0.5)
Y: how often=
C: =uh:m (2.5) soju: [ha ha
Y: [no no no
P<xxxxxxx> ((Korean, 1.0 seconds))
(1.0)
C: mm
Y: is a- [(x)
C: [(one week yes)
(0.7)
Y: once a [week?
C: [(a day)?
(1.0)
M: (in) (. ) one week?
C: one week (. ) yes
Y: is a once a week [(two times)
C: [(yes
M: two times twice a week.
C: yes.
(0.5)
M: two times per week.

tape 4, 103 (2.23) (4.44) (4.59)
((multiple laughter))
R: uh: (. ) do you like drink?
(0.7)
Y: y:eah: is a when I: wa:s a (. ) a
college student? (0.8) (it was) (. )
al:most every day:.
R: wow
Y: mm
M: wow
Y: yeah almost every day.
M: alcoholic
(1.1)
Y: it's not alcoholic is a (just) ha
ha ha
((multiple laughter))

tape 4, 144 (2.5) (4.49)
Y: hi:
?: (anyon)
3 (0.4)
4 Y: (anyon) (. ) oh: ha ha ha
5 C: oh ho ha ha
6 (0.6)
7 Y: .hh (1.0) is a he's not (xx) (0.4)
8 mm
9 M: but he’s Japanese?
10 Y: yes.
11 M: oh but he can speak a little (. )
12 Korean?
13 Y: little Korean just (anyon) ha
14 C: ha ha [ha ha ha just (anyon) ha= 
15 R: [ (xx)
16 C: = ha ha ha ha

tape 4, 181 (2.9)

1 M: there’s only (cer-) I think there’s
2 (0.6) other people their problem is
3 they can not [{1.0} understand uh
4 Y: [mm mm:
5 M: (1.0) any foreign accent.
6 (0.8)
7 M: yeah
8 (2.8)
9 ?: mm
10 (0.8)
11 Y: good ha ha ha
12 R: (but)
13 (0.6)
14 M: you have any children?
15 (1.3)
16 C: one?
17 M: yeah?
18 C: yes
19 (0.3)
20 Y: one daughter?
21 C: daughter
22 M: daughter?
23 C: [yeah
24 R: [°(do you have photo)° (1.2) °of
25 your (0.3) daughter? (. )
26 photograph.°
27 (1.2)
28 Y: do you have [photograph?
29 R: [(xx) photograph?
30 R: [now (. ) pic[tures?
31 C: [oh yes
beautiful
(is so pretty.

M: ha ha ha
C: ha ha
M: ha ha ha ha

?: hh

?: mm: .h oh:. (yeah)
R: oh cute and beautiful.
C: yes my wife.

Y: your wife is so pretty.
R: [mm (0.5) [mm:
M: yeah. (. ) beautiful wife, beautiful baby.

Y: (wuh)
M: lucky man.
C: hh

M: how old is your daughter now?
Y: [nineteen)
C: [nine months.
Y: nineteen=
C: =nineteen: months.
M: oh nineteen months.
C: yes=
M: =oh almost two. (. ) huh. (. ) yeah

R: .hh (wait) do you speak (0.4)
English in (. ) at home?
(0.7)
Y: no.
R: mm
Y: yeah [my my father and my mother=
R: [but
Y: =ha .h never speak Engli(h)sh ha ha
C: ha ha ha ha ha
R: but (. ) [but (. ) your fah (0.3) =
M: [yeah (0.4) kay
R: =father is American: ?=
Y: =yeah is a just (0.6) ha ha ha ha
ha .hh yeah just get a
(citilinship) yeah citi[zen what=
R: [mm
Y: =is a civilization? .h (0.6) yeah
just is a American ci- (0.4)
civilist (0.6) what is it.
R: (xxxxxxx)
(0.6)
Y: yeah [is a (0.3) can speak English=
M: [yeah alright]
Y: =is a little (0.4) [just
R: [mm
(1.0)
R: [mm:
M: [who your mother?
Y: yeah
M: oh: so your fah but your father can
speak (0.3) Korean.
(0.4)
Y: yes.
R: [mm:
M: [oh so they speak Korean together.
(2.0) how did they meet

M: where is he your stepfather where
is he from.
(1.5)
Y: where's from?
M: yeah=
Y: =Korea. (0.9) what?
M: your stepfather.
Y: my stepfather yeah Korea.
(0.8)
M: he's from Korea?
Y: yeah
M: I thought he's American.
(0.8)
Y: (is he) he's got American citizen.
(1.3)
M: [oh:
R: [from (0.8) thirty (. ) [(years ago)
yeah thirty
years ago. yeah
M: mm
he got oh he got "American
citizen)° [but he’s Korean.
Y: [mm
Y: yeah
(0.6)
M: oh: I thought he was American.
Y: is not (. ) is American but is a
Korean (American) ha ha ha ha ha
((multiple laughter))

tape 4, 505 (4.6) (4.29) (10.4)

M: how bout you (0.3) what’s your
hobby.
(0.6)
C: oh hh I’m: (0.3) compter ((two
syllables)) game.
(0.5)
Y: oh[::
M: [huh? (0.9) what?
C: [compute game
Y: [computer game.
M: oh computer game.=
C: =ye[::s
M: [oh: (there you go) what kind of
game.
(0.8)
C: mm:

tape 4, 518 (4.38) (4.45) (4.56) (8.14)

M: yeah (. ) when is it.
(. ) [this summer?
?: [(xx]
Y: [no is a
R: [Ju- June?
Y: no not June. May.
R: May?= M[ay?
Y: [yeah May.
M: [I thought it was in June.
R: [May
Y: May.
M: May. (0.4) [oh:
R: [oh::
342
15 (1.0)
16 M: wow. that's exciting yeah?

tape 4, B50 (10.8)
1 M: a lot of Hawaii people right? (.)
2 in sumo
3 R: yeah=
4 Y: =mm=
5 M: =Akebono:, 
6 Y: Akebono Konishiki::
7 M: [Konishiki:,
8 Musashi- Musashimaru::,
9 Y: [Musashimaru (0.7)
10 oh::

tape 4, B102 (4.7)
1 Y: oh:. (. where's your wife.
2 (0.5)
3 C: yeah?
4 Y: where's your wife. (. now
5 (0.7)
6 C: shopping? ((laughter))

tape 4, B107 (2.2)
1 M: okay (. think it's [four o'clock.=
2 ?: [(yeah::)
3 M: ==I think we'll finish.
4 (0.4)
5 Y: yeah [(x)
6 M: =so next week is not
7 ?: [(xxx)
8 Y: =not (0.3) [not not not. yeah.
9 ?: [(xxx)?
10 M: =so maybe the (0.8) [the next two=
11 R: =two weeks
12 M: =weeks yeah=
13 Y: ==mm
14 M: bring some pictures?
15 (0.5)
16 R: =hm? (0.4) [oh okay
17 C: =yeah?
18 (0.5)
19 M: I don't know (0.3) how it's working
20 but I think maybe (. also we kind
21 of can switch with (.) with pe
22 ((recording ends))

tape 5, 15 (2.7) (6.3) (6.15)
1 M: an' what's your name?
2 E: my name is Emiko.
3 M: Emiko.
4 (0.4)
5 M: okay
6 E: I'm from in Japan,
7 M: from Japan
8 (0.4)
9 M: okay?
10 (1.0)
11 M: and?
12 S: my name is Setsuko and I'm from
13 (Japan)=
14 M: =Setsuko
15 S: yes:=
16 M: =okay.

tape 5, 19 (1.3) (2.22) (2.26)
1 M: so easily ((smilely voice))
2 ?: hh
3 (1.1)
4 M: okay
5 (2.5)
6 M: let me find some paper:
7 (1.4)
8 H: Setsuko we can research for (1.2)
9 for for
10 M: oh [for your class?
11 ?: [(xx)?
12 S: ah-
13 H: mm
14 S: yeah
15 M: it's for your (.) for your class?
16 ?: (but)=
17 H: =yes [oh-
18 M: [yeah no problem,

tape 5, 22 (6.16)
1 M: the first time
2 (0.5)
3 M: okay so your name is
4 H: Hee Ju:n�.
5 M: Hee Jung.
6 H: jay you:, en jee. [yes
7 M: [Hee Jung.
8 M: okay and (.) [E-
9 E: [Emiko, [ee em ay?
10 M: [Emiko
11 M: ee em ay,
12 E: kay oh?
13 M: kay oh? (0.3) Emiko
14 E: Emiko
15 M: Emiko (0.5) it's a nice name I like
16 that (. ) Emiko
17 (1.1)
18 M: and your name? again?
19 S: Setsuko?
20 M: ah Setsuko.
21 S: yeah
22 (3.6)
23 M: okay?
24 S: yeah

tape 5, 26 (2.27)
1 H: yeah ou:r: (0.4) uh:- (0.3) we:
2 uh: same (. ) uh we have (0.4) take
3 a: (0.4)
4 ?: "same"=
5 H: =same classes=.
6 M: =mm-hm=
7 H: ="yes" . h [we:- (0.5) we do:::-
8 ?: [(xx) (sometimes)
9 H: (0.5) ha (0.5) our homework?
10 M: uh-huh
11 H: "we will" . h uh: (0.4) American?
12 or: conversation partner?
13 M: okay=
14 H: =some question?
15 M: sure
16 H: is about Valentine Day:s,
17 M: =okay okay

tape 5, 30 (2.28) (7.2)
1 H: is about Valentine Day:s,=
2 M: =o[kay [okay
3 ?: [(mm-hm)
tape 5, 36 (2.29)

1 M: [somebody (x)]
2 S: [yeah I know it ha ha ha
3 ?: oh~=
4 M: =you know the story?
5 (0.6)
6 S: yes
7 M: yeah I think it's (0.5)
8 [I can’t (rm) ((creaky voice))]
9 H: [Valentine’s story:, [you know?
10 S: [yeah
11 S: yeah
12 H: oh:=
13 E: =Valentine story
14 S: yeah (0.3) I read: (0.4) this
15 story: (0.4) from int(h)ern(h)et ha
16 M: oh from the internet.
17 S: [yeah ha ha
18 ?: [oh[:
19 ?: [oh[: oh::
20 M: [I can’t remember
21 everything but I think he was in
22 jail right?

tape 5, 37 (2.30) (4.14) (4.27) (8.25)

1 M: I can’t remember everything but I
2 think he was in jail right?
3 (0.5)
4 H: jay:? 
5 M: n- (.) understand jail?
6 H: [no
7 M: (prison?
8 ?: prison
9 : ah [(praps)
10 : [(m-)
11 (1.7)
12 S: prison. yes.

tape 5, 41 (8.11) (8.38) (8.52) (9.3)
1 S: n:o: he's a: (0.9) uh (2.7) I don't
2 know=
3 M: =oh:=
4 S: =fath father?
5 M: oh: yeah yeah [yeah
6 S: [puri?
7 M: oh the priest?
8 S: priest?
9 M: yeah

tape 5, 43 (1.2) (2.31)
1 S: uh kink h (1.6) kink hh said (0.3)
2 don't marriage ha
3 M: wow
4 (1.0)
5 S: m because uh (1.2) there a lot of w
6 wah? (0.9) but=
7 M: =a lot of war?
8 S: wah [uh
9 M: [(because)
10 (1.6)
11 S: uh (nan to yuu) (0.8) uh s sorry I
12 forgot the- (0.7) (xxxxx) (.). army
13 like a- (.). [army
14 M: [uh-huh (.). okay
15 (0.4)
16 S: army: (0.7) a:nd want to go back
17 to ho:me,
18 M: [uh-huh
19 S: [if they get marriage,
20 M: uh-huh=
21 S: =mm then kink (0.9) not allow to
22 (0.4) marriage.
23 ?: ["mm"
24 M: [oh: so he wants everybody to: be
25 in the war,
26 (0.4)
27 S: yeah
28 M: ah: okay okay
tape 5, 55 (8.9)

1 M: so the- (0.3) okay (1.9) so the
2    priest sent a letter?
3 (1.3)
4 M: no
5 S: no: sent a no:- uh (0.6) they::
6 (1.0) uhm (0.8) army- arm- m-
7 M: the army=
8 S: =(army) army and woman?

tape 5, 60 (4.15) (4.31) (8.24) (8.41) (8.53) (9.7)

1 M: oh he married he married them?
2 (0.3)
3 S: marry dam dam?
4 M: married them?
5 S: marry them? (.) yeah.

tape 5, 63 (2.32) (4.50) (4.53)

1 H: som:e man: (.) go to army?
2 S: yes
3 H: he his wife (0.6) uh his
4    girlfriend?
5 (0.5)
6 S: no no no .h (0.5) many man go to
7    war?
8 (0.6)
9 H: go to war?
10 S: go to war? .h but (.) uh: ift (0.3)
11 man get marriage,
12 H: [mm
13 M: [uh-huh
14 (0.4)
15 S: uhm (0.4) they want to go back to
16    home?
17 H: [mm
18 M: [uh-huh
19 S: then kink (0.8) said
20 M: no marriage.=
21 S: =no (0.3) don’t you don’t marriage.
22 (0.6)
23 M: yeah (0.4) because he wants the
24    people to fight? (0.3) the men
25    should fight the war?
26 (0.5)
27 ?: mm=
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28 M: =but if they love somebody at home, they have a wife?
29 S: mm=
30 M: =they won’t fight.
31 (0.4)
32 S: [mm
33 ?: [oh
34 M: [the war. they want (0.4) come home.
35 S: yeah.
36 M: right?
37 S: yeah.

tape 5, 70 (8.12) (8.36) (8.42) (8.54) (9.4)

1 S: but (0.7) this fah- father pris?
2 M: yeah priest
3 S: priest (1.0) mm:: ((ends with creakiness)) (1.7) (sink some uh)

tape 5, 73 (2.33)

1 M: so it’s illegal.
2 S: yeah it’s illegal.
3 M: [oh:
4 S: [and kink (0.6) very upset?
5 M: uhn
6 S: he uh king sent him: to prison.
7 M: oh:: okay.
8 ?: [oh:
9 H: mm-hm?
10 (0.4)
11 M: oh. (0.4) so you teach me something about my own [(0.3) culture.
12 {(overlapping sounds as conversation continues})

tape 5, 76 (2.34) (4.51)

1 H: he: (0.4) uh didn’t uh he di- (.)
2 he do- he don’t want to: .h go-
3 want to: go to army?
4 (1.3)
5 M: no uhm (1.5) everybody (.). the king said nobody can marry.
6 H: mm nobody
7 ?: [ah ah: (the king) (.). (said)
M: nobody can marry. (0.5) because if they marry they stay home.
10 H: stay home.
11 M: but if they're single,
12 (0.4)
13 : mm=
14 M: they go to the war.
15 : mm=
16 H: =mm:=
18 M: so he said don’t marry. (1.1) but (0.4) the priest (1.1) married people. (1.3) it’s illegal.
19 (0.5)
20 H: oh-
21 M: another priest.
22 (1.3)
23 H: don’t (0.4) don’t (0.3) want war?
24 (0.5) to war?
26 M: no no the [priest is
27 : [hh thh [ha ha .hh hh
29 : [not not married
30 is the (. ) war?
31 (0.7)
32 H: no married,
33 M: yeah
34 H: [no married is war?
35 M: [but the- no the priest,
36 (0.4)
37 H: but
38 (0.7)
39 M: the priest,
40 : hh ha ha .hh

tape 5, 83 (2.35)

1 ((multiple laughter, overlapping with H))
3 H: I’m so so(h)rry b(h)ut .h I(h)
4 c(h)an’t .hh [I a(h)m (why)
5 M: [(let me think).
6 (0.8)
7 S: (think)
8 (0.4)
9 M: so- (1.7) the priest, (1.4) would marry people together.
10 (0.5)
12 S: yeah
13 (0.3)
14 M: yeah?
He would marry a man and woman; they would go to the priest, and he would marry them.

but it's illegal.

[yeah because the king said no: no=

[uhh

Marriage.

Because if they marry, they stay home.

Okay if I have a wife.

And maybe children,

Wanna stay; [in Hawaii.

[yes [yes

But if the war is in California,

I don't want- I won't go.

ah]: yes

[single is a war.

Yeah the war is in Califonia, I'm in Hawaii. (0.5) so if I marry,

(0.3) I'm gonna stay in Hawaii.

(0.4) but the king
M: wants me to go (0.3) to the war. =
H: =oh ah: yes. =
M: =so he said don’t marry.
H: [oh
M: [nobody can marry.
H: =oh=
M: =so you’ll- don’t stay home.
H: [yes.
M: [you’ll go to (0.3) to the
war. (.) [in California.
H: [ah: (xxxx)
M: but (0.9) another priest
M: mm
H: mm
M: he would marry,
H: ah::=
M: =it’s illegal,
H: [mm
M: [oh[::
M: yeah it’s like a secret.
S: [oh yeah secr(h)et.
M: [to marry them together.
M: mm:
M: mm:
M: so: (0.7) understand?
H: yes (.) [(now) understand
M: [(alright)

1 M: so this priest (.) is named (.)
2 Valentine.
3 H: ah[::
4 [: [mm[::
5 M: [saint his name saint
6 Valentines.
7 (0.3)
8 [: [mm
9 M: [so he marries everybody together.
10 [: [mm
11 M: so the king is angry.
12 (0.8)
13 H: oh yes
14 (0.6)
Valentine is angry with the priest with Valentine's.

M: so he put in (a) jail.

?: mm

M: =ah:=

?: (=xx[xx^0])

E: [this is the Val(h)ent(h)ine

M: (. st(h)o[ry? ha ha ha .hh ha ha=

M: =that's the Valentine=

E: =ha

M: =story. (0.5) ah:

E: .hh=

H: =from [now

M: [so that's the s that's the

history, but I think uh

tape 5, 99 (2.38) (4.16) (4.23)

H: =from [now

M: [so that's the s that's the

history, but I think uh (. now the

meaning (. ) today: [is

?: [mm

M: it's just about love I think,

?: mm?

M: (in) today?

?: mm mm=

M: =Valentine's Day is just for: love.

(0.4)

H: love?

M: [yeah:

?: [(I think) hm?

(0.5)

?: mm

M: because the priest was marrying

people for love so. (0.6) it's a

day a day for. (0.5) day for love.

(0.6) but (0.5) now it's also very

uh: (0.7) about money.
tape 5, 137 (8.10)

1 E: if you have a (. ) girlfriend, what do you do Valentine Day?
2 (0.7)
3 M: oh: (0.7) maybe buy something for her,
4 E: [oh:
5 M: [like buy maybe a ca- candy:
6 E: Coho mm:
7 M: [some candy chocolate, (0.7)
8 [flower:s,
9 E: [present mm[:
10 M: [yeah some kind of present. Valentine's present.

tape 5, 151 (4.10) (4.22) (6.4) (6.28)

1 M: it's more (. ) for that. (0.3) but you can also send- (0.2) valentines for your fam:ily for fri:ends
2 ?: "mm"
3 M: everything
4 ?: "mm:="
5 M: =when we were in uh (. ) elementary school?
6 ?: "mm=
7 ?: =mm:
8 M: usually everybody gave to all the students in the [(0.3) class=
9 ?: [eh:
10 E: =a:ll student.
11 M: yeah all the students.=
12 E: =if you: don't like hh h:im?
13 M: no: [but you give to everybody.
14 ?: ["ha ha"
15 E: everybody.
16 M: yeah usually.
17 E: "oh"
18 M: so

tape 5, 155 (5.4) (5.5) (5.6) (5.7) (5.8)

1 H: oh (0.2) what do you think. mm .h
2 eh- (0.3) children is .h mm (0.3)
3 don't think commercial uh .h
4 Valentine Day is commercial: means .h uh .h (0.4) education uh (0.2)
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children i:s (.) mm pure yes .h
6
"mm" (.) we: (0.6) we can give a
7 (0.4) uh Valentin:e's .h mean?
8 (0.8) uh: (2.2) education
9
10 ?: oh::
11 H: for education? (0.6) mm child we
12 can give (1.3) child (1.7) a
13 Valentine:e's Day?
14 M: mm-hm
15 H: mm especially .h mm (0.9) a child
16 feel (1.3) feel? (1.3) child=
17 E: =fear [fear
18 H: [fear
19 M: mm
20 H: [(it) feeled
21 ?: [(xxx) (0.4) [feeled? ((pronounced
22 as two syllables))
23 H: [yes Valentine Day
24 ?: mm mm:
25 (0.9)
26 H: they're they::
27 E: mm children?
28 H: [they are yes (0.3) pure
29 E: pure [ah ah
30 H: [yes
31 M: mm
32 H: so (0.4) we can give (.) education
33 we (0.4) educate
34 E: ah::=
35 H: =child
36 (0.7)
37 E: how do we educate (.) children?
38 H: yes hm? ah .h you: (0.4) you sai:d
39 uh: (1.1) pure "yes" .h eh-
40 especially like: (0.7) I: like .h
41 (1.1) [(xx)=
42 ?: [("
43 H: =is ah on yes .h specially two: (.)
44 "mm-hm" yes .h=
45 M: =uh-huh
46 H: yes .h we: (0.3) uh: (0.6) we ed
47 uh: (0.2) we teach (0.9) uh: (0.3)
48 I- (3.1) and I uh (0.2) uh in:
49 (0.4) uh if: I (1.4) a teacher?
50 M: mm-hm=
51 H: "yes" (0.2) I (0.5) teachy
52 E: oh:[:
53 H: [I teach you: .h uh .h another
54 person (0.6) (x) ((croaking sound))
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card happy Valentine's Day

yes candy

[yes (D. 7)]

oh same thing (0.3) usually or (0.3) a car- card

[rom a small]

55 (2.3) (xxxx) yeah I feel .h you feel .h (0.3) special day
56 M: [mm]
57 H: [Valentine Day like Valentine Day
58 (x) .h through (0.4) Valentine Day
59 (0.6) you feel more .h mm: (1.3)
60 (hap) expensi expensive (0.3)
61 emotion or: (1.3) something done ha
62 (h)I (0.3) .h (h)I
63 M: mm=
64 H: =before (xxxx) ((said while
65 laughing)) ha ha .hh=
66 M: =hard to say
67 H: (that's) my qu(h)estion ha ha ha
68 M: [ha ha ha
69 ?: [ha (.) [ha ha ha mm
70 ?: [.hhh (.).h
71 ((this transcription of overlapping
72 laughter is a best guess attempt))
73 M: so if you are a teacher, (1.0)
74 H: mm
75 M: you want to teach the children,
76 H: mm .hh ah- .h=
77 M: =about Valentine's Day?
78 H: mm (1.3) mm (0.6) we can give (1.9)
79 ?: °child°
80 M: give a valentine
81 H: some ye:s
82 M: to- (. to the children?
83 H: yes
84 M: oh:
85 H: what uh (0.5) what
86 (1.8)
87 M: oh what what can [I give to the
88 children?
89 H: [yes (0.7) yes
90 M: oh same thing (0.3) usually candy
91 or (0.3) a car- card
92 ?: [mm
93 M: [a small card happy Valentine's Day

tape 5, 190 (7.6)

1 H: oh except .h present .h uh .h (0.5)
2 they feel(ed) (0.3) mm (0.5) they
3 are feel (0.6)
4 ?: [mm
5 ?: children
6 M: fear. (0.7) fear ef ee eigh ar?= 356
7 H: =fear? feel.
8 ?: ha ha ha (.hh
9 M: [fear?
10 H: fear-
11 (0.6)
12 ?: no feel=
13 ?: =feel=
14 ?: =feel=
15 ?: =feel
16 H: feel
17 M: feel=.
18 H: =feel yes=
19 ?: =ha [ha .h
20 M: [oh: okay (I got it) feel okay,
21 ?: mm mm::
(2.6)
22 H: ah ha ha ha .h I s[t(h)arted .h I=
23 M: [they feel
24 H: =(quest(h)ion) ha ha .h (I)-
25 M: so they feel happy?
26 (1.3)
27 H: yes (2.5) only feel (0.7) child
28 only feel (0.3) happy.

Tape 5, 222 (6.5) (6.18)

1 H: is your age: child? (0.3) age:
2 (0.4) you: (0.8) you're a child?
3 ((age = age?))
4 M: uhn.
5 H: "mm"
6 ?: (an)
7 (0.9)
8 H: what means ha ha [(xxx)
9 M: [oh what does it
10 mean? [Valentine's Day?
11 H: [.hh yes .hh hh [.h h you=
12 M: [ah
13 H: =(ph)rine) [fro:m this .hh
14 M: [ha ha
15 M: uh:m (1.0)
16 H: if (0.4) the day (0.2) uh (. ) not
17 (0.4) the day? (3.3) not important?
18 (1.2)
19 M: uh it was important I think=
20 ?: =m[m]
21 M: [I think you hope to get (0.4)
22 the card from your frie:nds or from
23 your classmate
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Tape 5, 256 (10.6)

1  H: why (i(h)s th(h)is)
2  M: [why,
3  H: [do you think why yes .h w .h why
4   follow .h uh .h (0.3) I didn’t
5   (0.4) buy:: (0.3) “mm” chocolate
6  or: expensive jewelry
7  [yes but .h (0.3) we: uh save=
8  M: [mm
9  H: =make a money? (0.2) for: “mm”
10  (0.4) for for my: (0.2) boyfriend?
11  M: uhn
12  H: yes .h uh (0.2) uh: save money
13  [.h yes .h (. ) I:
14  M: [uhn
15  H: (0.4) expect to: .h uh (1.2)
16  Valentine Day?
17  M: uhn
18  H: we can (0.5) buy w(h)e c(h)an ha
19  .hh yes (0.5) present (0.3) another
20  person:
21  (0.9)
22  M: °oh:°=
23  H: =”so” (0.5) we want to (1.9)
24  special(h)y ha ha .hh
25  M: oh you want to buy a special (0.5)
26  special pre[sent?
27  H: [(yeah)
28  (0.7)
29  H: yes (.) [uh:
30  M: [for: boyfriend?
31  H: yes in Valentine Day °yes° .h (1.7)
32  why expressu: (2.5) my emotion?
33  M: mm-hm
34  (5.2)
35  M: why:- why do you expres=-
36  H: =(he)- uh do you? .h uh: I think
37  uh: you said .h “mm” (0.7) for .h
38  (0.8) this Valentine (0.3) mood?
39  M: uh-huh
40  H: °”mm” (.) cheer up .h yes
41  commercial:: (0.6) is
42  (1.2)
43  M: well- (0.4) I think for like
44  relationship between two people
45  (1.0) it’s (1.3) you: (0.2) will
46  buy them something every year
47  ?: °“mm-hm”
48  M: for Valentine’s (.) not more
because of uh (0.3) commercials

M: =it's just normal because you love them (0.4) and then you buy them something nice

? : "mm"

M: =for them (0.5) but I think that television and newspaper is more for: (1.8) just

H: ha t(h)ypical h h hh

tape 5, 284 (4.48)

E: uh- I have a question this is a (0.3) Chris (0.2) Christian
cus:to:m?=
M: =no not Christian
E: not ev (.) everybody-
M: everybody. (.) yeah.=
E: =nh: (0.6) n nah (.) not not re-
with (0.2) religion? ha
M: no. (.) (not at all) (xx)
E: (xxx)?
M: only about uh (.) it's just about love
E: oh[:: ha ha ha ((giggling))
M: [(xxx) (yeah) (0.4)] [yeah
? : [mm:

tape 5, 302 (4.4) (4.36)

M: [(xx)
E: [but (0.3) Chris uh kon uh:
Valentine's Day, (0.5) Korea and Japan, (0.3) uh only women (0.6)
give (1.5) pre- to prest (0.4) for (. ) to: (0.4) man
M: oh yeah? (. ) [so the men don't=
S: [(women)
M: =give to (0.5) women?
S: [1 (1.3)
M: women?
S: fourteenth (0.5) M[arch
17 M: [fourteenth
18 H: .h there i[s another day:
19 S: [after
20 ?: [another day
21 M: [another day
22 H: yes=
23 E: =yes
24 M: which day
25 (0.5)
26 ?: hm?
27 M: fourteenth o:f
28 H: Marchi=
29 ?: =March
30 M: [oh Mar:ch
31 ?: [(xxxxx) [ha ha ha ha .hh
32 ((laughter begins during
33 unintelligible speech))
34 S: ["March fourteenth, (.
35 March fourteenth.
36 M: March four fourteenth.
37 S: yeah
38 M: oh::: [(I see)
39 E: [do you know: Hwaito Day?
40 (0.8)
41 M: huh?
42 E: do you know Hwaito Day?
43 (0.4)
44 M: no
45 E: [no?
46 H: [I heard yes.
47 M: what’s the [name? (.) wha-
48 ?: [(xx)
49 E: Hwaito Day:
50 M: Hwaito Day.
51 E: [yeah
52 H: [Hwaito Day.
53 M: so m::en give to: (.) women.
54 E: [yes
55 ?: [yes
56 M: oh:::

tape 5, 331 (6.19)

1 E: uh (.) when you were a (0.5) child?
2 M: [un
3 E: [what did you have any special
4 things on Valentine’s Day.
5 (1.8)
6 M: °an any special things on
Valentine’s Day\(^\circ\) uh:m (1.4) just in school (0.9) in school
E: (yes)
M: just with the with the class (. ) we [all: (0.7) trade uh:
?: [mm
(0.5)
?: ah[:
?: [oh:
M: [(x) [cards yeah
?: ["(ch change card)"
M: (change) card.
(0.9)
S: change card
(1.2)
M: ex[change
S: [oh okay I [see
M: [yeah
S: you: like (0.3) you like [one girl
E: [especially
?: ha ha ha ha,
M: =yeah yeah yeah (. ) ha ha ha ha ha
((multiple overlapping laughter))
E: (it has) to be two ha
((multiple overlapping laughter))
E: [three candy
H: [one more (0.7) one more
((multiple overlapping laughter))
E: eh you put th:ree candies?
(0.6)
M: two
S: [two:
E: [two candies
((multiple overlapping laughter))
M: everybody had one but she had two

tape 5, 347 (10.9)

M: uh::m (1.6) what else (1.3)
sometimes people give uh jewelry
(0.4)
?: oh[:
?: [oh
M: (ring) (. ) but not
(0.8)
H: especial[ly (. ) clo:se
M: [not-
M: it has to be very close yeah=
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H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: [uh wah woman to man?]
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
H: in Korea (1.0) uh some people (.).
  is present (1.7) (in a way). (1.2)
  underway.
M: really
S: underwear. ((smiley voice))
  ha ha ha ha ha
H: underwear. yes.
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man?
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
S: woman to man
H: yes woman
M: [red color?]
taped 5, 401 (6.6) (6.21)

1 M: so how bout you did anybody have a
2 (0.7) valentine (. ) [boyfriend= 
3 H: [uh
4 M: =girlfriend husband
5 H: uh me?: (0.7) got married.
6 (0.5)
7 M: oh you're married.=
8 H: =yes:
9 M: oh really. (0.4) oh wow. (0.9) oh
goode.

taped 5, 455 (2.13)

1 K: oh it's my first year.
2 M: oh you're freshman.
3 K: [I'm a freshman
yeah=
4 M: =oh:: a freshman.
5 (0.5)
6 E: (you be fish mat)?
7 ?: (°(xxxx)°
8 K: [yeah I'm a
9 E: eight(tee(h)n
10 M: [°freshman°
11 K: yeah I'm eighteen
12 (1.0)
13 ?: h ha ha ha=
14 M: =wh(h)a- ha [ha (.) ha ha .h ha .h
15 ?: [wh(h)y wh(h)y
16 ((more laughter))
17 M: you're surprised?
18 E: y(h)es y(h)es
19 ((more laughter))
20 H: I didn't understand (yes)
21 M: [oh
22 H: [I did not
23 (0.4)
24 K: I live in Mililani?
25 (0.8)
M: she's a (.) freshman?
(0.4)
K: oh oh (0.4) I'm a freshman?
?: [freshman (xxx)]
M: [she's a first year
(1.0)
H: ah first
(0.4)
K: [yeah
M: [first year=
H: =first (year
?: [year
M: [for
M: for college=
H: =ah:: college first year .h [ah=
M: [mm
H: =and [a (.) freshman?
?: [(xxxx)
M: freshman.
H: yes

Tape 5, 505 (8.2)

H: many people: .h mm (0.8) a many
people: (0.6) uhn (0.5) don't
know;,.
?: mm
(0.6)
H: yes uh: subway: [yes old people
?: [oh::
?: [oh::
H: [(xx) v(h)ery d(h)iffic(h)ult
[(xxx) [.hh
M: [complicated [huh?
?: [mm[]:
M: [yeah

Tape 5, 513 (8.7)

H: and now: mor:e (0.3) yes another:
(0.7) line?
M: mm-hm=
?: =[mm::
H: =[(yes)
M: (oh oh)
H: yes become (.) another line.
M: oh[:
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tape 5, B74 (6.7) (6.22)

1 H: he famous (0.4) uh- (0.5) in:
2 student.
3 R: yeah=
4 H: =(oh our) student yes he yes
5 (0.4)
6 M: he's famous?
7 H: famous yes.
8 R: for what,
9 (0.9)
10 H: mm (0.4) a good teacher
11 [and handsome and
12 ?: [mm:
13 ((multiple overlapping laughter))
14 H: good character ((said loudly, over
15 continuing laughter))

tape 6, 13 (7.7)

1 S: ande (0.3) note so stress: (. ) in
2 here? (0.8) in Japan (0.5) very-
3 (0.8) I feel very s stress
4 (0.9)
5 M: stressful?
6 S: suhtuh [stressful take a s=
7 H: [oh:
8 S: ="stress"?
9 (0.7)
10 H: in Japan?
11 S: in Japan=
11 H: =then: Hawaii? (1.4) [no stress.
12 S: [no stress.

365
taped 6, 30 (2.15) (8.6)

1  M: yeah yeah. (1.0) is it expensive?
2   (1.1)
3  E: yes
4  M: how much
5  H: [how much
6  ?: [hh ha ha ha .hh
7   (3.1)
8  E: not dollar is a mm (0.4) yen?
9  M: mm-hm
10  (0.7)
11  E: ss (°san man san man°) (.) (°san
12   byaku°)?
13  E: [thirty]: [°(0.4) thou]sand?
14  S: [thirty] (0.5) [thousand]
15  (0.8)
16  M: thirteen thousand?
17  E: [thirty: thou [sa:nd,
18  S: [(mm m) (0.7) [(thir) thirty
19  E: thirty.
20  S: (thir[ty)
21  M: [thirty. [thirty thousand.=
22  S: ((thirty thirty
23   thousand)
24  E: =thirty: thou:sa:nd,
25  M: thirty thousand,
26  E: an:do (0.7) fiftee:n fifty: (1.4)
27   hundred.
28  M: five hundred?
29  (0.4)
30  E: ah (0.3) thirty: (0.7) [fifty=
31  S: [thousand
32  E: =thirty: fifty. (0.6) thou:sand.
33  (0.9)
34  ?: [ha ha ha? (0.4) hm?
35  E: [thirty five
36   ((multiple laughter, overlapping with
37   what comes next))
38  ?: [(xxxxx).
39  M: [thirty five, (0.9) thir:ty five
40   thousand.
41  E: .h thirty five ((smilely voice))
42  ?: hh [.hh thirty [thousand.
43  M: [mm
44  ?: [yes
45  M: yen.
46 E: yen.

tape 6, 45 (2.3)
1 M: let me see your calculator.
2 (8.8)
3 M: what’s going on I’m doing
4 some math.
5 (0.7)
6 ?: oh hey
7 S: it’s a very quiet conversation from
8 your
9 ((multiple laughter))

tape 6, 90 (2.11) (4.9) (4.25)
1 M: I wanna go for the water park.
2 K: oh yeah [yeah yeah
3 S:  [water park?
4 M: yeah (.) [like water slide?
5 K:  [(that)
6 S: oh::.
7 K: (like) (0.5) they close it during
8 um (1.4) the winter:.
9 M: oh [they do
10 ?:  [mm[::
11 K: [yeah
12 M:  [just
13 K: [(it’s) really really cold.
14 M: oh it’s cold?
15 ?:  [mm:
16 K: [yeah.

tape 6, 95 (2.25) (4.43) (4.58)
1 K: I guess they like to gamble:.
2 (0.5)
3 S: mm:::?=
4 K: =because a lot of people win like
5 millions of dollar:s:.
6 M: =not a [lot of people [ha ha ha=
7 S:  [oh::
8 K:  [I know=
9 M: =.h ha
10 ((others laughing too))
11 K: =I know ha ha .hh (I mean) some
12 people who win like million:s
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do you want to go abroad? for study?
K: do I wanna study in other countries?
E: mm
K: I think it would be interesting,
E: mm mm
K: but hard.
(0.6)
E: oh: .
M: =yeah.
K: to: (. ) adapt to their way of life
E: oh: ha ha
K: way of life
E: yeah
(0.4)
K: yeah.
E: mm:

it's interesting [though yeah?=
K: [yeah
M: =(I think it's) fun
(1.5)
M: .n yeah good.
(0.6)
M: .h so do you have any children?
(0.5)
E: no: [ha ha
M: [no children
E: ha ha ha
M: "hm: ."
(0.7)
M: will you have in the future? or.
(1.3)
E: mm: : be- (0.4) before: (0.4) uh:
(0.7) I don't want to: ha:ve
children, [ha ha (. ) ha ha ha=
M: [uhn
20 E: =(but) now a little bit.
21 M: now yah: [oh yeah ((mumbled))
22 E: [(xxxx)?
23 (0.4)
24 M: yeah
25 E: mm:
26 (0.5)
27 M: it's a big (. ) big choice big
decision.

tape 6, 228 (2.19)

1 M: so he doesn't know how long he will
2 stay.
3 E: yes my (. ) ah no ha ha
4 M: oh[::
5 E: [he doesn't know. [ha ha
6 M: [he doesn't
7 know. (0.9) [ah: (0.9) ah
8 E: [mm
9 (0.8)
10 E: maybe,
11 (0.8) K: did you move
12 E: two more years. here by yourself?
13 M: oh two more years? (1.8)
14 E: mm
15 M: oh that's a long time K: (xxx)
16 E: my visa: by yourself?
17 good for three years. (1.9)
18 (0.6) S: myself?
19 M: oh: okay K: yeah you came by
20 E: ha ha yourself.
21 (0.8) or: you have
22 M: (oh: great)
23 (0.4) family: down
24 (0.9)
25 M: oh (0.5) and what is (1.8)
26 your husband's
27 company?
28 E: insurance company? S: (mya)? ha ha
29 (0.7) K: your: family? (0.5)
30 M: insurance company. your rela
tives?:
31 E: yes ha ha (0.8)
32 ha ha K: are in
33 (3.2) Okinawa?
34 S: mm:
35 K: or: (0.6) in Hawaii.
36 (3.5)
37 (3.0) K: in Okinawa?
S: Okinawa
K: oh.: so you're here by yourself?
(1.7)
K: you.: came on the plane?
(0.9)
S: ah I'm came myself=
K: =Yeah
(0.8)
M: [oh:
K: [{wow}
S: buto mm: (1.5) Hawaii in: (1.4)
Hawaii (0.4) an ((Hawaiian?)) (0.3)
friendo (0.4) ando (0.5) my: friend
is a (0.9) one: years ago? (1.4)
lived.
(0.7)
K: oh (0.4) your friend lived here
before?
(0.6)
S: yes [and
K: [oh
(1.1)
S: Okinawan (. (xx)?
(0.5)
M: to Hawaii (0.4) [oh:
S: [yes
M: so your friend is here now?
S: yes
M: oh:.

tape 6, 274 (6.23)
1 K: your guys's (0.5) age is different
2 from here too yeah?
(0.6)
4 ?: hm?
5 (0.5)
6 K: the age (. (is) different from=
7 ?:
8 [(age)
9 K: =here.
10 M: age of what.
11 (0.4)
12 K: I ee she was trying to explain to
13 me last time.
14 (0.3)
15 ?: hm?
16 K: uhm (0.3) that (0.3) your guy- your
birthday? (. (is January first.
17 ?: [mm
18 K: every January first you add a year?
19 ?: [mm
20 K: [or- (.) you guys do that? (.) in Korea?
21 M: oh:: I know what you mean. (0.7)
22 K: the [age is different.
23 ?: [hm?

tape 6, 323 (8.23)

1 M: .n so how many years have you (.)
2 guys been married.
3 (1.4)
4 ?: ha ha ha ha ha ha=
5 H: =uh:: come [to uh:
6 K: [you’re married too?
7 H: yes.=
8 M: =she’s married [too yeah.=
9 ?: [.hh
10 K: =oh wow::.
11 H: come to April: .hh nintho?
12 M: uh-huh,
13 H: we:- (1.8) .h (0.3) we two:- (0.5)
14 toon years.
15 M: two years?
16 K: oh:
17 H: (yes)
18 M: oh wow.
19 S: two years.
20 H: yes got [married.
21 S: [mm (0.6) [mm:
22 ?: [two years.

tape 6, 329 (4.1)(4.21)

1 M: where did you meet him
2 (0.7)
3 H: hm?
4 M: where did you meet him.
5 H: .h ah: in university.
6 M: ‘n university.=
7 H: =yes.

tape 6, 341 (8.46)

1 M: so how long will you stay?
then you’re gonna go back
a month.

I will? (0.5)

I will? (0.8)

I will?

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)

I will? (0.8)
S: mm (1.5) just moment? ((Japanese))
E: mm:
S: (n(h)and(h)e) .h (a(h)n(h)o) .hh mm
.E: mm" .h (0.5) my: (0.8) nurs:ingu
teacher?
M: uh-huh
S: is a (2.1) Hawaii: (.) in Hawaii.
M: oh (.) comes from Hawaii?
S: no no no in live in: Hawaii.
M: lives in Hawaii.
S: "yes"
tape 6, B66 (6.8) (6.31) (8.13) (8.37) (8.56) (9.6)

1 M: [yeah
2 S: [oh (. ) what does it say Chinese
3 parsely? ((three syllables))
4 M: Chinese pars[ley yeah
5 S: [parsley parsley.
6 ((two syllables each time))

tape 6, B108 (4.12) (8.3)

1 H: .h uh you: understand: d they?
2 (0.9)
3 M: they?
4 H: uh them.
5 (0.4)
6 H: understand them?
7 (0.3)
8 H: .h why .h .h we:, (1.3) live in:
9 four person [.hh mm together.
10 M: [mm-hm,
11 M: mm,
12 H: why (0.3) uh: her- (0.4) boyfrien:d
13 visit .hh our house?

tape 6, B167 (2.1)

1 S: maybe they’re [younger than you?
2 ?: [mm
3 H: hm? hhh y(h) ounger yes. [ha ha .hh
4 S: [mm: ge-
5 genera[tion is’ (0.3) [different.
6 H: [.hh ah-
7 ?: [mm: .
8 ((multiple laughter from far away))
9 E: °(four clock)° (0.3) four o’clock=
10 M: =four o’clock [yeah (xxx)
11 S: [ah (xxx) ah:. yes=
12 H: =thank you:
13 E: thank [you very much.
14 M: [mm
16 ?: .hhh
17 M: thank you for coming [today?
18 ?: [ (xxx)
19 ((recording ends))

374
M: so either of you are married? or
  (0.5) boyfriend, or
M: =children, (0.7) anybody ha ha
G: [hm?]
G: wh(a) t?
M: ha ha (1.3) family [(0.3) anybody)
L: [children ha
M: .h ha ha
L: .hh I’m [children
M: =you’re a child?=
G: =yeah I (have) a [good (goon)=
L: [I’m a child.
G: =I have a granddaughter
M: [you have a gr(h) andd(h) aughter
L: [ha ha ha (.) ha ha ha
G: y(h)eah
L: (0.5)
M: .h ha ha
L: .h (xxxx) ((said while laughing))
L: .h ha ha but- I already (1.5) aunt
(1.8) I’m already aunt ((clear one-
word-at-a-time articulation)) (0.6)
aunt?
M: oh you’re an aunt already.
L: yeah
M: oh so you’re sister has
L: my: cousin’s (0.4) no (1.1) yeah.
M: my cousin’s: (. ) child (1.6)
[not aunt
M: [so your cou- (0.9) I don’t know
what that is. your cousin’s child?
M: cousin’s child
G: °cousin’s child°
M: I: don’t know: what that is.
M: °I don’t know the name° do you know
that? (.) Taka?
M: what's your cou- if your cousin has a child what's that relation child's
rela[tion to you?
G: [cousin's child (0.6) nephew?
T: I don't- think there is a relationship
M: maybe like second cousin or something right?
?: [yeah second cousin. ((male NS))
?: [nh
M: second cousin
L: [second cousin [mm:
M: ["I don't know"
M: it's so confusing.
?: [mm=
M: =I think we actually have less words in English for family.
(?.) rela[tionships
M: than maybe Japanese or some (.I Asian languages?

tape 8, 60 (6.25)
L: and lifestyle is different.
M: life[style is different. yea:h
L: [yeah
(0.5)
G: [mm:
M: [so that's (.I more not always cuz some families
(0.4) [they live with their=
L: [yeah
L: =right
M: families
L: yeah

tape 8, 80 (8.16) (8.30) (8.58) (9.9)
L: (h)ou (0.4) your face is [red
M: [(she's) thinking about Sponge Bob
G: "mm" (0.8) "so" if you see: (.I that
cartoon?
M: uh
G: oh it's so really looks like Keiko.
(1.3)
M: looks like ha ha [ha
L: [you: remind
G: [O(xxx) mm (0.4) Keiko hh ha
L: [Oremind me of O (0.4) (x)
G: [O(xxxx) mm^0 (0.4) Keiko hh ha
M: ha ha ha

tape 8, 92 (1.1)
M: so you guys gonna have uh (0.3)
Japanese food? (0.7) Korean food?
G: note Japanese food.
L: mm[:
G: [beef
(0.9)
L: beef stew
M: "beef stew"
(0.9)
G: i- is it (. ) American:
(1.2)
M: I think so it's American food=
?: =mm::=
M: =depends how you make it.
(0.4)
L: mm:.
M: cuz curry: (0.5) then it's not
American.
?: mm=
M: =but maybe it's a- well (0.5)
actually there's no American food.
?: =mm=
M: because (. ) American food comes
from (0.4) everywhere. =
L: ah yeah

tape 8, 121 (6.10) (6.17)
G: eh? (1.2) "mm" (0.5) but why (0.3)
why: (4.6) why (the:) Japanese
(0.9) girl [(0.6) is good
377
M: [yeah ((nasalized))]

(1.1)
M: why're they good?
G: "mm"
M: they're not=
L: =is Japanese girl good
(1.5)
G: why
M: they're terrible.
L: (why is) ((whispering))
G: Jap(h)an(h)ese
M: ha ha
L: [ha ha ha ha .h] (0.6) .hh
G: [wha what] (0.3) would you would you please [say that again]
M: [ha ha ha
(1.3)
M: terrible=
L: =i-
G: Japanese girl is terrible?
M: is terrible yeah
(0.7)
L: how
M: n(h)o I(h)’m j(h)ust j(h)ok(h)ing
L: ha ha

tape 8, 134 (8.47)

L: .hh no: .hh b(h)ecause
G: be honest=
M: =°(because)° (0.3) be honest (that’s [right])
L: [I- I read book?
M: mm

tape 8, 186 (8.45)

G: it’s so sad. ((creaky voice))
M: it’s sad [uh ((nasalized uh))]
G: [it’s so humiliate
[(x) so embarrassment]
M: [yeah
M: yeah=
L: =yeah
(1.2)
L: disappointment
(0.4)
M: mm yeah

378
G: they have to do=
M: =they have to [do it
G: [for: (. ) living
M:=( (living) right
L: =[yeah (. ) [(for) helping
M: [they take them they
take them from (. ) to the cities
(xx) the cities so (1.4) yeah that
really
G: it's so sad.
M: definitely uh:
G: "mm:."
M: makes me upset
M: yeah
M: yeah

G: fifteen or f (0.6) fifteen or
fourteen (. ) is=
L: =(it's) illega[gal
G: [is uh- [how-
M: [it's illegal
(0.3) [yeah
G: [it's illegal and (0.5) too
young to (1.0) [make (0.5) correct?
L: [yeah
(0.5) {(recording ends)}

A: oh my gosh (. ) I didn't recognize
you [under that (. ) fisher hat.
T: [want some
D: ah ha ha
?: ha ha [ha ha
D: [ha ha ha ha sorry (0.4)
[uh-
N: [fisher- fisher hat?
A: [it looks like a fisherman's hat
tape 11, 44 (6.11) (6.20)

1 T: same as this. =
2 O: =how much it.
3 D: how much is it [six or: seven=
4 N: [mm
5 D: =dollars?
6 O: six [or seve:n?
7 T: [oh you should just buy this
8 N: hm?

tape 11, 48 (6.12) (6.28) (7.8)

1 N: hh
2 T: oh-
3 N: °I hurt°
4 (0.4)
5 T: oh
6 A: you’re h you’re sore?
7 (0.4)
8 N: mm=
9 D: =mm
10 (0.5)
11 A: °oh no°
12 (0.4)
13 ?: °just°
14 T: wait did you guys have to pick up
15 trash on the way up? (0.4) no
16 right.

tape 11, 61 (7.5)

1 A: I think (0.4) did you like the
2 stai:rs?:? (0.3) you know there’s a
3 [hundred an’ ten
4 D: [is a hundred stair yeah
5 A: yeah:=
6 O: =very (hot/hard) ha ha
7 ?: [ha ha ha
8 A: [yeah I thought that was the
9 hardest.
10 D: .hh [mm:
11 A: [like I wanted to stop and
12 slee(h)p
tape 11, 76 (1.4) (4.5) (4.34)

1 A: how come you didn’t go
2 (0.9)
3 N: what=
4 D: =m==
5 A: =why didn’t you go ((deliberate
6 articulation))
7 (0.4)
8 N: why (0.3) mm (0.2) because I’m not
9 a (. ) early bird ha ha s(h)o (.)
10 [not an early bi(h)rd so
11 T: [oh::
12 T: I understand.
13 N: n ha ha ha

tape 11, 82 (2.12)

1 T: I play racquet ball right now=
2 D: =hh ha . h r(h)a
3 T: racquet ball’s [(awesome)
4 ?: [ha ha ha ha
5 D: racquet ba(h)ll hh (. ) ha=
6 O: =ha ha
7 T: [I like racquet ball.
8 D: [. h racquet ball is so fa:st
9 T: yeah. it’s fun.
10 N: [m
11 (0.5)
12 D: [fu(h)n ha ha
13 T: [(I like it)
14 N: i- ins ins [(in) indoor?
15 D: [insi:de yeah
16 N: indoor sports?
17 T: [so it’s like tennis? (.) [but=
18 ?: [mm
19 T: =with a rubber ball?
20 ?: [mm

tape 11, 116 (6.13) (6.29)

1 N: (is it) four- (0.5) forty five
2 minute? "hm? (0.3) mm”
3 T: [yeah (. ) forty five (minutes).
4 D: [is a- (. ) yeah forty five minutes
5 mm hm.
6 (0.8)
7 T: wait is it forty five minutes?
N: no?
T: it's forty five minute halves right? so I think it's ninety minutes total.
O: [yes total
D: [yeah total ninety minutes
T: [oh. (.) yeah [right okay
N: [mm:
(0.7)
N: mm

tape 11, 120 (2.10) (5.9) (5.17) (6.14) (6.33) (7.9) (8.28) (8.34) (8.44) (9.8) (9.13) (10.11)

D: uh- uh: I forgot your name (.) is (1.8)
D: hey can I (.) show (0.9) you name. (0.4)
D: Ally (.) hm
A: [can I show y(h)our ha ha ha
D: [(xx) (0.4) (x) ye(h)ah ha ha (.)
D: [xxx) yeah yeah [yeah
A: [can you
D: [can you show me this (.) is it ah:
D: [can you show
T: [ha ha ha
D: [can you show
A: [yes yes yes
O: =[o(h)h
A: =[yeah:
(1.1)
D: ah Ally
O: =[Ally)
(1.0)
T: hey so are you: gonna be back in Korea?
APPENDIX D
ADDITIONAL TRANSCRIPTS

(3.20)
1 L: hh I- I'm not going to.=
2 L: =how's your mom's hair doing with
3 that.
4 M: awful.
5 L: still?
6 M: yes. (0.7) she hasn't fixed it.
7 L: .hh you know she might wanna put eigh
8 um (0.3) t a watchamacallit rinse on
9 it.
10 (1.3)
11 L: .t that takes down the the platinum
12 look. the- (1.2)
13 M: it's not platinum. platinum would be
14 okay. it's ash.
15 L: yeah hh

(9.11)
1 M: but after, (1.6) like (0.5) previous
2 system?
3 E: mm
4 M: juss (1.4) I think. (0.5) next
5 semester we have to take one more
6 class, (0.5) and uh we can (0.4) next
7 next semester we can take like ee es
8 el one hundred,
9 E: yeah.=
10 M: =an' we can (0.3) like (. ) take any
11 kind of (. ) subject?

(9.12)
1 M: so if I (0.3) can (0.5) if I can go
2 (. ) like (0.7) high- higher level?
3 E: yeah
4 M: next next semester?
5 E: oh the sem[ster after next?]
6 M: [I can take ]
7 M: yeah (0.9) (xx) ha ha ha ha .hh ha
8 ha .hh the next the-
9 [ semester (0.5) ] after-
E: [the semester after next.]
M: =next semester?
E: the semester after next.
M: the next (0.4) the semester next (0.3) after semester. (. ) [no.
E: [(oh)
M: da semester: (.) after next semester.
E: yeah.
M: [is that right?
E: [you- you don't need the last semester.
M: (0.8)
E: the semester after next.
M: the semester after next.
E: right (.) [hh
M: [(will I use?)
(1.2)
M: h .hhh=
E: =is that confusing?
M: confusing [ha ha ha ha ha .h da year=
E: [ha ha ha
M: =after: (0.5) next.
E: yeah.
(1.3)
M: oh. (0.6) da year next huh- (.) da year after next.
E: right.
M: oka(h)y ha .hhh may[be
E: [oh so if you get into the higher level class (.)
M: mm hm
E: then the semester after next you can take (0.5) ee es el one hundred.
(1.8)
M: da next (1.1) semest (. ) the semester next [af (0.4) [ter next
E: [the semester af[ter next
E: yeah (0.3) oh okay
Within the interactionist paradigm, the concept of meaning tends to be treated as straightforward and unproblematic. See chapter five.

Others who have used the term expansion include Hoff-Ginsberg and Shatz (1982), Moerk (1991), Nelson, Carskadon, and Bonvillian (1973), Newport, Gleitman, and Gleitman (1977), Penner (1987), Scherer and Olswang (1984), and Whitehurst and Vasta (1975).

Others who have used the term corrective feedback include Day, Chenoweth, Chun, and Luppescu (1984), Gass and Varonis (1989), and Lin and Hedgcock (1996).


For a review of research on corrective recasts exploring such questions, see Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada (2001).

The term mentalist, rather than the term cognitivist, is used here to refer to a view of cognition as something which is to be found within the mind of the individual. CA is certainly non-mentalist, but if cognition is conceived of as distributed, or as something which is to be found within interaction, then CA would not seem to be non-cognitivist, especially as such things as intersubjectivity are of central interest within CA.

The audiorecordings were made on a Sony minidisk recorder with a plug-in, flat microphone. For purposes of transcription and analysis, the recordings were transferred to 90-minute cassette tapes. The minidisks were kept as a permanent record and backup of the recordings.

For an interesting analysis of how participants may or may not orient to interculturality in what would seem to be a similar setting, see Mori (2003).

I do not have information on how long students typically stayed, but based on the audiorecordings that form the database for this study, it appears that students typically stayed for over an hour. I also gathered from what I was told about the conversation club that it was unusual for individual students to stay for the full four hours.

I also do not have information about how many hours the conversation partners worked each Friday, but I gathered from what I was told that working as a conversation partner for two hours each week was not atypical.

Apparently, in the previous term, a group of students was assigned to one conversation partner, so that the same groups met for the whole term. This is the first conversation partner meeting of the current term, in which no such assignments have been made.

Jefferson (1972) and Tannen (1987a, 1987b, 1989) discuss how other-repetition can be used to show appreciation of the humorous nature of the repeated element.

This is apparent in other parts of the recording.

In CA, the term omnirelevance refers to the availability of certain roles to be oriented to by participants by virtue of the context. For example, Sacks (1992) discusses the omnirelevance of the role of therapist within a group therapy session. In a classroom, the roles of student and teacher would be expected to be omnirelevant. When a role is described as omnirelevant, this should not be taken to mean that it is always, or even usually, relevant.
As has been pointed out to me by Dr. Gabriele Kasper, another way of analyzing such yes/no questions is as elaboration implicative. For example, should the answer to the question "Do you live alone?" turn out to be affirmative, some elaboration, such as "I live in a studio," may be expected.

There also seems to be a question in line 1, but no apparent answer.

The current standard spelling of the word Hawai'i includes the okina, which marks a glottal stop between the two vowels at the end, reflecting its pronunciation in Hawaiian. In the data, though, none of the participants pronounce the word with a glottal stop between the two vowels, so it is spelled in the transcripts, and when quoting from the transcripts, as "Hawaii." In other places, it is spelled with the okina.

Due to low recording quality, transcription of the other instance was abandoned.

Had the interaction been videotaped, it may have been possible to discern from E's gaze who she is directing the question to. See, for example, Goodwin's (1979, 1981) work on gaze and participation frameworks.

Another NS, K, joins this group some time after the talk about the Valentine story is complete.

An analysis of footing, looking at roles in the participation framework such as author and animator (Goffman, 1981), would be quite interesting, but in the interests of space will not be attempted here.

The term intersubjectivity refers to the shared understanding among participants as to what is happening in interaction.

This is, of course, culture specific. While preference, as discussed by Bilmes (1988), is likely to operate universally, such things as whether an acceptance is preferred following an invitation or whether a denial is preferred following an attribution are open to cultural variation.

Dr. Jack Bilmes has pointed out to me that these constraints are primarily constraints of politeness. A person could be impolite simply by ignoring these constraints.

Conversations between Monica Lewinsky and Linda Tripp were secretly recorded by Linda Tripp and became infamous as weapons in a conflict between different segments of the U.S. political elite. As these recordings have been released to the public by the special prosecutor's office, protection of the identities of the participants would seem superfluous, so the participants' names have not been changed to pseudonyms.

There is a similar repair initiator in line 4, "nani," said with rising intonation. This is Japanese for "what." Both NNS participants are L1 speakers of Japanese and it is not clear which one says this. However, as it comes before M says "children," it cannot be targeting the presupposition that the NNS participants are old enough to have children. It could be targeting the presupposition that they are old enough to be married.

This reformulation will be analyzed later as a corrective recast, or other-correction of language form.

M's candidate answer in line 2, "this summer," is an error if "this summer" is understood not to include "May."

This is more typically termed the interaction hypothesis. I term it a paradigm, in Kuhn's (1962, 2000) sense, primarily because I wish to draw attention to underlying assumptions.

The adoption of Kuhn's concept of scientific paradigm should not be taken as endorsing the validity of his views on the nature of scientific progress, scientific revolutions, and/or normal science.

The view of (linguistic) communication as telemanation is not limited to academics with a professional interest in the nature of language. In a book review in The New York Times, Wade (2003) writes in the first paragraph, "The only major talent unique to humans is language, the ability to transmit encoded thoughts from the mind of one individual to another" (emphasis added). Note that this statement does not only entail an acceptance of the telemanation model, but also defines language as telemanation.
Long's early work on interaction, most of which was published in the early eighties and of which Long (1981) is one example, remains some of the best descriptive research within the interactionist paradigm. It is for this reason that much of this critique focuses on Long (1981).

In the past few years, a research methodology has been gaining popularity within the interactionist paradigm that would indeed seem to provide this kind of access to what is going on inside participants' heads. This is the methodology of stimulated recall described by Gass and Mackey (2000). If what this methodology claims to deliver—access to the actual perceptions, thoughts, and intentions of participants—sounds too good to be true, this is simply because it is. The data collected with this methodology may be interesting as participants' own explanations and/or justifications of their behavior, but it is still performance data, not a window into the mind. See Bilmes (1986) and Edwards (1997) for lucid discussions of the relationship between talk and cognition. See also chapter nine for criticism of this methodology.

As will be discussed in section II, corrective recasts are conceptualized within the interactionist paradigm as a particular type of input. However, it is important to note that corrective recasts are reliant on output, as the NNS must produce (i.e., output) a non-target-like form in order to receive a corrective recast as input, which would be a form of feedback. In saying that interaction has been of interest primarily as a source of input, I do not mean to imply that output has been completely neglected. However, I would argue that the role of output tends to be conceptualized as a means of obtaining more input, in the form of such things as corrective recasts. The work of Swain (e.g., Swain & Lapkin, 1995) and a few others provides an exception to this relegation of output to a supporting role.

This is, admittedly, a very unorthodox, maybe even heretical, view of the use of parametric tests with human subjects. It goes against what has been accepted practice for several decades within many fields dedicated to research on humans. See Gigerenzer, et al. (1989) for a historical analysis of how the use of parametric tests has come to dominate research on humans.

There are two major problems with this type of quantification outlined by Schegloff (1993), a numerator problem and a denominator problem. This can best be illustrated with an example. This example is similar to, but not identical with the example used by Schegloff. If one were interested in language play and wanted to gain a measure of how much language play were going on in a language classroom, one could go through a transcript and code laughter. This would allow the amount of laughter to be calculated and presented in terms of the amount of laughter per given unit of time, such as a minute, or the amount of laughter as a proportion of the number of turns. The numerator would be the number of times people laughed. An assumption is that each instance of laughter is basically the same kind of thing as every other sort of laughter, in this particular example an indication that people are being playful. However, people laugh for many different reasons, such as to cover up embarrassment, so the assumption does not hold. This is the numerator problem. A second assumption of such an approach is that each unit in the denominator represents a relevant place for laughter to occur. If the measure is the proportion of laughter per minute, then the assumption is that laughter is as relevant at any one randomly chosen minute as it is at any other randomly chosen minute. If the measure is the proportion of laughter per turn, then the assumption is that laughter is as relevant during or following any one randomly chosen turn as it is at any other randomly chosen turn. This assumption also does not hold. There are times when laughter is appropriate and times when it is not. This is the denominator problem. These problems extend beyond analysis of laughter. For example, in research on corrective recasts, a not uncommon measure is the number of non-target-like turns followed by a corrective recast as a proportion of the total number of non-target-like turns. This relies on the assumption that each corrective recast is basically the same type of thing as every other corrective recast (the numerator problem). (See chapter six.) It also relies on the assumption that every non-target-like turn creates a slot for the relative occurrence of a corrective recast (the denominator problem). (See chapter eight.)
See chapter nine for a more detailed discussion of D's account.

This problem is unrelated to how well or poorly the coding and counting methodology is applied in particular cases. The methodology can be applied carefully or sloppily. Measures of inter-rater reliability may yield high estimates or low estimates. The problem is, though, that no matter how carefully it is applied, coding and counting results in the loss of the *interactive* nature of interaction.

However, see Sawyer's (2003) criticism of CA, which seems to be based on the belief that CA does rely on the assumption that communication is a form of telementation.

In addition, the concept of reliability changes. In the coding and counting methodology, reliability is seen in statistical terms and is measured by calculating inter-rater reliability. Within CA, reliability is pursued by presenting, in the form of transcripts, a rendering of the data which is as detailed as possible, providing the reader with at least some of the resources necessary to challenge the analysis as presented.

With the insistence of CA on naturally occurring data, an experimental approach must also be rejected.

There are exceptions, though, notably Ohta (2000b).

In addition, using the term *corrective recast* rather than simply *recast* allows the three Cs of clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check to be expanded to the four Cs of clarification request, confirmation check, comprehension check, and corrective recast, with each category label beginning with the same letter and the same sound and consisting of two words. This is one of the reasons that I adopted this term in this study.

See Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada (2001) for a review of research on corrective recasts. I would argue that the research which they review clearly falls within the interactionist paradigm.

This historical analysis was published in 1985, but it appears to be Kuhn's dissertation, written several years before *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Some of the terminology used is different from Kuhn's later writings. Most importantly, he uses the term *worldview* rather than *paradigm*.

This may seem quite relativistic. Laudan (1990), for instance claims that Kuhn's ideas amount to relativism. Kuhn (2000), though, claims to be an epistemological realist. It is difficult not to see Kuhn's ideas as at least somewhat relativistic, but it is important to keep in mind that emphasizing the roles of taste, fashion, and social structure does not entail that, on scientific grounds, one paradigm is just as good as any other.

The problems of an experimental methodology with both internal and external validity, discussed in chapter five, apply to these studies as well.

The critique of research on corrective recasts within the interactionist paradigm focuses on these four studies, Braidi (2002), Izumi (1998), Morris (2002a), and Oliver (1995). These four studies were chosen as exemplary studies, in two different senses. First, they are representative of research designs common in the study of corrective recasts within the interactionist paradigm. Second, they are among the most methodologically sound, according to the criteria of the interactionist paradigm, of descriptive studies on corrective recasts. In addition, Oliver (1995) is typically cited as one of the most important descriptive studies of corrective recasts.

See critique of this methodology in chapter nine.

Single quotes, as in 'corrective recasts,' are used to indicate that 'corrective recast' is an analyst's category, the members of which are identified on the basis of coding criteria, rather than on the basis of how participants in interaction orient to them.

The criteria for identifying 'corrective recasts' in Oliver (1995) and Izumi (1998) would seem to rely on an unanalyzed and rather intuitive notion of meaning. See chapter seven for a discussion of problems with such a notion of meaning.
I consider something to be non-target-like on the basis of my competence as a cultural member. As a rendering of the data in the form of transcripts is always presented, the reader is free to disagree with whether a particular turn that I call non-target-like actually is.

It is difficult to tell whether “me got married” should be considered an attempt to produce one sentence or two separate sentences. This illustrates the problem of identifying what in an NNS turn should count as a single clause or sentence.

T, who is Asian, as are all the other participants in this group, also orients to the possible racist hearing of what he has said with his disclaimer in lines 12-14.

As this segment continues, D also does some interesting work accounting for her error, as discussed in chapter five and chapter nine.

It can be, and has been, argued that the annexation of Hawai‘i was illegal and that the military occupation and colonization of Hawai‘i does not entail that it legitimately belongs to the United States (e.g., Trask, 1993).

This is the case that first drew my attention to the possibility that, at least at times, a ‘corrective recast’ may play a role in determining the type of error that has been made. This is also one of the most interesting cases found in the data and it is analyzed from different perspectives in several chapters.

This is not to argue that T has intentionally chosen these three words in order to model the three allomorphs of the regular plural morpheme. It does illustrate, though, how poetic everyday spoken language can be.

As discussed elsewhere, G’s turn in line 13 is an initiation of repair targeting something that M has said prior to line 12.

Not too much should be made of these numbers. Several hours of recordings were made of different conversation club groups, only some of which was searched carefully. Much of the data is compromised by high background noise, which may have obscured possible instances of other-correction of language form. Most importantly, as is illustrated in this section, though abstractions can be made, each instance is also a unique case and understanding the sequential organization of other-correction of language form requires careful analysis of each instance. Finally, any decision about whether ten cases in the five hours plus of recordings from which the detailed segments were drawn counts as many cases or only a few cases could only be arbitrary.

See discussion of this segment in chapter nine as a case of S using this ambiguity regarding the source of humor as a means of accounting for her laughter during the correction turn.

In a review of research on interaction in language classrooms, Seedhouse (1997) points out the typical absence of contradiction tokens in teacher turns which perform correction. He then goes on to make what I find to be an incomprehensible argument that this lack of contradiction tokens serves to inform students that mistakes in language form are socially unacceptable.

The limited nature of participants’ orientation to language form is discussed in more detail in chapter nine.

M shifts between pronouncing the consonant at the beginning of “the” as [d] and as [ð]. The latter pronunciation may be considered more standard, but the former pronunciation is not unusual among NSs in Hawai‘i.

Such metalinguistic correction was something that was not found in the conversation club data.

This example situation is autobiographical. However, I am unable to recall how or if I justified this behavior.

Note that in segment (9.12), which is not from interaction in the conversation club, E asks in line 31 whether the phrase that they are focusing on, “the semester after next,” is confusing, which M confirms in line 32. This can be heard as E and M working together to account for the difficulty that M has with the phrase.

See also Schegloff (2000) for a discussion of Wong’s (2000b) findings.
This does not mean that participants have or use the vernacular term *other-correction of language form*. Rather, it means that this is a category of turn that participants treat as having a particular function.

See Edwards (1997) for the application of CA to the study of a non-mentalist, discourse-oriented conceptualization of cognition.

Initially, I included a chapter on learning. In order to do this, though, I found it necessary to import concepts from sociocultural theory, namely, the concepts of private speech and scaffolding. As one purpose of the dissertation was to explore the extent to which straight CA could be applied to SLA, this importation of concepts from an outside theory proved unsatisfactory and it was finally decided that the chapter on learning would be abandoned.

Within a sociocultural theoretical framework, the help provided by an NS and the incorporation by an NNS of words or phrases used by an NS may be understood as scaffolding or the provision of assistance within the zone of proximal development.
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