

Getting started

Children's participation and
language learning in an L2 classroom

Asta Čekaitė



Linköpings universitet
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Linköping Studies in Arts and Science No · 350
Department of Child Studies, Linköping 2006

At the Faculty of Arts and Science at Linköping University, research and doctoral studies are carried out within broad problem areas. Research is organized in interdisciplinary research environments and doctoral studies mainly in graduate schools. Jointly, they publish the series Linköping Studies in Arts and Science. This thesis comes from the Department of Child studies at the Tema Institute.

Asta Cekaite
Getting started
Children's participation and
language learning in an L2 classroom

Edition 1:1
ISBN 91-85523-90-9
ISSN 0282-9800
© Asta Cekaite and
The Department of Child Studies, 2006
Print: LiU-Tryck

Distributed by: The Department of Child Studies, Linköping University,
581 83 Linköping, Sweden

Acknowledgements

Writing a thesis is not really like delivering a monologue. More people helped and supported me throughout my work than I could list here.

The challenging and creative atmosphere at the Department of Child Studies proved to be a continuous inspiration. During my first years at the Department, I benefited from interesting and intensive courses on the child perspective given by professors Bengt Sandin and Gunilla Haldén. Throughout my first year at the Department, Åsa Aretun, Carolina Överlien, Eva Gullberg, Henrik Ingrid, and Göran Nygren provided a stimulating and open forum for discussions, along with exquisite dinners and a sense of community, or maybe even a secret society.

Professor Karin Aronsson has supervised my work with great attention and interest. I'm greatly indebted to her for her constant support and belief in my ideas, and for continuous reading of my texts. This work would not have been possible without Karin. At some crucial moments she provided me with a 'machete', using a few well-targeted movements to make the chaotic disorder look rather well structured. However, despite her close involvement in my work, Karin has always allowed considerable freedom, trusting my ability to find the right approach. Her generosity towards me, both as a scholar and as a person, has meant a great deal to me.

The opponent of my final seminar, Ann-Carita Evaldsson, has made many valuable comments that have greatly improved the final version of the thesis.

I'd like to thank the members of NIFS, the Nordic Network for Analysis of Interaction in Educational Settings, including Polly Björk-Willén, Anna Slotte-Lüttge, Helen Melander, Veslemøy Rydland, and Inger Gröning, for our inspiring data sessions and friendly chats.

The Discourse group at the Department of Child Studies, organized by Karin Aronsson, Jakob Cromdal, and Michel Tholander, has provided an ongoing discussion forum for several years. My thanks go to the members: Kjerstin Andersson, Pål Aarsand Simonsen, Polly Björk-Willén, Katarina Erickson, Ann-Carita Evaldsson, Lucas Forsberg, Karin Osvaldsson, and Anna Sparrman. Their constructive comments, improvised seminars and lively discussions, which often continued outside the institutional framework, were an invaluable checkpoint for my ideas. The Talk-in-

Interaction Seminar series, set up by Karin Aronsson, Per Linell, and Jan Anward, not only taught me new approaches and revealed new areas, but also gave me an opportunity to meet new people. Thanks to Michel Tholander for his detailed readings and provocative clarifying questions. I'm deeply grateful to Polly Björk-Willén for her unfailing support, both in academic and personal matters, for discussions of Conversation Analysis or help with everyday dilemmas. I'd also like to thank other people who supported me as a colleague and/or friend: Åsa Aretun, Katarina Eriksson, Anne-Li Lindgren, Karin Osvaldsson, Helle Rydström, Maria Simonsson, Anna Sparrman, Karin Zetterqvist, Cecilia Wadensjö.

To the teachers and the children, thank you for making this study possible. My thanks go to Karen Williams for translations of examples and corrections of my English, Ian Dickson for technical support, Ulla Mathiasson and Lena Törnborg for professional administrative assistance.

I also wish to thank my friends from far away: Asta and Patrick, Jolita and Erik, Karolis, Audrius, and Laurynas, for taking rather little interest in my thesis, but instead focusing on other exciting matters. Thank you, Finn, for your catching interest in music, where feelings are more eloquent than any discourses. Also, Ulla Thunqvist proved to be indispensable in the final stage of my work.

Daniel Persson Thunqvist has always been there for me, both as attentive listener, careful reader, and as a true companion. Thank you, Daniel, Ludvig and Marcus Thunqvist, for making my everyday life an exciting and intensive adventure, for your continual love and support. Finally, my thanks go to my mother Julija Gailutė Kugelienė and my sister Ilona Kugelytė Storti, who have always been caring and encouraging in countless ways. It is to them that I dedicate this book.

The thesis has been financed by The Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet), project "Lärande i flerkulturella barmiljöer: Skolpraktiker och kamratsamtal i förskola och skola", Dnr. 2001-3765; 2004-2858.

Linköping, a winter-spring day, 2006

Asta Čekaitė Thunqvist

Contents

PART 1

Theoretical background, method, and summaries of
the studies

	Introduction	11
1	The language classroom as a site for learning	13
	The IRE and beyond: on teacher-student talk in language classrooms	15
	The learner's perspective in language classroom research: task-as-workplan and task-in-progress	17
	Language socialization and L2 classroom talk	19
	Socialization in and through classroom discourse: the classroom as a community of practice	20
2	The classroom as a multiparty setting	24
	The peer group and language learning in play activities	25
	The peer group in educational settings	27
3	Social identity, multimodality and language learning	31
	Micro-approaches to social identity: Affect and indexical resources	32
	Multimodality and co-construction of meaning at early stages of L2 acquisition	33
	Aims	35

4	Method	37
	Description of setting and data	37
	<i>Setting</i>	38
	<i>The staff and the children</i>	38
	<i>Classroom activities and languages in the classroom</i>	39
	<i>Recordings and data</i>	41
	<i>Transcriptions and translations</i>	41
	On the role of the observer	43
	Methodological considerations	44
	Ethical considerations	45
5	Summaries of the studies	47
	Study I: Soliciting teacher attention in an L2 classroom: Affect displays, classroom artefacts, and embodied action	47
	Study II: Turn-taking and learner identity during the first year in an L2 classroom: A novice's changing patterns of participation	49
	Study III: Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: playful recyclings in an immersion classroom	51
	Study IV: Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning	52
6	Concluding discussion	55
	Footnotes	58
	References	60

PART 1

Studies I-IV

Study I:	Soliciting teacher attention in an L2 classroom: Affect displays, classroom artefacts, and embodied action	73
Study II:	Turn-taking and learner identity during the first year in an L2 classroom: A novice's changing patterns of participation	103
Study III:	Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: playful recyclings in an immersion classroom	137
Study IV:	Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning	159

Part I

Theoretical background, method,
and summaries of the studies

Introduction

The present thesis concerns classroom interactions involving refugee and immigrant children in a second language (L2) immersion classroom. Each year, a number of immigrant and refugee children learn and live in such classrooms, and encounter similar interactional tasks and problems in their early encounters with Swedish. In such ‘reception’ classrooms (Swedish: *mottagningsklass*), the children usually have only recently arrived to Sweden, and they have limited skills in Swedish. Teachers usually have no knowledge of the students’ native languages. Thus, all participants must rely on Swedish as a *lingua franca*. The present work, thus, sets out to investigate how children with only limited skills in Swedish manage their participation within a classroom community. What does the interactional ecology in such classrooms look like, how do participants jointly co-construct meaningful conversations in their everyday encounters, and what learning *affordances* (i.e. opportunities, Gibson, 1979) are created in such classrooms?

Thus far, much research on classroom L2 learning has focused on cognitive aspects of L2 acquisition¹. As a result, interactional dimensions of classroom language learning have been understudied. The present work therefore aims to contribute to research on the classroom as a ‘social site’ for language learning, and it primarily focuses on learners’ communicative practices in the classroom.

Studies that focus on the socially constructed nature of language classroom activities have largely explored the teacher’s role in constructing language learning opportunities (Hall & Walsh, 2002), or they have investigated how pedagogy translates into interaction in studies on learners’ work in, for instance, task-activities (Seedhouse, 2004). That is, the primary focus has been on language learning affordances as co-constructed in relation to pedagogical activities. In the present work, however, such a focus is only a secondary aim. Instead, a broad approach to students’ participation in classroom interactions is adopted, whereby all interactional contributions are included in the analysis, irrespective of whether they are on-task or off-task talk, student-teacher or peer group interactions.

The present thesis thus openly approaches what happens in the immersion classroom, narrowing its scope to the children's communicative practices and language use. Viewed from a learner perspective, the classroom is a multiparty setting that in certain ways structures the learner's participation. It involves not only a teacher-student dyad, but also the peer group (that is, multiple interactional partners and the overwhelmingly present audience).

A basic assumption is that, by taking the perspective of the learner, we are able to situate language practices within the concrete classroom experiences and locally situated concerns of the learner. In studies on L2 acquisition, the nonverbal features of learners' contributions are usually unanalysed. Multimodality is, however, an inherent feature of human interaction, and a focus on L2 novices' use of nonverbal resources may provide valuable insights into how meaning making is accomplished with (still) minimal verbal L2 resources.

All in all, instead of merely demonstrating what the L2 novices do not know, it is relevant to explore their interactional skills and competencies in achieving meaningful participation in multiparty classroom interactions. In the following, I will first review some relevant prior work, and then set out to formulate the aims of the present study.

The language classroom as a site for learning

Research on language classroom learning has a longstanding tradition. However, there is still much to be said and explored concerning language learning in this complex and multifaceted setting. For instance, studies investigating the relationship between learner participation in classroom discourse and second language acquisition (SLA) have produced inconsistent and ambiguous results, concluding that learners' overt participation in the classroom does not provide possibilities to confidently predict what they acquire from classroom interactions (Breen, 2001: 128, for a detailed review see Breen, 2001; Ellis, 1994). Such results, however, 'may not reflect a fault within learners' participation in the classroom, but rather the current state of research perspectives on it' (Breen, 2001: 128).

Lately, several research perspectives on second language learning have advocated a redefinition of how to approach learning in formal settings. Criticism has been raised against existing notions of what kind of language use and communicative practices evolve in language classrooms, more specifically targeting the sharp distinction between the 'constrained' or 'unnatural' character of interactions in (traditional) formal learning settings as contrasted with the 'authenticity' of the 'real' communication (and learning) outside the classroom (cf., Cook, 1997; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Nunan, 1987).

Moreover, criticism has been raised against the research interest in primarily theoretically predefined language learning instances in classroom interactions, and the ways in which (second and foreign) language learning has been operationalized as 'distinct increases in the comprehension or use of correct grammar' (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000: 6). For instance, in classroom research, the analytical focus has largely been on instances of speech modifications and corrective feedback in teacher talk, or task-based activities (cf., *Interaction Hypothesis*, see Long, 1985; Gass, 1997; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Pica, 1987). While such an approach may provide important insights into language learning through interaction, the narrow

focus on speech modifications has neglected the socially constructed nature of learning. Moreover, there has been little consideration of how learners acquire discourse and interactional knowledge (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000).

In line with the recent reconceptualization of second language learning as an emergent, socially distributed process, situated in the larger context of social interaction, the rigid distinction between language acquisition (e.g., grammar knowledge) and language use has been gradually loosened. Instead, the classroom has been reconceptualized as a fundamentally social site for language learning. Several research perspectives have advocated an open and detailed approach to what happens in the classroom, more specifically directing their focus to the social aspects of classroom life and close analyses of classroom interactions (Breen, 2001; Mori, 2002; Ohta, 2001; van Lier, 2000).

Research within a sociocultural perspective has foregrounded the need to approach teacher-student interactions with respect to how teachers organize classroom activities, distribute speaking rights, and create participation structures (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). With a focus on the social processes of the language classroom, longitudinal, ethnographically inspired studies can explore the relationship between participation and proficiency, elaborate on the development of language and interactional competencies (cf., Breen, 2001; Ellis, 1994; Pallotti, 1996; van Lier, 1988), and explicate the ways in which the micropolitics of the classroom community position learners in the everyday life of classrooms (Toohey, 1998; Willet, 1995). Taking an ethnomethodologically inspired, conversation analysis approach (henceforth CA) to language learning, Firth and Wagner (1997) have advocated a reconsideration of the scope of SLA (second language acquisition) studies, arguing for a participant-relevant perspective on the competences participants use to jointly accomplish meaningful interaction. Conversational studies have pointed out the need to address the issue of language learning through close examination of actual classroom talk (cf., Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). Research within an ecological perspective on language learning has similarly argued for a holistic approach, pointing out that the social activities of the learner are central to any understanding of language learning (Kramsch, 2002; Leather & van Dam, 2002; van Lier, 2000).

These different research traditions, thus, meet in their joint interest in classroom language learning as displayed in participants' actions, focusing on learners' contributions and perspectives rather than on the predefined

instances of learning. This has led to an increased sensitivity to the institutional organization of classroom discursive activities and the intricate details of classroom interactions. In the following, I will present the emerging body of research on the ‘social construction’ of classroom talk (Markee, 2004: 583).

The IRE and beyond: on teacher-student talk in language classrooms

One direction in research has been to look at teacher talk, broadening the scope beyond an earlier focus on teachers’ speech modifications. This research has investigated how teachers, through the use of language, construct, support, or curtail student interaction. More specifically, the studies explore the participation structures, turn-taking, and student rights and responsibilities that are co-constructed in teacher-student interactions (for a detailed review, see Hall & Walsh, 2002). For instance, Hall (1998) explored how the teacher constructed learning differences through the use of an IRF (initiative-response-feedback) structure. In a longitudinal study of Spanish foreign language classes in a high school in the US, Hall examined turn-taking patterns developed between the teacher and four learners within the same instructional practice (‘practising speaking’ in Spanish). She demonstrated that the teacher interacted in qualitatively different ways with the four focus learners. One of the major factors was how the teacher designed the third turn in the Initiative-Response sequences. Instead of simply providing evaluations of some of the students’ contributions (as in the IRE structure), the teacher employed feedback (F) and asked the students to provide explanations for their responses. Thus, learning differences were created, such that some of the students’ responses were treated as relevant and important for the general class discussion, whereas other students received only minimal acknowledgement for their contributions.

Although the teacher’s discourse is dominated by the traditional IRE structure on the surface, it can involve a broad range of social functions (e.g., affiliative or disaffiliative repetitions), consequential for participation in language classroom interactions. For instance, repetitions are features of teacher-student discourse that have been neglected in much of the research on language classrooms. In contrast to the traditional cognitive focus on the functions of repetitions, Duff (2000) investigated social aspects of

repetition in language classrooms. In her analyses of classroom data from three different foreign language classrooms for adolescents and adults, Duff has documented a broad range of functions related to repetitions in teacher-student interactions, such as disciplinarian, cognitive, linguistic, and affective.

Repetitions were also involved in classroom discourse that represented spoken artistry and teacher's playful performance (Sullivan, 2000). In a study of a university level EFL (English as a foreign language) classroom in Vietnam, Sullivan explored the ways in which the teacher incorporated story telling and word play into vocabulary teaching, demonstrating how such an approach to teaching led to students' playful attention to the different meaning potentials of words and a spontaneous focus on form.

Another direction taken in research on language classrooms focuses on the heterogeneous nature of classroom talk. A number of studies have pointed out that language classroom interactions entail different varieties of talk. In an (micro)ethnographic study of language classrooms, van Lier (1988) explored social processes and outlined different varieties of interactions and repair patterns, relating them to the different pedagogical focus of the classroom activities.

In a similar way, the CA approach to classroom interaction argues that, rather than being characterized by a 'single set of question-answer-comment practices', the language classroom entails different varieties of 'classroom talks', different types of classroom interaction (Markee & Kasper, 2004: 492), that in their turn, configure and provide different kinds of learning affordances.

Seedhouse (2004) outlined a broad range of speech exchange systems operating in L2 classrooms. He delineated the ways in which turn-taking and repair patterns adapt to 'properties of sorts of activities in which they operate' (Sacks et al., 1974: 696 in Seedhouse, 2004: 102). As demonstrated, the interactional organization of repair in language classrooms varies according to the pedagogical aims of activities. Thus, for instance, other-repairs are prevalent in form-and-accuracy activities, whereas in meaning-and-fluency activities there is a preference for self-repair (Seedhouse, 2004: 102). If, during content-oriented activity, repairs evolve into lengthy side-sequences, they can disrupt the ongoing conversational activity.

In a similar way, Slotte-Lüttge (2005) has focused on repair patterns in teacher-student interactions in Swedish immersion classrooms (Grades 1–3) in Finland, exploring learning affordances that were co-constructed in

monolingual versus bilingual discourse practices. She demonstrated that there was an interactional dispreference for teacher-initiated self-completed repairs. In the cases where students indicated problems in understanding, the extended sequence of repairs tended to interrupt the ongoing activity, or even resulted in students' abandonment and withdrawal from the conversation. On the other hand, teachers' direct repairs both made the students' continue their work on classroom task and acknowledged them as competent, bilingual participants in classroom discourse.

While CA studies have established a number of speech-exchange systems operating in language classrooms, they also recognize the inherent hybridity of classroom discourse, and the possibility that various types of interactions can emerge within each type of discourse (cf., Seedhouse, 2004: 206-207). Thereby, the actual development of talk in a language classroom is an empirical matter.

The learner's perspective in language classroom research: task-as-workplan and task-in-progress

A redirection in language classroom studies away from a focus on predefined instances of learning (e.g., theoretically predefined focus on speech modifications, or pedagogical aims, defined from curriculum designers' point of view) has led to increased interest in learners' actions and perspectives on language learning affordances (e.g., Bannink, 2002; Mori, 2002; van Lier, 2000). It is, thus, important to explore learning opportunities and the potential benefits of educational activities in terms of 'how learners themselves demonstrate their orientation towards particular types of activities' (Mori, 2004: 537). Within the CA perspective, several studies of university students' foreign language learning (Markee, 2000; 2004; Mori, 2002; 2004) have explored how pedagogy is translated into interaction, arguing that members' perspectives on language learning opportunities constitute a key issue in investigating how learning affordances are created and how different activities (and speech exchange systems) provide specific acquisitional contexts².

For instance, studies on task-work in pairs or small groups (Markee 2000; 2004; Mori, 2002; 2004) have shown how intended pedagogical aims, *task-as-workplan* ideas, translate into the *task-in-progress* (Breen, 1989 in Seedhouse, 2004) of actual pedagogy.

In a study of task-based, small group work on comprehension tasks in university level ESL (English as a second language) classes, Markee (2000) explored how 'members' folk categorization' of the lexical problems facilitated or impeded behaviour that promotes understanding and learning (2000: 163). He demonstrated that the language learning goals set out by the task design were affected by social dynamics and the participants' face wants in that in the cases of comprehension problems, learners avoided initiating other-repairs.

In a study conducted in the same setting, Markee (2004) examined various kinds of problems that occurred in 'zones of interactional transition', that is, zones of transition between different classroom speech-exchange systems. He demonstrated that, during group work, a student who asked the teacher for assistance did not identify the original owner of the comprehension problem (that is, which of students was experiencing problems in understanding the meaning of a word or a phrase in the task). The students asked the teacher for assistance when they had 'exhausted the linguistic resources available to them' in their group (2004: 592-3), and when the 'knowledgeable learner' had failed to explain the problematic item. The 'knowledgeable learner' then assumed responsibility for asking the teacher for assistance. As demonstrated in teachers' counter-questions, students' misleading questions were 'tactically' disguising the identity of the person who was really having comprehension problems.

Thus, an important issue, highlighted in research on learners' task behaviour, is that social dynamics involving 'learner-learner solidarity' and 'the need to save the partner's face' may rearrange the accomplishment of the language learning task, socially constructing situations that might impede behaviour that promotes understanding and learning (Markee, 2004: 593).

Another important aspect of task-as-workplan and task-in-progress concerns the qualitative features of talk generated during communicative tasks, which are intended to train learners' conversational skills and to provide 'authentic talk' scenarios.

In her study of Japanese FL adult students' task work, Mori (2002) explored the relationship between the instruction, the pre-task planning, and the actual task activity. She demonstrated that, although the task was intended to generate opportunities for mundane conversation, the actual task activity resembled teacher-dominated question-answer discourse, whereas pre-task planning provided learners with ample opportunities for

conversational exchanges (similar findings are presented in a study based on frame analysis, see Bannink, 2002).

CA studies on language classroom interactions, thus, illustrate that pedagogical aims do not necessarily directly ‘translate’ into practice. In consequence, pedagogical activities might provide language learning affordances that are distinctively different from the aims of the pedagogues. Thus far, however, they have primarily focused on adult talk-in-interaction during group work in pairs, or at best, small group task work, and they have worked with single case studies, or limited sets of data (but see Seedhouse, 2004; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005). A broader perspective on learner contributions may be provided by ethnographies of classroom interactions and, more specifically, systematic analyses of recurrent interactional patterns and learners’ interactional repertoires across the boundaries of various types of classroom activities. Such research may direct our attention to learners’ participation in routine interactional practices, which involve sociocultural meanings, values and beliefs, social roles and identities associated with what counts as novices’ appropriate participation.

Language socialization and L2 classroom talk

Recurrent communicative practices are viewed as important sites for language socialization and language learning, both in the first language (L1) and the second language. In research on children’s L1 socialization, the primary focus has been on young children’s language socialization through recurrent communicative practices, e.g., interactional routines (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), relating the micro-features of interactions to the sociocultural concerns of the language community. An *interactional routine* is defined as ‘a sequence of exchanges in which one speaker’s utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants’ (Peters & Boggs, 1986: 81). Repeated participation in such interactions provides structured opportunities for novices’ engagement in relevant meaning making activities and provides a framework for children’s development of language skills, as well as sociocultural beliefs and values. It provides opportunities to appropriate the relevant ways of using language and interactional resources for enacting and rearranging social identities and relations (Peters & Boggs, 1986)³.

In research on language socialization in L2 classrooms, interactional routines are defined in a variety of ways, including both formalized interactional structures, such as teacher-initiated assessment sequences (Ohta, 1999), teacher-directives (He, 2000), and broadly defined routines related to pedagogical activities of the classroom, such as recitations, phonics seatwork, (Willet, 1995) or attendance routines (Kanagy, 1999).

Studies on second and foreign language classrooms have focused on the teacher's socialization practices. They involve a comparative perspective between the wider target language society and the teacher's classroom discourse. More specifically, they investigate the relationship between the sociocultural content of teacher talk and the sociocultural concerns of the target language community.

For instance, Poole (1992), in her study of adult ESL classes in the US, demonstrated that teachers modelled their talk in ways similar to the scaffolding practices of middle-class caregivers.

In a study of language socialization practices in a Chinese Heritage language class for children (ages 4-9) in the US, He (2003) investigated how teachers constructed varied speech roles for novices and explored the values, obligations, and responsibilities associated with them. She demonstrated that, in contrast to Western classes where teachers represented students' answers as students' individual contributions, the Chinese Heritage language teachers constructed the students' answers as their own, thereby diminishing the students' authorship.

Studies thus indicate that classroom interactional patterns are to some extent reflexive of the sociocultural norms and beliefs of the target language community. Lately, however, questions have been raised concerning whether it is possible to talk about a stable body of sociocultural knowledge in the wider social context, and whether the process of second language socialization can be unproblematically seen as a means for becoming straightforwardly competent within a fixed sociocultural group, the target language society (Roberts, 2001: 116).

Socialization in and through classroom discourse: the classroom as a community of practice

Research has directed attention towards the processes of socialization in educational settings, thus studying language classrooms as communities of practice in their own right, rather than as sites of socialization into a

language community outside the classroom (Boxer, 2004; Garret & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). Classroom discursive features constitute a discourse genre in itself; these features are embedded in and saturated with culturally significant meanings, creating expectations, norms, and judgements about learners and their knowledge (Watson-Gegeo, 2004) ⁴. Thus, language socialization is discussed in terms of the novices' appropriating resources and norms that enable them to participate in the particular educational setting (as a *community of practice*, cf., Lave & Wenger, 1991).

A number of studies on adults and adolescents have investigated discourse (pragmatic) socialization in classroom practices (Cole & Zuengler, 2003; Duff, 1995; Morita, 2000). They have explored participants' socialization into interactional skills, participation structures, and resources involved in the interactional architecture of these practices⁵.

In a study of oral academic discourse, Morita (2000) investigated non-native (NNS) and native English speakers' discourse socialization through recurrent classroom activities (oral academic presentations). She demonstrated that appropriate performance in this academic activity involved more than students' subject mastery and English language skills. Enculturation and apprenticeship into this type of academic discourse involved the appropriation of interactional skills concerning how to express epistemic stance, to engage the audience, and collaboratively construct subject knowledge (see also Kasper & Rose, 2002, for an overview of this research).

Much of the prior work on children's socialization into educational settings has been situated in monolingual contexts (Cook, 1999; Mehan, 1979; Sahlström, 1999; Tholander & Aronsson, 2003). Early studies on children's socialization and participation in educational discourses in multilingual societies have often adopted a comparative perspective, inspecting discontinuities between patterns of language use at home and at school and how such gaps may result in children's school failure (e.g., Philips, 1970).

Only a limited number of studies on L2 socialization have explored children's apprenticeship to the linguistic and cultural practices of a classroom community, primarily situating the process of language socialization in the context of interactional routines within preschool and elementary school settings (Björk-Willén, 2006; He, 2000; Kanagy, 1999; see also Palloti, 2001; Willet, 1995 below).

In a longitudinal study of language socialization in a Japanese immersion kindergarten classroom, Kanagy (1999) examined how children acquired competence in second language interactional skills over the course of a year. She demonstrated how the teacher, using carefully staged demonstrations and elicitations of interactional routines (e.g., taking attendance, greeting and personal introduction), scaffolded children's participation towards individual performance and socialized kindergarteners to initiate and respond to these L2 discourse sequences. Over time, the routines were restructured: from the teacher's initial scaffolding efforts, to spontaneous initiations of routines in peer interactions, and, gradually, to individual performance by the children themselves.

One important question, consequential for enhancing our understanding of students' success or failure in classrooms, is whether classroom culture (and discourse norms) is taught explicitly or is an object of implicit socialization. Although both explicit and implicit socialization can work together in classroom interactions, research suggests that socialization in classroom discourse is largely carried out implicitly, and that classroom culture is learned by 'engaging in classroom discourse, and accompanying various tasks' (Kanagy, 1999: 1490). Such implicit socialization is also at the heart of learners' participation in language learning tasks. As demonstrated in a microanalytic CA study of French L2 classrooms (involving both children and adults), learners' participation in language tasks, delivering answers, and producing repairs involved not only content knowledge and mastery of L2, but also a broad range of interactional and sociocultural skills, acquired through implicit socialization (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004).

The dialectic nature of socialization has been illuminated by some studies within the microanalytic perspective on children's discourse socialization (Björk-Willén, 2006; He, 2000). The analyses presented there emphasize that socialization is not a static unidirectional process involving an active expert (e.g., adult, teacher) and novices as passive recipients of knowledge⁶. Rather it is a dynamic, dialectic process involving negotiation of expert and novice roles. As demonstrated by Björk-Willén (2006), in her study of young preschoolers' participation in teacher-led 'sharing time' routines in a multilingual preschool, even young children may resist and redefine teachers' socialization attempts.

As demonstrated, classroom practices and conversations socialize students into norms and values, which also reflect what constitutes

learning, and what 'counts' as knowing, and this has important implications for how participation is organized in the classroom. Thus far, however, studies have foregrounded adults' and adolescents' rather than children's apprenticeship into L2 academic discourses and L2 discourse (pragmatic) socialization.

The classroom as a multiparty setting

In line with a redefinition of learning as a matter of socially distributed practices, the L2 research focus has moved from an individual learner to include a dyad, involving teacher-student or student-student. However, for a student, a classroom usually involves a multiparty framework for participation and learning. As yet, only a few studies have specifically explored how multiple participation frameworks constitute particular classroom language learning affordances. In the following, I will present some of these studies and discuss the ways in which different classroom activities (even dyadic peer tasks) are affected by the multiparty classroom setting.

In a longitudinal study of adult beginners learning Japanese, Ohta (2001) explored pair task interactions in detail, examining how learners act upon the various affordances of the classroom setting. Although she primarily focused on dyadic peer work, she demonstrated that learners made use of linguistic information that was available in the interactional contexts of the classroom, entailing multiple interactional floors. From a learner-centred perspective, Ohta investigated the interactional roles students took on as they participated in the classroom. The students not only acted as ‘addressees who interact with the teacher’, but also as overhearers ‘auditors who are privy to the interaction of the teacher with others’, as well as ‘overhearers of the interactions of students in other groups during peer learning tasks’ (2001: xvi). The multiple interactional floors enabled the learners to use the overheard information from another peer in constructing their own answers. Moreover, the learners made use of teacher talk (expressions of alignment) in their own task talk.

Related aspects of affordances provided by the multiparty framework of participation were explored in Pallotti’s (2001) longitudinal case study of a 5-year-old Moroccan girl’s language socialization during her first year in an Italian kindergarten classroom. He demonstrated how linguistic information available in the interactional setting during multiparty unstructured conversational activities was systematically employed by the

novice as a conversational strategy to gain access to the ongoing interaction. The novice employed other-repetitions ('external appropriations') of the ongoing conversations to launch her own conversational initiatives. Pallotti (2001) also foregrounds an important aspect of language learning in a multiparty institutional setting: he shows that the competitiveness of such a setting influences the novice's interactional repertoires.

Teacher-fronted lessons also constitute 'social multiparty events' that are routinely interpenetrated in various forms of by-play and side-play (van Dam, 2002b: 203; see also Goffman, 1981). In a study of the first EFL lesson for children (12-13 years), van Dam (2002a) calls analytic attention to off-record speaking slots and nonlesson frames within a teacher-fronted setting. She examined the students' spontaneous contributions from the overhearer floor and suggested that, although they did not necessarily receive the teacher's attention, such 'off-record niches of multiparty lesson floors' were exploited both by the learners and by the teacher for language play and metacommunication, thus 'fostering both socialization and acquisition' (2002a: 259). However, her focus is primarily on the teacher, and she does not provide a systematic account of how multiple lessons floors in the classroom affect learning.

To conclude, attention to multiparty participant frameworks is, thus, a fundamental aspect of the ecology of school-based language acquisition (e.g., van Dam, 2002a, b). Participation in the interactional practices of a classroom community involves crucial learning of how to handle the interactional competition in a multiparty setting. Furthermore, in line with a multiparty perspective on L2 classrooms, work on language learning activities in a classroom has to be broadened beyond the teacher-student dyad to include groups, more specifically, the peer group. The richly textured social life of a classroom and school involves peer group interactions, peer group concerns and ongoing work on peer group social relations. In the following, I will discuss research on the relation between peer group interactions and language learning.

The peer group and language learning in play activities

Lately, special attention has been given to the role that the peer group plays both in first language socialization and in the acquisition of language and pragmatic skills (for a detailed review, see Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002; Kyratzis, 2004). Peer group interactions provide a site within

which children negotiate meanings, and arrange and rearrange relationships within their local peer culture (Evaldsson, 2005; Goodwin, 1990; Kyratzis, 2004). Simultaneously, the peer group offers children ample opportunities to listen in, display and practice language and conversational skills, and hence may very well prove 'a crucial site' for language and pragmatic development (Blum-Kulka et al., 2004: 307).

Early discourse-oriented L2 studies have focused on the characteristics of children's interactions. Several of them have investigated questions concerning the nature of the interactions involving different participant constellations and explored the characteristics of adult-child or dyadic peer interactions (e.g., Cathcart-Strong, 1986; Hatch, 1978; Peck, 1978). Thus, for instance, Peck (1978), in her study of a 7-year-old Spanish boy learning English, investigated his dyadic interactions with a native speaker child. While these interactions involved recurrent instances of sound play and word play, interactions with an adult were primarily centred on meaning. Peck concluded that they contributed to different aspects of L2 learning. Interactions with children promoted the development of formulaic language and phonology, whereas interactions with adults modelled referential functions in language use.

In a similar way, several studies discussed the ways in which peer play was significant for L2 learning. Wong-Fillmore (1979), in her study of 5 Spanish learners of English (engaged in play activities with English-speaking children), demonstrated that play activities provided L2 learners with possibilities to engage in extended interactions. Speech routines associated with, for instance, openings and closings of telephone conversations allowed the learners to participate in play activities, thereby providing contexts for their learning of new material. On the playground, the predictable activity structure of games similarly provides possibilities for early participation and scaffolds language learning (Ervin-Tripp, 1986).

Some of the differences, characteristic of peer or child-adult interactions, concern conversational maxims, or what counts as a relevant contribution in these participation frameworks (and, consequently, what interactional moves receive a response).

In a study of 4 Spanish speakers learning English in a bilingual kindergarten, Cathcart-Stong (1986) arranged dyadic play activities involving pairs of NNS and native speakers. She has demonstrated that the children oriented to the conversational maxims 'be interesting' and 'be persistent'. The children, thus, not only oriented to adult discursive norms (saying something relevant), but also needed to be 'interesting and

engaging enough to get a topic going' (1986: 524) by labelling an interesting object or introducing a play scenario (for similar strategies in children's access rituals to play activities in L1 settings, see Corsaro, 1979; in bilingual settings see Cromdal, 2001; Krupa-Kwiatkowski, 1998). In contrast, in classroom activities (Cathcart, 1986), children usually initiated exchanges with teachers by employing attention getting devices based on a simple summons ('Lookit').

Thus, a few early studies on peer interactions in L2 have demonstrated the ways in which children's social activities (e.g., play) shape and facilitate their L2 learning. Although it is a promising line of research, related studies looking beyond children's speech modifications have been scarce. Moreover, several of these studies have not involved any sequential analysis of children's interactions.

The peer group in educational settings

By and large, classroom studies of L2 acquisition have traditionally focused on teacher-student interactions (the teacher being the primary and significant source of L2 input). Recently, however, students' interactions were discussed as being part of dyadic collaborative language learning task activities, demonstrating that peer scaffolding (e.g., utterance expansions, repetitions, clarifying utterances) provides resources to extend other peers' linguistic development through social interaction (Donato, 1994; for a review of collaborative learning in peer task activities, see Swain et al., 2002).

Peer-peer task-related dialogue is viewed as a means of second language learning, but what are the characteristics of spontaneous peer interactions in formal settings? In a study on children's emergent bilingualism in a Spanish-English elementary school, Olmedo (2003) investigated the ways in which the children collaborated with each other and served as language mediators for their peers. They provided scaffolding in comprehension and communication for their classmates by using paraphrases and paralinguistic cues and by spontaneously taking on the role of translators. However, the study does not provide excerpts from such classroom interactions.

Studies conducted within a language socialization perspective have demonstrated that the peer group constitutes an important framework for practice in children's gradual mastery of interactional routines (on L1, see Ochs, 1988; Watson-Gegeo & Boggs, 1977). Because participation in

routinized interactional events is flexible and can be adjusted to learners' language and interactional competencies, interactional routines may scaffold language acquisition, and the peer group provides an important site for the restructuring and creative reshaping of routines (Kanagy, 1999; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). As demonstrated by Willet (1995) in her longitudinal ethnographic study of four ESL learners in the first grade of an English classroom, the three girls creatively restructured their participation in phonics seatwork, providing scaffolding and pooling resources and competences. However, due to the gender politics of the classroom, the novice boy was reluctant to involve himself in peer collaborative learning and to accept the teacher's assistance. At times, L2 acquisition may thus involve substantial resistance on the part of learners (e.g., due to the peer group dynamics)⁷. This can be seen as a contrast to a unilateral focus on teacher transmission of L2, which has at times characterized studies of language socialization in classrooms (e.g., Roberts, 2001).

Also, the classmates do not necessarily provide appropriate instructional help in classroom activities. In a study of a Grebo-speaking girl's first year in educational activities in a US third grade elementary classroom, Platt and Troudi (1997) documented that the teacher delegated much of the novice's teaching to the peer group, without the teacher's monitoring and assistance. The classmates, however, could not always adjust their assistance to the novice. At times, thus, the peer group may in fact limit the learner's involvement in educational activities.

This raises the question of how to conceptualize peer interactions, which probably implies a more cautious approach to the overall positive benefits of peer collaboration (e.g., Wong Fillmore, 1991; see also Markee, 2000; 2004, who demonstrated that social dynamics prevented adult learners from getting involved in L2 learning). Furthermore, some of the important insights into the peer group's role in educational settings may be provided by a close examination of peer group's language uses beyond the scope of educational task activities.

In and out of the classroom, the peer group is an important site for creativity, innovation, and negotiation of the established institutional order. Recreational language practices (peer group's jocular language activities from the playground) can occur in educational settings and may even have features in common with traditional educational practices (Rampton, 1995; 1999a). In an ethnographic study of multiethnic adolescent groups' interactions in a multiethnic school in the UK, Rampton (1995) explored

language crossing, that is, interethnic use of language that is not one's own (the use of speech varieties that are not normally thought to belong to the speaker). Crossing occurred in different participation frameworks and was intimately related to identity work within the peer group and classroom community. For instance, Standardized Asian English was employed in interactions with teachers in order to feign one's own limited English language proficiency, and to display oneself as a student with only limited language skills. The peer group provided informal Panjabi lessons, in their ritual character resembling traditional language teaching practices, thereby destabilizing the traditional dichotomy of 'natural' versus 'instructed' language learning.

Playful recyclings of school languages (German as a foreign language) were documented in multilingual adolescent peer group interactions in a multiethnic London school (Rampton, 1999b). Such recyclings were shaped as aesthetic (and public) performance involving elements of play with sounds and language forms. They were recurrently designed as the peer group's comments on the teacher's management of classroom order, and provided resources for subversive transformations of the ritual character of the institutional setting (Rampton, 1999b; 2002).

Language alternation and code-switching provide resources that multilingual peer groups employ in their daily school encounters. As demonstrated by Cromdal (2001; 2004), in research on primary school children's play interactions in an English-Swedish school setting, children, for instance, used their bilingual resources in negotiating their entry into play activities, or as a means for escalating conflict and managing and sustaining oppositions. Similarly, the peer group's multilingual resources were employed in escalating sequences of ritual insults (Evaldsson, 2005). Instances of code-switching served as important rhetorical and dramaturgic play devices, for instance, contextualizing shifts between serious and nonserious frames (Cromdal & Aronsson, 2000).

Thus, different forms of creative language use, involving playful keyings and language play, are documented in a number of studies on peer interactions in educational settings. These findings suggest that such verbal activities are far from unique in learner discourse. Furthermore, ethnographic approaches to students' language practices at school demonstrate that peer group language practices are not limited to the playground, but are rather central also in formal educational contexts (Broner & Tarone, 2001; Rampton, 2002; Willet, 1995). These findings contradict the traditional dichotomies of natural versus instructed language

acquisition (for a related critique, cf., Cook, 2000; Rampton, 1999a; van Lier, 1988: 227), and they call for a theoretical reorientation with respect to what constitutes acquisition in instructional settings. Moreover, they indicate that peer culture and classroom interactions are not tightly separated, but rather interact in a dynamic interrelationship. Thus far, however, peer group language practices and playful transformations of curricula-based language learning have escaped systematic exploration within the dominant SLA research on children's formal L2 learning.

Social identity, multimodality, and language learning

Situated approaches to language acquisition have foregrounded the dynamic concept of *social identity* as a crucial factor in language acquisition⁸. Longitudinal studies on children's L2 learning in formal settings have explored how teachers and school practices worked together to position and to sort children with respect to classroom activities and opportunities for language learning (Hawkins, 2005; Toohey, 1998; 2001). For instance, Toohey (1998; 2000), in her three-year-long ethnographic study of children ESL learners (Grades 1–3), investigated how the teacher's conceptions of the individual children's language learning abilities and their other social characteristics positioned the children in situations that enabled or curtailed their participation, and defined the children as 'good' or 'problematic' language learners. Toohey (2001) also investigated how L2 learners participated and were presented in children's disputes, and how their classroom identities (defined and rearranged through disputes) sometimes excluded them from participation in activities and conversations in the classroom.

In her ethnographic study of two non-native ESL learners, Hawkins (2005) examined the novices' formation of educational identities in their first year of kindergarten. With a focus on classroom interaction, home visits, and the boys' own accounts (interviews with the boys), Hawkins demonstrated that their language and literacy development was intimately related to their formation of 'school-affiliated identities'.

As yet, however, studies on children's language learner identities have primarily investigated how the micropolitics and power relationships in classroom communities limited or provided access to practice of the target language. They have not focused on the micro-analytic details of the ways in which children use language and interactional resources to construct their social and cultural identities.

Micro-approaches to social identity: Affect and other indexical resources

Language use and social identity are intimately related in that stances, acts, activities, and identities are indexed through conventionalized verbal and nonverbal resources (Ochs, 1996). This is not, however, a static process, rather, identities of participants are co-constructed and unfold on a moment-to-moment basis, in the contingent strings and courses of their action (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Aronsson, 1998). In this thesis, I will argue that the L2 novice needs to deploy such (verbal and nonverbal) resources in specific ways in order to participate and display relevant, and institutionally ‘sanctioned’ stances and identities.

One type of device for indexing locally relevant social identities is the affective stance. Affective stances have been predominantly explored within L1 socialization and use. *Affective stance* refers to ‘a mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern’ (Ochs, 1996: 410). Affect permeates different layers of human interaction, and ‘novices are expected to recognize and to display emotions in culturally defined ways and according to local norms and preferences’ (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002: 352). Studies taking a language socialization perspective and focusing on children’s learning of their first language have explored how children are socialized into using linguistic indexing of stance (e.g., affective particles) through caregiver-child interactions (Ochs, 1988). In research on peer groups, studies have demonstrated how children, through their use of affective stances, construct desirable or contested identities and position themselves in relation to the local moral order that organizes the peer group (Evaldsson, 2004; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2000). As yet, however, most of this work has concerned monolingual children, or at least bilingual resources have not been foregrounded in the analyses (but see Cromdal, 2004).

Although affective devices constitute an intrinsic part of interactional competence, only a few studies on formal L2 learning contexts have investigated novices’ use and/or acquisition of affective markers in a longitudinal perspective. In his longitudinal study of a 5-year-old Moroccan girl’s first year in an Italian kindergarten classroom, Pallotti (1996) demonstrated how the novice learner acquired affective suffixes and related the development of these features to her participatory role in the competitive setting of a kindergarten classroom⁹.

Lately, the concept of learner has been problematized in, for instance, CA studies. Instead of taking for granted that learner or NNS speaker identity is relevant in all encounters, they draw attention to the contingent and socially constructed nature of NS-NNS speaker identities in talk-in-interaction (Kurahara, 2004). For instance, in her study of adult NS-NNS participation in a conversational educational task, Kasper (2004) explored how language learner identity was only occasionally invoked via membership categorization devices (related to novice-expert status), and demonstrated how different devices such as code-switching and repairs were related to the participants' joint creation of language learning affordances through interaction.

Although microanalytic studies (focusing on a single interactional event) provide important details concerning how specific situated identities are invoked in language learning activities, longitudinal accounts of learners' involvement in L2 communication are important for our knowledge about how the communicative roles the learners assume in the everyday life of the classroom may affect learners' emergent language and interactional repertoires. Yet, research on children's L2 acquisition has paid less attention to longitudinal explorations of the microgenesis of relevant skills and indexical devices in L2.

Multimodality and co-construction of meaning at early stages of L2 acquisition

At early stages of L2 acquisition, interaction is by no means easy and requires skilful employment of (so far) limited language resources. Studies of L2 novices' interactions demonstrate the intricate ways in which L2 novices employ verbal and nonverbal resources, available at hand. Some of the pervasive features of early conversations in children's SLA are different types of repetitions. In their study of a Japanese 2 and one-half-year-old boy learning English, Itoh and Hatch (1978) demonstrated that repetitions were an initial strategy for the child's engagement in communication using the new language. Repetitions were not, however, straightforward mechanistic echoing. Through modulations and changes in intonation, repetitions were framed as 'relevant' and 'new' contributions to the ongoing interaction (Itoh & Hatch, 1978).

Self- and other-repetitions may be deployed by the speakers to nominate, establish, and make comments on the topic. In her study of child

L2 learners' discourse, Hatch (1978) demonstrated that repetitions served as resources for collaborative topic development (on different types of repetitions in L2 play activities, see Rydland & Aukrust, 2005).

Grammatical correctness is not the only factor of importance in accomplishing meaningful interactions. As demonstrated by Saville-Troike and Kleifgen (1986) in their study of elementary school and nursery classroom English L2 learners and their multilingual conversations with teachers, coherent discourse and the interpretation of actions in the immediate classroom situation were largely dependent upon the participants' shared 'cultural and world knowledge', incorporations of prior discourse into a current situation, as well as participants' shared 'scripts for school', such as ongoing interpretation of each others' actions within the framework of the relevant classroom activity.

Some of the other significant interactional resources available for L2 novices at an early stage of L2 learning are nonverbal resources (van Lier, 2000). However, such resources are not exclusively related to novices' still limited language proficiency. Goodwin argues that, in order to properly understand how people manage their face-to-face encounters, analysis must take into account the multiple semiotic systems on the basis of which interaction is designed (Goodwin, 2000: 1489). *Multimodality* is thus an organizing feature of social interactions, and talk and embodied interactional features gain their meaning as social action in conjunction with encompassing activities, sequential structures, and the material structure of the surroundings (Goodwin, 2000; see also Kendon, 1990).

Embodiment is also seen as an inherent feature of language socialization and language learning (de Leon, 2000; Pennycook, 1985). For instance, it is acknowledged in ecological approaches to L2 learning in that 'gestures, pictures, and objects all blend with language in the communicative context', and is an inextricable part of learners' relations to the learning environment (van Lier, 2000: 256). Yet research on multimodal aspects of L2 learning situations is still only taking shape. Thus far, emergent work within this area has primarily focused on gestures. The non-native speakers' gestures are defined in terms of communicative strategies in language production (Gullberg, 1998) or cognitive strategies related to 'private speech', 'self-regulation', and 'zones of proximal development' (McCafferty, 2002). Primarily, however, these studies have dealt with story retelling tasks, or dyadic NS-NNS interactions. Lately, some microanalytic studies of L2 novices' interactional participation have demonstrated the intricate ways in which

L2 novices employ their limited resources in small group interactions (Carroll, 2000; Olsher, 2004). We still know relatively little about how L2 novices use embodied practices as part of their daily interactional business in a classroom, a complex multiparty setting. A microanalytic situated approach to the embodied features of L2 novices' interactions may provide insights into how learners develop a broad range of resources (including paralinguistic cues and visual aspects of action) in order to participate and facilitate interaction. Moreover, when located in the multiparty context of the classroom, such an approach may illuminate how L2 novices manage their participation in the dynamic flow of classroom encounters.

Aims

In the present study, I wish to analyse and explore children's interactions in an L2 immersion classroom – as a social site for learning. In contrast to much of research that assumes a teacher perspective, the present study directs its analytical lens on language learners. Instead of merely investigating the canonical dyad of teacher-student, the present study aims to explore interactions initiated by children in a variety of participation frameworks, involving student-student or students-teacher participant constellations, arguing that such a classroom needs to be conceptualised as a multiparty site for participation and learning.

A basic assumption is that by taking the perspective of the learner, we will be able to situate language development within the concrete classroom experiences and locally situated concerns of the learner. This perspective implies that language learning is related to the students' socialization into institutionally 'ratified' ways of participation in the classroom community, and that the classroom is primarily defined as a community of practice located within the institutional, sociocultural context of a school (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). As a community of practice, it involves sequences of acts and recurrent communicative practices, jointly accomplished by the co-participants. Embedded within these practices are a number of interactional routines that involve predictably structured sequences of exchanges (Peters & Boggs, 1986; Willet, 1995).

Broadly then, the present thesis concerns the learners' communicative practices as they emerge within the interactional ecology of a specific classroom (Leather & van Dam, 2002; van Lier, 2000). It involves a shift in perspective, from predefined instances of learning to emergent practices.

Furthermore, in contrast to previous microanalytic research on formal language learning settings that have primarily focused on educational activities (e.g., task-based interactions), the present study documents the learners' recurrent communicative practices occurring across the boundaries of official classroom assignments. Detailed micro-ethnographic analysis of classroom interactions may improve our knowledge of what goes on in L2 classrooms and may provide insights into how language learning may be related to learners' participation patterns. In order to uncover how classroom interactions influence language learning, one has to start out from actual situated patterns of language use, and then investigate how their interactional configuration provides language learning affordances (e.g., Breen, 2001; van Lier, 1988).

More specifically, then, the present study sets out to explore what interactional repertoires children develop through participation in an immersion classroom. What are the resources (language skills and interactional skills) that the learners' display at the early stages of L2 acquisition, and how are they configured in specific interactional events? What constitutes the basic premises for learners' participation in classroom interactions? In what ways, if any, is development of learners' interactional skills and development of language skills interrelated in a longitudinal perspective?

Method

Description of setting and data

The way in which language classroom activities are organized and how the classroom turns out are influenced by a range of factors. They involve both the local considerations and concerns, demands and expectations of the teachers and students, and the wider social context, the society at large, including the institutional ideologies of school (e.g., van Lier, 1988).

Characteristic features of 'reception' classrooms are that they constitute a specialized form of education, which has several aims, such as taking care of students who have recently arrived to Sweden, introducing them to the Swedish language, and preparing them for transfer to regular classes, that is, introducing them to the Swedish educational system and the Swedish school culture (Axelsson & Norrbacka Landsberg, 1998).

Generally, students spend one year in such a classroom and are gradually transferred to their future regular classrooms. They are introduced to their future regular class during their time in the reception class, in that they attend educational activities such as physical education or handicrafts together with the children in their future classroom.

The nationalities and language backgrounds of the students in such classes vary from year to year and depend largely on which groups of immigrants or refugees have arrived at the time. This means that students can have a variety of language backgrounds, and their prior schooling experiences may vary a great deal. Such immersion classrooms often contain age-integrated groups (students representing different ages). The teachers have considerable degrees of freedom in organizing classroom work. Because students usually differ greatly, the organization of classroom activities often needs to be adjusted to students' different proficiency level in Swedish, as well as their other academic skills and interests (Axelsson & Norrbacka Landsberg, 1998). The teaching is not restricted to Swedish language teaching, but it also involves other school subjects, such as mathematics, aesthetic, and literacy activities. Mother

tongue teachers regularly visit such classes. All in all, the educational policy is largely designed to provide a ‘proper’ introduction to the Swedish language, as well as to the Swedish school culture. Swedish is usually the primary language of teaching and the preferred *lingua franca* of such classrooms.

Setting

The data consist of video and audio recordings of everyday interactions in a Swedish immersion class for refugee and immigrant children; a so-called ‘mottagningsgrupp’ (*reception classroom*) in a Swedish school, grades 1–6. The school is located in a suburb of Stockholm. The class met five days a week, 4–6 hours a day. The present group included children in grades 1–3 (7 to 10 years). All children were beginner learners, who had recently arrived in Sweden. However, the children’s time spent in Sweden varied, as did their time in this class. Moreover, they differed in their proficiency in Swedish.

The staff and the children

The main teacher, Vera, was a native Swedish speaker. She was an experienced teacher, who had worked with children many years. A teacher’s aid, Fare, (Swedish-Arabic bilingual), assisted Vera. Mother tongue teachers (Arabic, Kurdish, and Thai) participated in classroom activities once/twice a week. Vera and Fare were jointly responsible for parent-school contacts and meetings, at which Fare also acted as translator.

The nine children in the immersion class were refugees or immigrants from Iraq, Kurdistan in Iraq and Turkey, Lebanon and Thailand¹⁰. They spoke Arabic, Thai and Kurdish. Swedish was the *lingua franca* of teaching, as well as the language taught. The majority of the children except a Thai girl, Nok, and Sawan, a Kurdish boy, also spoke some Arabic. They were well integrated into the class, however. The names of the teachers, as well as the names of all students, have been fictionalised to ensure anonymity.

Table 1. Children and their language backgrounds

Child	Age and gender	Native language	Other languages
Fusi	7 years, a girl	Kurdish (Suranji dialect)	Some knowledge of Arabic
Nok	7 years, a girl	Thai	
Ali	7 years, a boy	Arabic	
Rana	8 years, a girl	Arabic	
Hiwa	8 years, a boy	Kurdish (Suranji dialect)	Very limited knowledge of Arabic
Ahmed	8 years, a boy	Arabic	
Miran	9 years, a boy	Arabic	
Sawan	9 years, a boy	Kurdish (Kurmanji dialect)	Some words of Arabic
Layla	10 years, a girl	Arabic	

Classroom activities and languages in the classroom

The activities ranged from teacher-led book reading or story-telling, sharing time, rehearsals of Swedish songs and rhymes, vocabulary training, and examinations of home-work to individual work on tasks such as mathematics, writing, and aesthetic activities (e.g., drawing, making cartoon houses). One day every second week, the teacher Vera organised short trips outside the suburban area (e.g., excursions to the city hall or central train station).

In the classroom, the teachers employed teaching techniques that were centred on active student participation. Children's spontaneous contributions were encouraged throughout individual work as well as during teacher-led activities. Raising one's hand to bid for attention or a turn was rare, and peer group talk, if it did not disturb or interrupt classroom activities, was tolerated. Many activities occurred spontaneously, and educational games (e.g., Memory) were recurrently initiated by the teachers.

Generally, the main teacher, Vera, organized classroom activities in order to create what she called 'språktillfällen' ('occasions for speaking Swedish'). She was attentive to the children's initiatives, and focused her

instructions and spontaneous (whole-class) talk on their topics of interest. Speakership was primarily distributed through students' self-selections. Such an informal and open organization of interaction created a great deal of uncertainty as to who would speak when a turn terminated, resulting in turn-taking competitions and simultaneous talk. Classroom life entailed, thus, a great deal of improvisation and humour, and often deviated from what can be seen as an official pedagogic agenda (allowing for the children's spontaneous off-task contributions). The teacher, Vera, and the teacher's aid, Fare, were greatly appreciated by the students. Importantly, the lenient atmosphere of the classroom did not evolve into chaotic behaviour. The students' classroom conduct was guided by a set of tacit (at times, explicitly articulated) norms. For instance, the children were not allowed to leave their desks unless they asked the teacher for permission and could provide a reason for their request.

In order to maintain the children's home language as well to facilitate their participation in the L2 immersion, three mother tongue teachers, one for Arabic speaking, one for Kurdish, and one for the Thai speaker, worked with the children in the classroom at least once a week (e.g., translating the teacher's instructions and interacting with the children).

The official language of instruction in the classroom was Swedish. Moreover, Swedish was the primary *lingua franca* of the entire group of children. The children usually adhered to the normative order of Swedish as the official language, and primarily employed Swedish when approaching the teachers, and the teacher's aid Fare. It was only when the children were experiencing repeated problems in understanding exercises or the teacher's instructions that Fare chose to use Arabic. During the year, the children's use of Arabic in the classroom decreased, and most of the classroom interactions, including the children's spontaneous contributions, were carried out in Swedish, thereby consolidating the classroom as a Swedish speaking community. Given that only some of the students mastered Arabic fluently, Swedish was an important resource that both presented the means for communication with the teacher Vera, who was an appreciated conversational partner, and allowed the students to play out their verbal contributions for the larger public audience, involving all the teachers, and the students. The children's friendships were primarily formed with respect to gender, and age, rather than their language backgrounds, thus, for instance, Nok spent much time with Fusi, Hiwa with Ahmed, Layla with Rana.

Recordings and data

The main data for the study are recordings of children's on- and off-task interactions. In total, the data amount to 90 hours of recordings. The children's classroom interactions as well as their play activities outside the classroom were video recorded during three periods of the school year, covering an early (autumn), mid-period (winter) and late period (late spring), two weeks for each period. Video recordings were made with a stationary camera with an external microphone. The focus of the video recordings was distributed across the children in the class, providing approximately 1 day of recordings concerning each child and his/her daily interactions during each collection period. Because of the restricted classroom space, the data collected on each child obviously exceed one day of recordings in that any given child could also appear as an interactant in the recordings of one or more of the other children. In addition to the video recorder, the audio tape recorder was used to ensure high sound quality (e.g., to capture the children's private conversations).

I was present during the whole day of classroom activities and spent considerable time together with the children during recess, their outdoor activities, and lunches, taking field notes, and engaging in informal conversations and interviews with the teacher Vera, the teacher's aid Fare, and the children. The field notes and ethnographic data on the present community of learners include information on the children's social networks, their development of friendships, as well as changes in the social architecture of the peer group over time. The data also include the teachers' thoughts and considerations concerning the children, their academic success, as well as language teaching and learning. In this way, taking notes, documenting and collecting classroom artefacts supplied information that helped to contextualize my understanding of classroom life, and the information recorded on tape, adding depth to the knowledge about classroom events, the children's language use and communicative practices.

Transcriptions and translations

The recordings of recurrent classroom activities, transitional periods between classroom activities, and the children's informal conversations were selected and transcribed by the author. Afterwards, the transcripts were analysed for the children's interactional repertoires, occurring across the boundaries of various classroom activities. For the longitudinal article,

recordings were selected and transcribed with respect to the focus child's (Fusi's) participation in classroom activities in general, and teacher-fronted activities in particular. In total, the transcribed data of the three periods comprise 14 hours of recordings (out of a total of 90 hours, see above).

The children's talk in Arabic, Kurdish, or Thai has been translated by native speakers of the languages involved. The translations of excerpts were done by a native speaker of English, and the ambition has been to preserve the children's original style of speaking to the greatest extent possible, including errors (e.g., number congruency errors 'a mittens'; 'a shoes'). Mispronunciations and gender errors (such as 'et fisk' instead of 'en fisk'), however, were not translated. The transcriptions were made using the transcription system used within conversation analysis (CA).

Transcription key

- : : prolonged syllable
- [] : demarcates overlapping utterances
- (.) : micropause, i.e. shorter than (0.5)
- (2) : numbers in single parenthesis represent pauses in seconds
- YES : relatively high amplitude
- x : inaudible word
- (xx) : unsure transcription
- what* : translation into English
- jala** : word in Arabic
- ◦ : denotes speech in low volume
- (()) : further comments of the transcriber
- > < : quicker pace than surrounding talk
- < > : slower pace than surrounding talk
- ? : denotes rising terminal intonation
- . : indicates falling terminal intonation
- = : denotes latching between utterances
- Fare : sounds marked by emphatic stress are underlined
- he : indicates laughter

↑↓ : rising/falling pitch

On the role of the observer

The way we present ourselves, what we do in the field, has a lot to do with the impact of our presence and the camera on the observed (Duranti, 1997: 118). In the following, I will discuss how my presence and the presence of a video/tape recorder might have affected the interaction in the classroom and among the peers during recess.

My ambition was to introduce myself and to adopt a rather neutral role in the classroom, by trying to avoid a hierarchical teacher-associated position in relation to the children. For instance, I avoided taking responsibilities for supervising the children's classroom work, disciplining them, or staying with them in the classroom without the teacher present. I also avoided interfering with the children's sanctionable activities (for instance, when during recess the children stayed and played inside, in the school corridor instead of playing in the school yard). Moreover, I told the children that my overall research interest concerned their learning of Swedish, not their classroom performance as such. Also, because my native language is Lithuanian, I still spoke Swedish with an accent.

In the initial phase of data collection, the children were allowed to try out the camera and they were invited to film and use the camera by themselves. When their initial interest was satisfied, it was rare that my own presence or that of my camera was made noticeable, e.g., through what Duranti (1997: 118) calls 'obvious camera behaviors', certain types of 'camera recognitions', such as staring into the camera and smiling, or waving towards the camera. Such episodes mainly occurred during recess, or when the children were tired or bored during classroom work. Most of the time, however, they were engaged in their daily business and were preoccupied with participating in classroom life, trying to get the teacher's or their peers' attention, and having their contributions heard in the complex chorus of the classroom setting.

Occasionally, during the lessons, the teachers became involved in spontaneous conversations with me. This was not an unusual phenomenon, in that similar side conversations between the teacher Vera and the teacher's aid Fare (concerning a variety of practical issues in the classroom) regularly occurred in this classroom, thereby leaving considerable scope for the children's own simultaneous interactions.

So, is it possible to investigate social interaction without interfering and, to some extent, affecting participants' practices? As noted by Duranti (1997), most of the time, people engage in social actions, and employ the interactional repertoires and resources that are available to them independent of the presence of the researcher and/or the recorder. In the present classroom, the intensity of life and the activities of the classroom were the primary concerns of the teachers and the children. Moreover, episodes in which the researcher was included or addressed by the children can be valuable in that they may uncover and elaborate the tacit knowledge organizing the participants' actions (see, e.g., Article 1, Ex. 6).

Methodological considerations

Methodologically, the choice of longitudinal naturalistic data, was inspired by studies within language socialization paradigms (cf., Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996) that focus on language learning as a social and situated phenomenon. The analysis is also informed by conversation analysis, which means that talk is studied as social action (cf., Heritage, 1984). Such an approach entails detailed attention to interactional work, explored through the participants' perspectives and sense-making orientations displayed on a turn-by-turn basis. More specifically, in line with the studies that follow the learners' perspective (e.g., Bannink, 2002; Mori, 2004; Ohta, 2001), the present study has primarily focused on the students' communicative practices, and interactional resources in classroom interactions.

An ethnography of classroom interaction, grounded in detailed microanalysis of interactional patterns, may improve and provide knowledge of what goes in (L2) classrooms (Erickson, 1996; Mehan, 1979; van Lier, 1988). Integrating microanalyses of data with ethnographic knowledge of the setting allows us to more fully analyse children's interactional contributions, which in many cases are comprehensible only in the light of a shared interactional biography of the classroom community and the classroom-specific interactional arrangements. Longitudinal ethnographic classroom data form the basis of my understanding of how the specific practices are distributed and the ways in which the interactional patterns cut across the children's classroom and play activities. These data also allow us to understand and explore how novices make use of 'immediate and more distant interactional history' (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996: 253) in interpreting and participating in novel

encounters, and how they make sense of attitudes and ideas conveyed through interaction.

Video recordings provided possibilities to document interactional phenomena such as embodied accomplishment of talk-in-interaction, crucial for meaning making at early stages of L2 learning. As noted by Kasper (2004: 564), because of its close analyses and detailed attention to interactional engagements, CA offers an analytical method to identify affordances of different kinds of talk-in-interaction for L2 learning. The microanalytic method allows us to investigate the genesis of novices' language and interactional skills within the situated activity context. All in all, longitudinal data collection, combined with a microanalytical approach, allows for explorations of a novice's performances over time as well as for documenting the microgenesis of the novice's interactional competence, locating changes in a deeply situated account of interactional activities in the classroom (e.g., Kasper & Rose, 2002; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996).

Ethical considerations

The present thesis has followed the Swedish Research Council's ethical directions for collecting and handling data. This means that, at the outset, the teachers involved and the school principle were contacted. I presented myself as a PhD. student from the Department of Child Studies at Linköping University, and I explained my interest in studying second language learning, specifically, my interest in children's early L2 learning. I also explained that I had no interest in evaluating the pedagogy, the teachers, or the students *per se*, rather, my interest was in studying the general features of second language learning in a classroom setting. The ethical considerations that guided the research were reported to the teachers. These included issues concerning participation in the study, such as: (i) the participants (teachers and students) always have the right to stop their participation in the study; (ii) all participants' names and information concerning the school (name and district of the school) will be anonymized; (iii) the study will not use information that indirectly can lead to identification of the participants; (iv) the collected tapes will not be made available to persons not involved in the research project; (v) video information will not be used outside the research project. Similar information was provided for the students' parents, and their written consent for the children's participation in the study was obtained. The

teachers helped to explain the information concerning the study for the parents. The children were introduced to the general aims of the study and their consent was obtained, they were also informed that they could interrupt their participation in the study.

When the data collection was over, further ethical issues concerned how the data would be handled. The recordings were stored in a locked room at the Department of Child Studies at the university. Furthermore, when the data have been presented in public, only transcriptions have been used, not the recordings, as well as fictive names for the participants, in order to prevent identification.

Summaries of studies

Study I

Soliciting teacher attention in an L2 classroom: Affect displays, classroom artefacts, and embodied action

Asta Cekaite

Classroom life takes place in a multifaceted interactional environment, where multiple simultaneous activities may be pursued by various constellations of participants. For the students, an overwhelmingly present concern is to solicit teacher's attention and interactional uptake. This paper explores L2 novices' ways of soliciting teacher attention in classroom interactions. The data are based on detailed analyses of video recordings in a Swedish language immersion classroom. The study focuses on L2 novices' *summons* as well as the teacher's conversational uptake. As a first speaker's part in a sequence of actions, a summons (a vocative address, or physical action, e.g., raising a hand) is typically performed to solicit the recipient's attention (Schegloff, 1968: 1080). The recipient's response to the summons (e.g., 'yes', gaze, nod) displays her/his expectation for further action on the first speaker's part. Thereby, the recipient commits him-/herself to staying within the encounter (cf., Schegloff, 1968). This type of sequence provides the most rudimentary form of attention-getting activity in an L2 classroom. Similarly, studies on children's early L2 interactions in educational settings have demonstrated that summonses are initial methods for achieving participation (Cathcart, 1986; Pallotti, 1996).

In the complex classroom setting, L2 novices face several tasks when summoning the teacher, including (i) establishing attention, (ii) indicating what they want to talk about, that is, achieving shared understanding of specific actions. Moreover, students have restricted rights to initiate talk in

classroom settings, as well as restricted rights to choose topics. They therefore also face the task of securing the teacher's uptake.

The present analyses illuminate the lexical shape of the summons in conjunction with prosody, body posture, gestures, and the artefacts provided by the surroundings. The novices upgraded their summonses in a number of ways: e.g., by moving towards the teacher (ambulatory design), and by combining their summonses with a display of affect. The students recurrently employed gestures, body posture, and body position as ways of indexing a series of affective stances, e.g., 'tired', 'resigned' or 'playful', that in the local educational order of the classroom provided for methods that invited the teacher's attention and response. Such bodily displays (e.g., half-lying on the desk, turned towards the teacher, leaning away from the book, ambulatory design of actions) became meaningful in relation to situated classroom artefacts (books, desk). Prosodic indexing of affective stances were significant interactional resources in that they made an affective stance audible and could alert the teacher even before the teacher's visual orientation was established.

Together with classroom artefacts, these locally available resources allowed children to upgrade their summonses and to indicate their *communicative projects*, in spite of their limited Swedish (L2) resources. Also, summons turns were recurrently designed as affectively charged action that challenged the institutional order of the classroom (e.g., displaying 'not working', and thereby inviting the teacher's action). Within the local institutional order, both novices and more advanced students designed their initiating moves as displays of 'trouble relevant for the other' (Sacks, 1992, vol. I, p. 256), orienting to the teacher's responsibilities to help and assist the children. Such moves served as relevant warrants to initiate interaction and created additional incentives for the teacher to assist the student. Affective stances thus cannot be seen as uncontrolled 'inner' expressions of psychological emotional states. Instead, they are seen as part of the students' intricate interactional work on recipient design in pursuing the teacher's attention in the often fragmented and busy classroom interaction. The performative displays of affect supplemented the children's limited lexical repertoire by establishing a framework for interpreting their interactional moves.

Attention-getting formats have earlier been discussed as facilitating language acquisition, in that they allow for collaborative topic nominations, establishment, and negotiations together with a more competent speaker (Bruner, 1981; Hatch, 1978; Ochs Keenan &

Schieffelin, 1983). The basic argument of this paper is that a summons sequence can in itself provide a language learning context, in that establishing the respondent's uptake in a multiparty setting involves a considerable amount of interactional work. If we see language and grammar as evolving from specialized ways of solving interactional problems (e.g., Bruner, 1981; Hatch, 1978; Pallotti, 1996), summons sequences can be considered as fundamental frameworks for students' initial L2 learning.

Study II

Turn-taking and learner identity during the first year in an L2 classroom: A novice's changing patterns of participation

Asta Cekaite

In a longitudinal perspective, the present paper discusses how the interplay of the L2 novice's (Fusi's, a seven-year-old Kurdish girl's) *language skills* and *interactional skills* influenced the design of her *self-selections* during the three periods, casting her as (i) a silent child, (ii) a noisy and loud child, and as (iii) a skilful learner. The methods adopted combine a microanalytic, CA-inspired approach to everyday L2 interactions with ethnographic fieldwork analyses of language socialization within a classroom community.

The analyses revealed systematic changes in the novice's interactional engagements and highlighted how teacher-fronted activities, which had a rather 'loose' interactional organization, constituted a complex interactional setting for the L2 novice.

At the beginning of the school year, Fusi remained a passive observer of the whole group conversations. She participated only in individual work on task, where talk involved a limited set of basic interactional moves (e.g., summons sequences), and she primarily initiated talk in the physical proximity of the addressee.

During the mid-period, Fusi organized her conversational participation mostly by selecting some of the very few topics that she could deal with linguistically, such as ready-made instances of 'planned discourse' in teacher-fronted examinations, and spontaneous whole group conversations. However, her interactional skills were markedly lagging behind; she

repeatedly employed inappropriate production formats, failing to locate her initiatives at appropriate sequential slots or designing her contributions as aggravated direct disagreements. Moreover, she engaged in turn-competitions with the teacher, trying to 'win' the turn by markedly raising her volume of speech. Due to such breaches of interactional norms for classroom discourse, Fusi's actions often resulted in reprimands, disciplining or peer group teasing. The teacher's non-responses or disciplining moves (as well as peer self-selections) provided implicit socialization into what was the socially approved or, on the contrary, inappropriate interactional design of self-selections.

At the end of the year, period III, Fusi had not only mastered more elaborate L2 (Swedish) repertoires, but she had also developed interactional skills that allowed her to participate in spontaneously evolving whole group conversational activities. Her timely self-selections involved more than anticipating turn completion points, she was able to self-select at the 'right' moment, thereby displaying her knowing of the sequential organization of the classroom activity. Through everyday participation in classroom activities, Fusi had appropriated the competitive albeit relevant manner of how such initiatives were to be designed, indexing them with 'appropriate' affective stances, shaping her self-selections in a way that immediately indicated the newsworthiness of her contribution, for instance, by locating the important information first, and when needed, by recycling important turn beginnings. In cases of simultaneous talk with the teacher, she would 'cut off' her contributions.

This zigzag trajectory, from a silent and compliant child (period I), to a loud and noisy student (period II) and finally to a 'skilful student' (period III), demonstrates that learning and participation cannot be seen as a unilinear development towards full participation, or as a unidirectional development of one specific learner identity. Over time, one and the same L2 learner can position herself very differently within the classroom community, partly depending on the situated interplay of language skills, on the one hand, and interactional (pragmatic) skills, on the other. Hence, rather than studying an L2 novice's single 'learner identity' as a fixed entity, dissociated from his or her participation in classroom activities, we need more longitudinal work on the social dimension of participation and L2 learning in multiparty classroom settings. Instead of a unilinear 'development', we may be able find different trajectories, linked to distinct interactional language learning affordances over time.

Study III

Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: playful recyclings in an immersion classroom

Asta Cekaite and Karin Aronsson

In this study of children's Swedish immersion classroom conversations, it was found that playful repetitions and recyclings were recurrent features of their second language repertoires. In the audiolingual method of language teaching, repetition has been employed in language drills used to promote learners' formation of 'good habits'. In contrast, in content-based language teaching methods, repetition is often associated with mechanistic imitation and is banned from language classrooms. Lately, repetition has been redefined as an empirical issue (Duff, 2000), rather than as a set of fixed language teaching methods. In line with an emic ethnographic perspective on language acquisition, the present study explores how children themselves use repetition in their first stages of L2 acquisition, that is, it focuses on the classroom members' own methods. Specifically, it focuses on joking events they spontaneously initiate in early L2 conversations.

Joking events were identified in terms of the participants' displayed amusement. Recurrently, the children engaged in joking interactions by recycling prior speakers' utterances. Playful recyclings primarily involved *activity-based jokes* (Lampert, 1996), and *metapragmatic play*, that is, joking about *how* and *by whom* something was said. Two types of recyclings, intertextual play and role appropriations, were employed by the children in creating classroom entertainment.

Intertextual play involved epistemological play on hybrid representation modes such as novel combinations of song lines and personal names, or numbers and personal names. The children exploited everyday classroom routines: formulaic routine phrases such as counting routines, address routines, Swedish song lines, relating them to incongruent and unexpected aspects of classroom life.

Playful recyclings also included *role appropriations*, including role reversals based on children acting as teachers as it were (e.g., exploiting teacher talk register). Such resources involved verbal, vocal (pitch, intonation) and non-verbal (e.g., authoritative pointing) aspects of the teacher register.

While repetition generally contains perspective-taking of some kind, humour is often based on an inversion of normative expectations (Bakhtin, 1981). When assuming a variety of social roles, the children displayed their understanding of the social organization of everyday life in the classroom community. In many ways, participation in playful recyclings drew on the interactional conditions of the classroom setting as a multiparty participation framework. The study shows that the children created joking events in a variety of participation frameworks, involving peer groups, teacher-child dyads and the entire group. Within the multiparty format of classroom conversations, the children were able to creatively reframe the official business of routine tasks into joking encounters. Playful recyclings were important resources for rearranging social relations within classroom community, both in terms of participation frameworks (alignments) and mode (serious, non-serious), and they constituted an inherent part of interactional competencies in the classroom. Also, in joking exploitations of the teacher talk register, the children simultaneously displayed pragmatic awareness of local norms for language use.

Peer group recyclings at the early stages of L2 learning thus created meaningful contexts for the acquisition of linguistic and pragmatic skills. As demonstrated in the present study, the notion of L2 learning is not only applicable to learning practices in formal teaching in the classroom, but also to spontaneous creative use of teaching for some totally different purposes.

Study IV

Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning

Asta Cekaite and Karin Aronsson

The present study explores spontaneous language play episodes. Analyses of children's interactions in an immersion classroom demonstrated that children with limited L2 proficiency recurrently initiated joking events based on *form-focused language play*. Although language play is well recognized as a resource in L1 acquisition, by and large, peer group interactions (dealing with form-focused language play) have remained

somewhat underanalysed in studies on L2 acquisition. Moreover, in research on L2 acquisition (primarily, within communicative language teaching), 'authentic' and 'natural' language use has been privileged in discussions of 'meaningful input', which could imply that spontaneous language use does not involve a focus upon linguistic form and grammatical aspects of language (Cook, 2000).

The present study involves a distinct focus on children's recurrent involvement in spontaneous language play episodes collaboratively accomplished within different constellations of multiparty talk. We have identified joking events in which children laughed or commented on something as funny, thereby acknowledging laughables, and we adopted an emic perspective in that the participants' own orientation to something as funny helped us to identify joking events.

A large subset of children's spontaneous joking was based on ways of speaking, which exploited linguistic ambiguity and phonological, semantic and syntactic features of language. Most of the children's language play involved quite rudimentary forms of joking rather than elaborate genres such as riddles, puns or standardized jokes. For their amusement, the children exploited incongruities and rule distortions in that they drew upon sound play (manipulations of phonological rules), word composition (morphological rules), word substitutions (paradigmatic rules) and word order (syntactic rules). Such joking events usually included artful performance and collaborative aestheticism, involving alliterations, parallelisms, code switching, word elongations, onomatopoeia, voice and pitch variations (as well as laughing and repetitions) within the multiparty framework. Incongruities in form-focused language play often generated extended repair sequences that could be seen as informal 'language lessons' (focused on formal aspects of L2). During extended language play and repair work, the peer group thus generated opportunities for collaborative 'pushed output' (Swain, 2000), thereby, language play provided the peer group with important resources for exploring several levels of grammar.

Such events constitute instances of explicit language instruction that bear a resemblance to language drills and other form-focused language teaching activities. Language play episodes were bound to a range of classroom routines, which involved classroom activities that focus on formal aspects of L2 learning. Hence, within their joking events (language play), the children recycled the ritual character of language learning and created 'time out' within the framework of classroom activities.

Participation in the form of joking alignments and realignments in language play episodes seemed to be key elements of the local politics of classroom life. Multiparty spontaneous language play thus involved a twofold process, that of practising language and of qualifying as participants and members of the classroom community. The findings of the present study illustrate the need to integrate language play (spontaneous collaborative form-focused episodes) into models of L2 learning and teaching.

Concluding discussion

The present thesis has explored the learners' communicative practices as they emerge within the interactional ecology of the classroom. Three communicative practices were selected for analysis as they were recurrently identified in children's classroom repertoires: (i) summonses; (ii) self-selections in multiparty teacher-fronted conversations; (iii) language play and metapragmatic play. In relation to the children's participation in these practices, the study explored the resources that the children displayed at early stages of L2 acquisition, and the ways in which they were configured in specific interactional events. By focusing on the above language practices, the present thesis illustrates aspects of language use in classrooms that have largely escaped systematic analysis in SLA research.

First, the present studies demonstrate a range of interactional resources, deployed by the learners in designing their contributions. For instance, repetitions (e.g., format tying) were recurrently deployed in order to initiate joking events. The humorous potential of teacher talk was invoked by recycling interactional features of a teacher register (intonation, voice quality and accompanying authoritative gestures, lexis, evaluation sequences) or classroom routines (songs, greeting routines). The present studies show that a solely cognitive approach to repetition does not cover the functions of repetitions, particularly when language learning and use are intimately related to the enactment of social roles and relations. Rather, the children's repetitions, designed as recyclings of the institutional character of classroom talk, underscore that even L2 novices are able to recognize and deploy contextualization cues and discourse markers in a way that is sensitive to the institutional organization of talk. By playfully rekeying such contributions, the children demonstrated their awareness of the social norms of language use (see also Kyratzis, 2004).

Recyclings of the institutional character of classroom routines ('Memory', vocabulary training) were intimately related to the children's play with language forms. Such playful uses of language were deployed in a variety of participation frameworks, and they were recurrently designed

as a public performance for an overhearing audience. Thereby, the present studies (III and IV) demonstrate that language play is not exclusively associated with children's play activities outside the institutional contexts, but is a pervasive feature of children's spontaneous interactions in formal language learning settings as well. Such practices motivate a redefinition of the traditional dichotomy concerning what constitutes formal versus natural language learning (see also Cook, 2000; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Rampton, 1999a). This reconsideration is motivated not only by the pervasiveness of such practices, but it is also grounded in the situated details of their interactional organization. As demonstrated in both studies on language play and metapragmatic play (Study III and IV), and in accordance with the interactional development of playful episodes in everyday conversations (Jefferson, 1996), such wilful or unwilful deviances from the classroom norms of language production recurrently developed into metatalk and repair practices, and at times, the joint re-establishment of the appropriate, correct language form. Notably, such playful episodes were embedded within the pedagogical aims of the present classroom in that the teachers recurrently initiated collaborative (language) repairs. The peer group was an important factor, in that the classmates readily joined in on both further playful transgressions and repair practices. Thus, language play episodes (at times) evolved into spontaneous collaborative language lessons, as it were.

Other interactional resources that were documented as pervasive features of children's early interactions were multimodally indexed affective stances, as well as an embodied deployment of classroom artefacts. Although affect permeates all human interaction, affective stances have been shown to be significant interactional resources when children's linguistic competence is still limited, allowing them to design utterances in a way that constituted a powerful device for achieving the teacher's attention. It is important to underline that these devices needed to be deployed in locally relevant ways in a given classroom practice, that is, summoning the teacher's assistance during individual seatwork. The specific configuration of affective resources together with the student's orientation to the relevant classroom artefacts was recurrently designed so as to display a 'needing', 'demanding', or even 'unhappy' local student identity with respect to her current work progress. Thus, the locally available interactional resources were configured so as to display the institutional roles and relations appropriate for the specific, routine classroom practices.

A common theme in the present studies (Study I and II) is the relation between the interactional organization of classroom activities and the children's interactional repertoires. Here, a close analysis of children's interactional participation demonstrated that specific language and interactional resources co-occurred within the specific instructional formats, that is, individual work and teacher-fronted multiparty conversations. As demonstrated, individual work activities primarily involved children's summons-answer sequences. In contrast, teacher-fronted conversational activities required a different interactional design of self-selections within less formally structured interactional routines. Such entry moves required a more lexically elaborate design than lexically simple summons sequences, in that they needed to be shaped in relation to the ongoing talk.

So, one important dimension with respect to classroom language interactions is that instructional formats (individual seatwork and teacher-fronted activities) involve distinct interactional organizations. As such, they structured the children's participation in classroom activities according to their proficiency level. Even the L2 novices participated in individual work, managing their participation by simple summons sequences directed to the teacher. However, their access to multiparty conversational activities was constrained by their (still) limited language skills.

Through a longitudinal analysis of novice participation in such classroom activities over the first year in the classroom, the present work (Study II) demonstrates that local 'learner identities' were discursively constructed with respect to novice's language skills and interactional skills. During the year, the novice's 'identity' changed, from an 'immature' to a 'competent' and a 'skilful' learner. Thus, what can be seen as a 'learner identity' was intimately related to the novice's appropriation of interactional skills required for institutionally relevant ways of participating in the classroom community.

Another important factor in classroom language learning was the fact that the primary access to classroom activities was influenced by the multiparty and frequently competitive nature of the classroom setting. When repeatedly calling for the teacher, the children upgraded their summons by displays of affective stances ('resigned', 'unhappy') and relevant classroom artefacts. When self-selecting in teacher-fronted activities, they shaped their entry moves in a competitive manner (e.g., speedy talk and lexically elaborate design of their turn). Here, the

interactional design entailed the students' display of the 'knowledgeable' and 'competent student' identity.

As demonstrated, the interactional work that the children accomplish just in order to get access to the selfsame educational activities may (i) shape the children's interactional and linguistic repertoires; (ii) provide or curtail language learning affordances. These aspects have generally been neglected in studies on language classrooms (but see Pallotti, 2001), and even studies that adopt (an emic) learner perspective have treated access to educational activities in language classrooms as unproblematic, primarily investigating learners' actions with respect to some language learning tasks (e.g., Markee, 2000; Mori, 2002). So, while the ways in which different classroom activities (e.g., language-focused activities or content related activities) result in different patterns of feedback and modifications (Oliver & Mackey, 2003) are generally acknowledged in SLA research, the present thesis demonstrates the importance of attending to the learners' interactional skills as consequential for his or her access to participation in classroom activities. Such interactional skills proved to be consequential for creating learning affordances.

Thus, the present studies add to our knowledge of L2 learners' informal learning, and they provide some novel insights into how learning affordances are co-constructed through classroom interaction. Working on the learners' participation in interactional routines provided possibilities to focus on the intersection between interactional (pragmatic) and language skills. Furthermore, examining the interactional and language competencies that are required when learners attempt to get conversational access provides a fuller understanding of socialization into classroom norms of language use. As demonstrated across the present studies, some of the crucial tasks children face in classrooms are related to gaining access to the classroom activities and to interactions in general. Examining classroom interactions from the perspective of the learner provides a fuller appreciation of the diversity of factors in L2 acquisition, and offers a somewhat unexploited avenue of understanding the language classroom as a social site for language learning.

Footnotes

¹ In this thesis, I use the terms learning or acquisition to refer to the process of language development (cf., Ohta, 2001).

² Learner perspective on language learning affordances is not limited to CA approach. Similar point of departure is adopted by studies within ecological perspective (van Dam,

2002a, b; Bannink, 2002), and sociocultural perspective (Ohta, 2001; Young & Miller, 2004).

³ They do not necessarily involve expert/adult-initiated exchanges, rather, they may be defined as types of patterned interactional behavior in exchanges between expert and novice (see for instance, Peters & Boggs, 1986 on the examples of interactional routines of children's summonses and adults' routine answers).

⁴ A related concept of recurrent communicative practices is deployed by studies within the sociocultural perspective on L2 learning. Communicative practices are defined as goal-oriented, recurrent moments of face-to-face interactions, associated with specific lexical and syntactic choices, participation structures, prosodic and other formulas to signal opening, transitional, and closing moves (Hall, 1999: 144-148). Hall (1999), for instance, argues that a key understanding of the learners' language development lies in close examination of the communicative practices (including classroom practices) into which they are socialized. It is through participation in socioculturally important routinized classroom practices that learners develop their understanding of language, and learning.

⁵ Recently, studies within the critical, sociopolitical perspective on language socialization, explored adolescents' and young adults' socialization in bilingual and multilingual settings (see Bayley & Schechter, 2003). They investigated how immigrant students were socialized in linguistic and cultural practices of secondary schools, and high school, demonstrating how novices took on the resources and norms of how to fit into a group to achieve insider identity of the educational setting (Cole & Zuengler, 2003; Harklau, 2003).

⁶ Language socialization studies, inspired by phenomenological tradition, not only emphasize the enduring nature of routine, they also foreground its 'open-ended, negotiated, sometimes contested character' (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002: 344). Similarly, from a microsociological CA perspective, routine is viewed as a practical accomplishment (Schegloff, 1986) thus, an object for transformation and change. Transformations of routines discursively articulate and elaborate the tacit sociocultural norms and beliefs organizing the recurrent mundane activities of the communities (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002).

⁷ Similarly, in studies of informal language socialization in bilingual minority language settings, it has, for instance, been documented that children's sibling play practices have, in fact, led to the abandonment of the mother tongue spoken by parents and grand-parents, in favour of the majority language of schooling (Kulick, 1992; Rindstedt & Aronsson, 2002).

⁸ Such concept of identity foregrounds the role of language and discursive practices as constitutive of and constituted of a language learner's identity (Norton, 2000: 5).

⁹ Moreover, affective devices may provide the participants' with crucial interactional resources when participants' linguistic resources are rather limited. For instance, Goodwin & Goodwin (2000) have demonstrated that a person with only limited resources could tie into assessment sequences through the use of a limited number although prosodically appropriately indexed words.

¹⁰ Some children participated in the classroom only during some limited period of time (for instance, at the end of the school year), and were therefore not a part of systematic data collection. They included Karwan (8, a Kurdish boy), Miriam (6, a Somali girl), and Kao (12, a Thai boy).

References

- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.
- Aronsson, K. (1998). Identity-in-interaction and social choreography. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31, 75-89.
- Axelsson, M., & Norrbacka Landsberg, R. (1998). *En studie av två internationella klasser*. Botkyrka: Mångkulturellt centrum.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (Ed. M. Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bannink, A. (2002). Negotiating the paradoxes of spontaneous talk in advanced L2 classes. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization*, (pp. 267-288). London: Continuum.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Björk-Willén, P. (2006). *Multilingual preschool routines and interactional trouble: How preschool children participate in multilingual education*. (Article manuscript).
- Blum-Kulka, S., Huck-Taglicht, D., & Avni, H. (2004). The social and discursive spectrum of peer talk. *Discourse Studies*, 6, 307-328.
- Boxer, D. (2004). Studying speaking to inform second language learning. A conceptual overview. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 3-24). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Breen, M. (2001). Overt participation and covert acquisition in the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 112-140). Longman: Pearson Education.
- Broner, M., & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 85, 363-379.
- Bruner, J. (1981). The social context of language acquisition. *Language and Communication*, 2, 155-178.
- Cathcart, R. (1986). Situational differences and the sampling of young children's school language. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 118-140). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Cathcart-Strong, R. (1986). Input generation by young second language learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 20, 515-530.
- Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11, 67-110.
- Cole, K. & Zuengler, J. (2003). Engaging in an authentic science project: Appropriating, resisting, and denying "scientific" identities. In R. Bayley & S.

- R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 98-113). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, G. (1997). Language play, language learning. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 51, 224-231.
- Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1443-1465.
- Corsaro, W. (1979). 'We're friends, right?': Children's use of access rituals in a nursery school. *Language in Society*, 8, 315-336.
- Cromdal, J. (2001). *Can I be with?: Negotiating play entry in a bilingual school*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 515-543.
- Cromdal, J. (2004). Building bilingual oppositions: Code-switching in children's disputes. *Language in Society*, 33, 33-58.
- Cromdal, J., & Aronsson, K. (2000). Footing in bilingual play. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 435-457.
- de Leon, L. (2000). The emergent participant: Interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) infants. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8, 131-161.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 505-537.
- Duff, P. A. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 109-138). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erickson, F. (1996). Ethnographic microanalysis. In S. L. McKay & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 283-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1986). Activity structure as scaffolding for children's second language learning. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 325-357). Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evaldsson, A-C. (2004). Shifting moral stances: Morality and gender in same-sex and cross-sex game interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37, 331-363.
- Evaldsson, A-C. (2005). Staging insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group. *Discourse in Society*, 16, 763-786.

- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-Lopez, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339-61.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In *Forms of talk* (pp. 124-159). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489-1522.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (2000). Emotion within situated activity. In N. Budwig, I. C. Uzgiris & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Communication: An arena of development* (pp. 33-53). Stamford: Ablex Publishing.
- Gullberg, M. (1998). *Gesture as a communication strategy in second language discourse*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University Press. (Unpublished Ph.D.diss.).
- Hall, J. K. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: The construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF. *Linguistics and Education*, 9, 287-311.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction. The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186-203.
- Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harklau, L. (2003). Representational practices and multi-modal communication in US High schools. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 83-97). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition. A book of readings* (pp. 402-435). Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Hawkins, M. (2005). Becoming a student: Identity work and academic literacies in early schooling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 59-82.

- He, A. W. (2000). The grammatical and interactional organization of teacher's directives: Implications for socialization of Chinese American children. *Linguistics and Education, 11*, 119-140.
- He, A. W. (2003). Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 128-146). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Worcester: Polity Press.
- Itoh, H. & Hatch, E. (1978). Second language acquisition. A case study. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition. A book of readings* (76-88). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Jefferson, G. (1996). On the poetics of ordinary talk. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 16*, 1-61.
- Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1467-1492.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversations-for-learning. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 551-567.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language. A supplement to Language Learning. Volume 52, supplement 1.*
- Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2002). Introduction. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 1-30). London: Continuum.
- Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *English Language Teaching Journal, 50*, 199-113.
- Krupa-Kwiatkowski, M. (1998). 'You shouldn't have brought me here!': Interaction strategies in the silent period of an inner-directed second language learner. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*, 133-175.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurhila, S. (2004). Clients or language learners – being a second language speaker in institutional interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 58-74). London: Continuum.
- Kyratzis, A. (2004). Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 33*, 625-649.
- Lampert, M. D. (1996). Studying gender differences in the conversational humor of adults' and children. In D. Slobin et al. (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 579-596). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leather, J., & van Dam, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Ecology of language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NY: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 583-596.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491-500.
- McCafferty, S. G. (2002). Gesture and creating zones of proximal development for second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 192-203.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: The social organization of classroom behavior*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501-518.
- Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 323-347.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 563-550.
- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESOL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 279-310.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning*. Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, 41, 136-145.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs Keenan, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1983). Topic as discourse notion: a study of topic in the conversations of children and adults. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin, *Acquiring conversational competence* (pp. 66-113). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ohta, A. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1493-1512.
- Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 519-533.
- Olmedo, I. M. (2003). Language mediation among emergent bilingual children. *Linguistics and Education*, 14, 143-162.

- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221-245). London: Continuum.
- Pallotti, G. (1996). Towards an ecology of second language acquisition: SLA as a socialization process. In E. Kellerman, B. Weltens, T. Bongaerts (Eds.), *Proceedings of EUROSLA 6, Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen, # 55*.
- Pallotti, G. (2001). External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations. In A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner & F. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture in communication* (pp. 295-334). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Peck, S. (1978). Child-child discourse in second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition. A book of readings* (pp. 383-400). Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Pennycook, A. (1985). Actions speak louder than words: Paralanguage, communication, and education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 259-282.
- Peters, A. M., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 80-96). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3-21.
- Philips, S. (1970). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Bilingualism and language contact*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Platt, E., & Troudi, S. (1997). Mary and her teachers: A Grebo-speaking child's place in the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 28-49.
- Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 42, 593-616.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1999a). Dichotomies, difference and ritual in second language learning and teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 20, 316-340.
- Rampton, B. (1999b). *Deutsch* in Inner London and the animation of an instructed foreign language. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3, 480-504.
- Rampton, B. (2002). Ritual and foreign language practices at school. *Language in Society*, 31, 491-525.
- Rindstedt, C., & Aronsson, K. (2002). Growing up monolingual in a bilingual community. *Language in Society*, 31, 721-42.
- Roberts, C. (2001). Language acquisition or language socialization in and through discourse. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 108-121). London: Routledge.
- Rydland, V., & Aukrust, V. G. (2005). Lexical repetition in second language learners' peer play interaction. *Language Learning*, 55, 229-274.

- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Volumes I and II* (Ed. G. Jefferson). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the hill backwards: On interactional constraints and affordances for Equity-constitution in the classrooms of the Swedish comprehensive school*. Uppsala University: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 85 (Unpublished Ph.D. Diss.).
- Saville-Troike, M., & Kleifgen, J. (1986). Scripts for school: Cross-cultural communication in elementary classrooms. *Text*, 6, 207-221.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1075-95.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human studies*, 9, 11-151.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1996). The microgenesis of competence: Methodology in language socialization. In D. J. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language* (pp. 251-263). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2005). 'Jag vet int va de heter på svenska'. Interaktion mellan tvåspråkiga elever och deras lärare i en enspråkig klassrumsdiskurs. Åbo University: Åbo University Press. (Diss).
- Sullivan, P. (2000). Spoken artistry: Performance in a foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplatche (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interactions* (pp. 73-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171-185.
- Tholander, M., & Aronsson, K. (2003). Doing subteaching in school group work: Positionings, resistance and participation frameworks. *Language and Education*, 17, 208-234.
- Toohey, K. (1998). 'Breaking them up; taking them away': ESL students in grade 1. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 61-84.
- Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations and classroom practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Toohey, K. (2001). Disputes in child L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 257-278.
- van Dam, J. (2002a). Ritual, face, and play in a first English lesson: Bootstrapping a classroom culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 237-265). London: Continuum Press.

- van Dam, J. (2002b). Language acquisition behind the scenes. Collusion and play in educational settings. In J. Leather & J. van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 203-221). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.
- van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Boggs, S. T. (1977). From verbal play to talk story: The role of routines in speech events among Hawaiian children. In S. Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child discourse* (pp. 67-90). New York: Academic Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 331-350.
- Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 473-503.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C. Fillmore, D. Kempler & W. Wang (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). Second-language learning in children: a model of language learning in social context. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 49-69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, R., & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 519-535.